Make file
Separation of Church + State
put with other religious files

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS OF
J. M. O'NEILL
BROOKLYN COLLEGE
BROOKLYN 10, N. Y.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

J. M. O'NEILL

A Reprint from
COMMENTARY
June 1947
425 Fourth Avenue
New York 16, N. Y.

THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

J. M. O'NEILL

ONE does not have to go far in civil liberty activities to realize that the whole field is confused by categorical slogans and historical myths. One of the most universal and, to my mind, currently one of the most harmful of these is the belief in a so-called "great American principle of *complete* separation of church and state."

Appeals to this alleged principle are today creating dissension and confusion in the discussion of all sorts of proposals affecting contacts between government and religion.

It has recently been invoked by those opposing Mr. Taylor's appointment to the Vatican and by the opponents of released time in public school for religious instruction, of school credit for such instruction, of public transportation for pupils of church schools, of Bible reading and prayers in the public schools, of N.Y.A. and G.I. Bill of Rights funds for students in church schools, of tax exemption of church property, and of federal aid to parochial schools.

Each and every one of these proposals is as debatable as, for instance, peacetime conscription. Each should be supported or opposed on its individual merits, the sole criterion being its value in terms of the public welfare. Above all, no one, by virtue of the side he is on in such a debate, should be held to be un-American, unconstitutional, or subversive of our traditions.

Today, appeals to this so-called principle are being used to deny opponents the opportunity of debate; they are attempts to gain debatable ends without the burdens and risks of debate. There is no such great American principle and there never has been.

If there is such an American principle, it must have been formulated, adopted, or promulgated by some group or groups authorized to speak for America. If such an event has ever taken place we should find the evidence of it in the federal constitution, in the acts of Congress, or in the constitutions or laws of the several states. There is no such evidence in existence. In its absence, the mere opinion of private individuals or groups that there *should* be *absolute* separation of church and state (a condition that has probably not existed in recent centuries in any civilized nation on earth) does not create a "great American principle."

I

DOES the Constitution of the United States provide for the complete separation of church and state? One passage in the First Amendment to the Constitution (the first article of the Bill of Rights, 1791) contains a statement which some may have in mind when they invoke this principle. It reads: "Congress shall make no law respect-

---

RECENT efforts to obtain public funds for parochial schools, corresponding efforts to "bring religion into the public schools," and—most recently—a Supreme Court decision permitting the expenditure of public funds to provide bus service to parochial schools, have once more spotlighted one of the important issues in American life: the relations of religion, government, and education. J. M. O'NEILL, a liberal and a Catholic, here advances the thesis that "the American principle of separation of church and state," commonly invoked in controversy over this issue, has no relevance to the specific problems facing us today. A different point of view was presented by Professor Milton R. Konvitz in our June 1946 issue and other points of view will be presented in future issues. Professor O'Neill is chairman of the Department of Speech at Brooklyn College and chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the American Civil Liberties Union. He is author, co-author, and editor of many standard books on rhetoric and speech. Professor O'Neill was born in Victor, New York, in 1881, and is a graduate of Dartmouth College. He writes here in his personal capacity, not as a spokesman for any organization.

ing an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." That is all there is, and the evidence available in American political and judicial history proves that it means exactly what it says—no more and no less.

Years before 1791, the question of the "establishment" or "disestablishment" of religion in the colonies and the states was about as live a topic as labor legislation is in 1947. This passage meant something important to the men who wrote and adopted it. They did not write carelessly because the matter was of little importance, or ambiguously to catch voters on both sides of the street. The phrase "separation of church and state" would not have served their purpose as well, for it is a thoroughly ambiguous phrase which may mean anything from absolute and complete separation to something like the separation of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of our federal government.

The clear statement in the Bill of Rights was put into the Constitution to prevent the setting up in the United States as a whole of something specific that had been bitterly fought and already defeated in a number of the individual states, viz., a state religion. The men who gave us the Bill of Rights wanted free and equal opportunities for religious worship, belief, and practice for all faiths. Their clear intentions were accurately phrased in the Constitution, and *all other matters concerning government and religion* were left to the individual states.

The argument that the words "no law respecting an establishment of religion" mean "no law in reference to religion or to any religious institution," an argument sometimes seriously presented in law courts, is wholly inconsistent with the constitutional situation which governed the adoption of the First Amendment, is denied by the contexts from which phrases supporting this argument are taken, is contrary to the purpose stated by leaders in the fight against established churches and by scholarly commentators, and traduces the known verbal competence of James Madison, who phrased the amendment.

If the argument is valid, the first part of the first sentence of the Bill of Rights is clumsy and ambiguous and the concluding phrase ("or prohibiting the free exercise thereof") is redundant. If it is valid, all laws dealing with tax exemption, building regulations, fire prevention, sanitation, curriculum, teacher qualifications, state inspection, state examinations, credits, etc. are violations of the First Amendment in so far as they apply to churches and church schools. Further, through the operation of the Fourteenth Amendment (adopted 1868), such regulations are now unconstitutional even when expressed in *state* laws. If this argument is valid, it would now be unconstitutional anywhere in the United States to use public funds in part-support of hospitals, orphanages, or homes for delinquents, conducted by religious organizations. Yet this procedure goes back to the beginning of the country and is accepted today, as throughout our history, as a normal and wise practice.

It is simply impossible to believe that Madison, Jefferson, and the other Founding Fathers supposed they were adopting a prohibition of transportation, textbooks, lunches, or other services to pupils in church schools, to be provided *by state law from state funds.* They knew that they were writing only a limitation on congressional legislation for the United States *as a whole,* to be adopted by the states as a part of their delegation of power to the federal government. They knew that the doctrines of the First Amendment as they wrote it were not restrictive of the constitutions and laws *of the several states.* These doctrines did not limit the powers of the individual states until after the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868. So, whatever this restriction amounts to today, that restriction could not *possibly* have been a part of *the intention* of the men who were responsible for the First Amendment.

AGAINST the contention that the purpose of the phrase prohibiting Congress from making a law "respecting an establishment of religion" was the complete separation of church and state, I offer the following facts:

First, Madison's original wording of this phrase was "nor shall any national religion be established." This language thoroughly disproves the claim that Madison's purpose was to forbid public aid or support for religion (since such matters were not under national authority), or to outlaw the use of public funds for religious schools *by the states.*

Second, this amendment alone in the Bill of Rights was phrased explicitly to restrict only the power of Congress, and to leave untouched the powers of the several states: "Congress shall make no law."

Third, in 1789 the Congress which gave us the Bill of Rights refused to submit for ratification a proposed amendment which said in part: "No state shall infringe the equal rights of conscience." Even if that amendment had been adopted and ratified, it would not have set up complete separation of church and state. Had it been put into the Constitution, no state could have set up an established church, of course, since that would "infringe the equal rights of conscience." But under that amendment a state could freely (if it wished) give impartial aid, financial or otherwise, for any purpose, to all religions desiring it, because this would not "infringe the equal rights of conscience." But the Bill of Rights Congress refused even this limitation on state authority. Thus the Founding Fathers, far from prohibiting all state support to religion or religious institutions, left the states free even to set up established churches and to restrict religious freedom.

Fourth, about the only schools Madison and Jefferson and their contemporaries knew were largely or wholly under religious auspices. "Complete separation," such as Justice Rutledge (in the New Jersey bus case) says is prescribed by the Constitution, has never obtained in any state in the United States. Even Jefferson's plan for a system of public education for Virginia included a school of theology for the training of clergymen!

In brief, either Madison and Jefferson and their contemporaries considered the possibility of prohibiting any use of public funds by the state in aid of religion, or in support of institutions or enterprises under religious auspices, or else they did not consider it. If they considered such a prohibition they decided against it, since they made no attempt to write this into the Bill of Rights. If they did not so much as consider it, they could not have intended to accomplish it.

Fifth, the Fourteenth Amendment, which was written and ratified in 1866-1868 to create and protect the citizenship of the recently freed slaves, now extends the restrictions of the First Amendment to the several states. It states: "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Obviously, an amendment incorporated into the Constitution in 1868 could not alter the purpose or the meaning of an amendment of 1791. It could and did alter the *effect*—by spreading it to include all of the states.

This extension of the First Amendment to the states was unplanned, unintended, and unrecognized for years after it happened. President Grant, elected in 1868 as the candidate of the party responsible for the Fourteenth Amendment, in 1875 recommended a new amendment to prohibit state support of religion or religious schools. James G. Blaine, an outstanding Republican congressional leader of the time, sponsored Grant's amendment in Congress. Congress, as in 1789, refused to adopt the amendment—indicating once again its intention to leave the states free in this matter. In 1880 James A. Garfield, in his speech accepting the Republican nomination for the Presidency, also recommended prohibiting tax support of religious education. Clearly these three dominant Republicans of that period did not believe that the Constitution already prohibited public support of religious education.

Finally (as reported by Fraenkel in *Our Civil Liberties*), the Supreme Court did not recognize that the Fourteenth Amendment placed on the several states the restrictions of the First in regard to freedom of religion, speech, and the press until a half cen-

tury after it happened.

In the light of these facts, no one has a right to believe that Congress in adopting the Fourteenth Amendment *intended* to forbid state support of religion or religious education.

THE common attempt to make a mystery out of what Madison meant by "an establishment of religion" (an extreme instance is found in the dissenting opinion in the New Jersey bus case, February 10, 1947) is both historically and semantically incomprehensible. It obviously means just what it means in the writings of Madison, Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers, and of historians and commentators throughout the last century, viz., a state church or religion—a single religion or church enjoying a formal, legal, official, monopolistic relation to government. This is the meaning given in the Encyclopedia Britannica. This is the way in which the term has been used for centuries in speaking of the established Protestant churches of England, Scotland, or Germany, or the Catholic establishment in Italy or Spain.

For example, John Adams said, "If Parliament could tax us, they could also establish the Church of England." Sam Adams said, "The establishment of a Protestant Episcopacy in America is also zealously contended for. . . . We hope to God such an establishment will never take place in America." Judge Story in his *Commentaries* wrote: "The real object of Amendment I was to prevent any ecclesiastical establishment which would give to any hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the federal government."

The phrase "separation of church and state" in this accurate, constitutional sense is so used by William Warren Sweet in his *The Story of Religions in the United States,* by Morrison and Commager in *The Growth of the American Republic,* and others. Cardinal Gibbons was clearly using the phrase in this exact sense in his *A Retrospect of Fifty Years*: "The separation of church and state in this country seems to Catholics the natural, the inevitable, the best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the state. . . . American Catholics rejoice in our separation of church and state; and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances likely to arise which should make a union desirable either to church or state."

The many references to the fictitious principle in the recent Supreme Court decision on the New Jersey bus case may give the old myth a glow of specious vitality. While the actual decision of the Court gives no endorsement to the principle, some of the argument in the majority opinion, and much in the dissenting opinion does.

The decision of the Court is in agreement with its earlier favorable decisions in regard to Bible reading in public schools and textbooks at public expense for pupils in parochial schools. It is also in agreement with almost universal state practice in tax exemption, the paying of public funds for services rendered to such church-controlled institutions as hospitals and the like, and the numerous laws and public regulations "in respect of" education in religious schools. Here as in earlier decisions the alleged principle gets sustenance only from fragmentary *obiter dicta* of some of the judges, chiefly Justice Rutledge's dissenting opinion.

This dissenting opinion, relying upon "history" to show that the First Amendment means something that it does not say, omits the controlling facts of history cited above, does not cite a single quotation from either Madison or Jefferson showing that either of them ever was opposed to government support of religion except as an aspect of an "established" religion, and omits the host of available quotations from both of these men which show that they consistently used "establishment" to mean an official and monopolistic union of one religion and government.

IN ALL of the discussion leading up to the action of the Congress of 1789, it was "a condition and not a theory" which confronted the leaders in the fight to prohibit establishment. Establishment was the rule not only in England and in Scotland, but in all of

Europe, both Protestant and Catholic, and in most of America itself. At the beginning of the Revolution the Anglican Church or the Congregational Church held positions of full or partial establishment in all but four of the thirteen colonies.

The handful of Catholics in this country at the time played no important part in the disestablishment discussion. They numbered about 24,000 at the end of the Revolution, about two-thirds of them being in Maryland. As a small minority, even in Maryland (where the Episcopal Church had long since become the established church), they were naturally in favor of disestablishment. Early in the 18th century, when the dissenters and Quakers in Maryland were brought under the English Act of Toleration of 1689, the Catholics were excluded.

Contrary to the frequent assertions of eminent men, both Catholic and Protestant, neither the genuine, specific American principle of "no established church" nor the vague, spurious principle of "complete separation of church and state" is a Protestant as distinct from a Catholic principle. Established or state churches have been an almost unbroken rule ever since the Reformation in the Protestant countries of England, Scotland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, and in the countries of Eastern Europe which have broken away from the Roman Catholic Church. In Holland and Switzerland the state has contributed to both Protestant and Catholic church schools.

If the almost universal existence of state churches is good evidence, it is apparent that outside of the United States most Protestants and most Catholics agree on the principle of an established church. In this country, on the other hand, practically everyone agrees on the principle of *no* established church. *This is a genuine American principle.* There is probably no other public principle upon which greater unity could be obtained today. Yet one might think on the basis of some of the arguments circulated today concerning specific measures that there is a fundamental disagreement in America on this issue between Catholics and Protestants.

II

THE state constitutions and state laws likewise offer no comfort to those who would find in them an American principle demanding complete separation of church and state. The various states have a wide variety of provisions touching religion, particularly as regards education, in their state constitutions, laws, and court decisions. For a time it was contended that the First Amendment prevented the states from legislating in this area. But it was shortly recognized that the words "Congress shall make no law" was not a restriction on the state legislatures.

The people of the various states have therefore been wholly free to enact whatever constitutional or statutory provisions in the religious area they wanted. They have exercised their freedom rather thoroughly, and the provisions adopted have been various, and variously interpreted.

The states differ widely on Bible reading in the public schools, released time for religious instruction, use of public-school buildings for religious purposes, hiring public-school teachers who wear religious garb in the classroom, giving credit for religious instruction, etc. A recent survey by the National Education Association reports that on seventeen of such disputed practices showing relations between religion and public education or between public agencies and religious education, over half of the states allow over half of the practices. Every state allows some of them. And this survey does not include tax exemption among the seventeen practices discussed.

Bible reading in the public schools has been more frequently and more diversely dealt with by the various states than any other one topic concerning religion and education. The states have of course been wholly free, since the Supreme Court has held that this subject does not raise a federal issue.

In some states *a statute requires* Bible reading in all public schools; in others, *a statute prohibits* it in all public schools; in still others, *a statute permits* it; while in still another group, *court decisions permit* it.

Some states provide by statute for excusing pupils who wish to be excused during the Bible reading. Other states grant the same privilege by court decision. In other states there is no provision for excusing pupils. About a dozen states require no comment on the reading. In many states, prayers or comments, or both, regularly accompany it.

The inevitable conclusion is that the so-called "great American principle of complete separation of church and state" is not an American principle at all, but only a spurious slogan. The principle that there shall be no established church, no state church, no organic union between the state and *any one church,* is the only American principle in regard to church and state that has any authority whatever. On this principle there is no controversy in this country.

III

HOWEVER, getting straight on the true character of this fictitious principle does not give us the solution to the problems which have been confused by reliance on it. The fact that we cannot by an appeal to a general principle prohibit all contacts between government and religion does not mean that we have to provide for such contracts. The wisdom of any measure is a wholly different question from its constitutionality, and there are still before us in this area problems which must be solved on the basis of what is wise for 20th-century America.

None of the measures put forward to solve these problems has anything whatever to do with the question of an established church. The adoption of all of them together would not create an established church—even if the Constitution allowed it.

What are these problems? Here are the most urgent: the Protestant-school problem, the Catholic-school problem, released time, public transportation of pupils to parochial schools, and federal aid to education including aid to parochial schools.

I shall let Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century,* formulate the first problem: "If inclusion of religion in public schools cannot be worked out, I see for Protestantism only one conceivable alternative—a drastic one. I see nothing for the Protestant churches to do but to establish their own schools, somewhat on the model of the Roman Catholic parochial schools, and to withdraw their children from the public schools." Dr. Morrison's is only one of many voices being raised today to much the same effect in Protestant meetings and periodicals.

I shall not presume to try to solve this problem. However, from my limited point of view, the difficulties in the way of either of the above suggested remedies seem enormous. How can "religion in the public schools" be worked out? What religion? Even if the great number of Christian sects be reduced by grouping all the Evangelical Protestant denominations as one (a major operation, I suspect), there would still be in addition: Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Russian Orthodox, Christian Science, Mormon, Ethical Culture, Orthodox Jewish, Reform Jewish, Mohammedan, and many others. The public schools belong to all of them. Shall the schools teach concepts of religion that are common to all the religions in America? I doubt that there are any such concepts. If any could be found and phrased they would necessarily be so vague and general that no one could become much interested in whether or not any one believed them. What would the unaffiliated, the unchurched, the agnostics, the atheists, think of the teaching of such concepts in their public schools? The public schools belong to these groups, too.

The difficulties in the path of Dr. Morrison's second way out, Protestant parochial schools, while perhaps not so nearly insoluble as those in the way of religion in the public schools, are very great. They can perhaps be best considered in connection with the second big problem mentioned above—the Catholic-school problem.

Catholic parochial schools are only a partial solution to the problem of education for Catholic children. Many people seem to believe that all the Catholic children of the

country are in Catholic schools, and that therefore Catholics intrude in other people's affairs when they discuss public-school matters. The fact is that only a *minority* of the Catholic children of the country are in Catholic schools. Only a *minority* of the Catholic parishes and missions of the United States conduct parochial schools. And even where there are parochial schools many Catholic parents send their children to the public school rather than the particular parochial school available. (The word *particular* should be stressed. In some sections of the United States, Protestants send their children to Catholic parochial schools because of the inferior nature of the public schools available.) The Catholics of the country consequently have a tremendous stake in the public-school system—a fact which many of them seem not to realize. So parochial schools are no simple solution, either for Catholics or Protestants.

The difficulties of providing adequate physical facilities and adequate teaching staffs are very great. Money alone—even public money—is not the whole answer. The limited supply of teachers adequately trained both in regular school subjects and in religion is a tremendous obstacle. The teaching orders of nuns are not growing fast enough to furnish teachers for all of the Catholic children of the country even if there were enough space in the schools to take them in. In the diocese of Brooklyn in February 1946, 3,098 pupils registered for the Catholic high schools, and 2,143 were refused for lack of room.

Protestant schools might not have these exact problems; but providing schools, and finding, training, and paying enough lay teachers would certainly be difficult even with unlimited public funds to draw upon. It seems quite evident that no complete system of parochial schools for Catholics or Protestants can ever be established except at public expense. In which case public funds would have to be furnished to all other groups desiring them, and then there might soon be very little left of the public-school system. Can anyone who grasps even dimly the nature of the problems of our American democracy contemplate without dread such a disintegration of our system of public education?

THE released-time program for religious education of children in public schools is a widespread and sharply debated method of providing some formal, organized religious instruction. Under it, pupils in public schools are excused for part of one afternoon each week for religious instruction given by teachers of various denominations. It has been vigorously opposed and, as usual, the "great American principle" has been invoked against it. In the most celebrated lawsuit to arise over this topic (McCollum vs. the Board of Education, Champaign, Illinois), the Circuit Court of Champaign County, in upholding the constitutionality of the released-time program, said of this particular argument: "It seems plain that the primary object sought to be obtained in the constitutional provisions was that there should be no state church. In this sense there is no question but that the constitutional provisions sought a separation of powers of church and state, but the relators counsel in their brief give this phrase 'the separation of church and state' a far broader meaning." For the correct construction of the word "establishment" in the First Amendment, this Court quoted the United States Supreme Court in the case of Davis vs. Benson (133 U.S. 333) to the effect that what led to the adoption of the First Amendment was "the oppressive measures adopted, and the cruelties and punishments inflicted *by the governments of Europe* for many ages, to compel parties to conform, in their religious beliefs and modes of worship, to the views of the most numerous sect" (italics mine).

It is argued that released time is a divisive measure, that it emphasizes differences instead of common factors and common loyalties, that it takes time that properly belongs to secular subjects, promotes bad feeling, and improperly uses taxpayers' money. On the other hand, the persons and agencies in favor of this program (such as the Depart-

ment of Religious Education of the Greater New York Federation of Churches) argue that religion has a claim on the time and attention of school children at least as legitimate as that of many subjects in the curriculum, that the state constitutional recognition of the diverse religious life of the community prevents any other practicable way of furnishing religious instruction to thousands of pupils, that it promotes good feeling and reduces "spiritual illiteracy." Such advocates consider it a step in the right direction, but a long way from the goal.

The released-time program has roots of one kind and another going back to the beginning of the public-school system. It has been operating in its present form for about twenty-five years. There were enrolled in it in New York City alone in June of 1946 over 110,000 public-school pupils. There ought to be available, therefore, for those who are interested in modern evidence as a basis for modern decisions, plenty of evidence on which to decide whether or not on the whole the released-time program is good or bad for the children of the public schools. And that is the precise question that should concern us in 1947.

I suggest the following long-range approach for consideration as a possible solution, not only for the released-time controversy, but also for the parochial-school problem—though I fully understand the difficulties in the way and the enormous change in attitude it would require.

1. No parochial schools of any kind to be conducted in the country—this by wholly voluntary arrangement, of course, not by government dictation. All the children now in the parochial schools of all denominations to be sent to public schools for instruction in the regular academic and vocational subjects.

2. Each parish, or other group, to have by state law the right to have all of their children, staggered in groups by grades from primary through senior high school, free from public school for one full half-day each week for attendance at the parish "institute" (let us call it that in order to give it a label other than "school"). Each parish to employ its physical, financial, and personnel resources in the institute to teach religion, morality, manners, "marriage courses," and related subjects. Each parish further to have at the institute throughout the year—particularly in vacation periods—complete social and recreational programs. Each parish to make all of the services of the institute available to all the young people of the parish whether in school or not.

Among the unquestionable weaknesses of the present system, including both public and parochial schools (certainly often discussed but never cured so far as the Catholic schools are concerned), is the fact that too many parents shift to the schools the whole responsibility for both moral and religious training. Many schools do not function adequately on these matters at any time, do nothing at all during vacation periods, and can obviously do nothing for the thousands of adolescents and young people who are not in schools. There are many Catholics who believe that if the Church would place on the public schools the full burden of "regular" schooling, and spend the millions of dollars and the thousands of devoted lives now being spent in regular classrooms, in religious, moral, and social training for all of the Catholic youth, we would produce better Catholics and better citizens.

THE "bus cases," involving transportation of children to parochial schools as well as to public schools, have also been hotly argued in recent years. The February 10 decision of the Supreme Court will not end the debate. Attempts have been made here as elsewhere to foreclose discussion by calling on our non-existent principle. In a recent Kentucky case the Court of Appeals of that state upheld a state law which permitted the furnishing of transportation at public expense for children attending either public or parochial schools. Judge E. Poe Harris wrote:

"In this advanced and enlightened age, with all the progress that has been made in the field of humane and social legislation, and with the hazards and dangers of the

highway increased a thousand-fold from what they formerly were, it cannot be said with any reason or consistency that tax legislation to provide our school children with safe transportation is not tax legislation for a public purpose.

"Neither can it be said that such legislation, or such taxation, is in aid of a church, or of a private, sectarian or parochial school, nor that it is other than what it designs and purports to be, legislation for the health and safety of our children, the future citizens of our State.

"The fact that in a strained and technical sense the school might derive an indirect benefit from the enactment, is not sufficient to defeat the declared purpose and the practical and wholesome effect of the law."

PROBABLY the most far-reaching problem in our list is the last one—the question of federal aid to education, including aid to sectarian schools. The latest expression of this proposal is in the Aiken bill (S-199) in the present Congress. The subject has been argued pro and con many times. The opponents of federal aid to parochial schools have so far always won, and federal aid to education has always lost.

There have been two principal arguments against extending such aid to parochial schools. The chief of these in recent years has been the untenable position that the United States constitution forbade such aid. This contention has so far interfered with any full and fair debate on the merits of federal aid to education. I submit that it is time we had such a debate and time that the question be decided on the sole issue of the effect such aid would have on the children of America, and particularly the children of the backward and depressed areas and classes.

A secondary argument against federal aid to parochial schools has been that such aid would be a great hindrance to the proper development of the public schools and therefore very bad for the whole country. That argument has merit. It should be fully developed and carefully weighed.

My own opinion is that when all of the above is done, the weight of evidence will be in favor of federal aid without distinction on racial or religious lines to all schools that are training American children for citizenship in the United States. The main arguments for this program are: (1) No bill which does not provide for all schools is likely to become a law, so the total need is left unserved; (2) literacy, health, patriotism, knowledge of history, of the duties of citizenship, of the problems of humanity, are needed by all of the youth of the country without regard to race or creed or type of school attended; (3) when the United States calls upon the youth of the nation in time of war (and needs literate, healthy, intelligent men), it does not ask only for the boys from the public schools, but for those from all schools and, alas, even for those who have never had any schools that were worth calling schools; (4) the Negroes who would be large beneficiaries of such federal aid would probably fare better in many sections if the administration were in the hands of church

These seem at the present time to be the five largest problems which we should free from the confusion caused by the invoking of a non-existent principle. But that will not solve the problems, and they must be solved. None of them were settled for us in 1791. I am confident that the proper answers can be found if difficulties are met honestly, realistically, in good temper, within the boundaries of both fact and law, with jealous respect for the rights, the beliefs, the hopes for their children both as individual persons and as citizens, of the members of all the divergent groups in our complicated society. Only grave harm can come from violations of personal courtesy and civil liberties (the public aspect of personal courtesy). No possible good can come to either religion or education by continuing to rely upon incantation addressed to the ghost of an imaginary constitutional amendment.

The Christian-Evangelist

National Weekly of Disciples of Christ

RAPHAEL HARWOOD MILLER, *Editor*

LIN D. CARTWRIGHT, *Editorial Secretary* W. B. CLEMMER, *Field Editor*

ELISE G. MORTON, *Assistant to the Editor*

Stassen Vs. the Baptists

THE political stature of Harold E. Stassen has by no means been enhanced by his protests against the convention action of the Baptist groups regarding diplomatic representation at the Vatican and the Supreme Court decision on school buses. In his address before the Southern Baptist Convention in St. Louis and again in a telegram to the Northern Baptist Convention in Atlantic City he launched a vigorous protest against these two actions of his fellow-Baptists.

It is, of course, the privilege of any Baptist to protest the pronouncements of his convention on any subject with which he disagrees.

However, since Mr. Stassen went out of his way to attack only the resolutions dealing with Catholic-Protestant relations, it seems to be in place to raise the question whether the candidate for the nomination to the Presidency did not have in mind a much larger audience than Baptists. Was it not an evidence of his political sagacity that he used the Baptist conventions as a sounding board by which to reach the ear of the Roman Catholic group which he will greatly need in November, 1948, especially in the large cities of the North?

BUT IT IS THE REASON which Mr. Stassen gave the Atlantic City Convention for his opposition to its resolution against the decision of the Supreme Court on the school bus issue that is disconcerting to Protestants. He wired the convention, "I do not consider it to be in keeping with the dignity or teachings of my great religious denomination to attack a decision of the Supreme Court after it has been made."

This is strange reasoning to come from a Baptist. From the days of Roger Williams to the present, the Baptist Church has stood rock-ribbed against all efforts to confuse the lines of distinction between the church and the state, coming from whatever source. Whether the separation of state and church is threatened by the legislative branch of the government, or the judicial is incidental.

The best interests of the nation admittedly demand a due respect for the decisions of the Supreme Court. They must never be regarded lightly. But why should Mr. Stassen demand of the Baptist church a silence regarding its decisions which the Supreme Court does not ask of itself? The minority group in the Supreme Court was emphatically vocal in its protest against the decision in the school bus case. Chief Justice Hughes, an eminent Baptist, did not hesitate to criticize the majority report, as we recall, in the McIntosh case, which in principle, at least, was afterwards reversed. The Supreme Court has repeatedly reversed itself. In 1918 the Court held that a child labor law was unconstitutional, but in 1941 it unanimously held that Congress had the power to pass such a law. Wesley McCune in his recent book on the Supreme Court says, "since men are not yet gods, such shifts are not irrational."

THE BAPTIST PASTORS' CONFERENCE held recently in New Orleans was clearly in its right when it telegraphed Mr. Stassen to protest his "using the Southern Baptist Convention program as a political forum. . . . To protest a belief in separation of church and state, and at the same time to uphold as you did the constitutional retention of unauthorized representation at the Vatican and the subsidizing of parochial education with public funds is inconsistent and unthinkable."

One cannot help wondering if Mr. Stassen has deliberately injected the religious issue into the forthcoming national political campaign. We hope that one in whom we have had such great confidence will not be made to feel, under pressure of political expediency, that he must cater to one religious group over against another. Is the Roman Catholic political pressure already being exerted upon him from behind the scenes to such an extent that he has felt the necessity of these recent pronouncements? We sincerely hope not.

Mt. Palomar's Challenge to Faith

WHEN the prophet wrote, "as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts" did anyone comprehend how high the heavens really were?

It will perhaps remain for the California Institute of Technology's 200-inch telescope, now nearing completion, to bring home to the human mind the infinities of space and the boundless extent of the heavens.

This 200-inch giant, so we are told, will give the astronomers eight times the space in which to work and will bring into view light sources a billion light-years away. A writer in a recent issue of *Science Illustrated* sees in this new telescope a new revelation,

not only of space, but also of the infinite reaches of time. "If, as seems certain," he writes, "photographs are obtained of galaxies a billion light-years distant [one light-year being the distance light travels at 186,000 miles per second, in a year] we are observing the picture of something as it appeared a billion years ago. That is how the 200-inch in looking out into space, looks backwards to the beginning of time."

But it is when the new telescope invades the field of man's imagination that we really begin to stagger. A noted astronomer has recently said, "We hope the most exciting things to come from the telescope will be discoveries of the nature of which it is now impossible for us to imagine."

"When after an all-night journey to the very limits of creation," says the writer in *Science Illustrated*, "an astronomer returns to earth and finds people talking about the latest divorce of Hollywood stars, you can't blame them for looking bored."

IT IS WHEN WE BEGIN to grasp the implications of the revelations about to be released from Mt. Palomar that we begin to see why modern men are so greatly concerned with the re-thinking of their theology. The older concepts which seemed adequate to our fathers who lived in an infinitely smaller universe have now become outmoded and inadequate. For surely the greater our concept of the universe becomes, the more expanding must be our concept of the God who created it and sustains it.

The crude anthropomorphic conceptions of God often held by well-meaning people today, as well as those which have been formulated by the intellectuals to replace them, will no doubt seem altogether inadequate to those living in a universe as seen from the telescope on Mt. Palomar.

IT WILL BE THE TASK, in the years ahead, for the theologians to join hands with Christians everywhere upon a new search for the Living God. He will not be found, however, among the stars which, after all, are but huge gas-bags with infinite spaces between, but more surely where Hosea found Him, in the tragic experiences of the human heart where love dwells and is oft betrayed, and men dare hope again.

Above all, He will be found today as the early church discovered centuries ago, from the observatory point of another mount—Mt. Calvary. There only shall we see that behind the "All-Great" of our expanding universe is the "All-Loving too."

This will be the battle of the pulpit in the years ahead. Men must find a resting place for their souls in this seemingly illimitable universe. Even upon the bosom of a redemptive God.

Gratitude Is Not Enough

STEPHEN CAREY, distinguished representative of the American Friends Service Committee in Europe, recently returned to America with a sobering and thought-provoking report on what he has seen and experienced in that devastated area of the world.

Language utterly fails to picture the vast tragedy of this continent laid waste by war. "It is hardest of all," he says, "to see the children—children who must walk barefoot in the snow, children who live in dug-outs without heat or light, children who shiver in tattered summer clothes through bitter cold, children who beg for scraps of bread, children who lie hungry in tuberculosis hospitals, children who never laugh."

But it is not these physical hardships, terrible as they are, which concern this prophetic soul who has looked upon Europe as "with the eyes of God."

"It is the invisible and the intangible that is the greatest problem, the great challenge of the continent. A generous Congress can provide the means to rescue Europe from its physical misery, but appropriations and supplies cannot touch the loneliness of the mind, the moral disintegration and spiritual chaos eating into the heart of Europe's social fabric and culture. This is the crucial tragedy, and very little is being done about it."

AGAIN WE SEE IN A NEW LIGHT the divine wisdom of our Lord, who, in another wilderness of hunger and temptation, saw the futility of attempting to heal the hurt of the world with bread alone. Bread of course, but not bread alone.

Even as concerned as the Friends Service Committee has always been with spiritual objectives, Mr. Carey warns his American Friends of the threat of failure in the monumental work which they have undertaken and carried forward with such heroic sacrifice.

"We have fed and clothed while hoping to reach deep into human hearts," said Mr. Carey. "We have thought of supplies as a means and not an end. In developing our programs we have built a reputation for devotion and impartiality which has inspired imitation and dramatized the concept for feeding one's enemies. These are notable achievements, but are they enough? Have we reached into people's lives and changed them? Have we in fact broken through to the realm of the spirit? My observations during the past year force me to answer, 'No.' We have earned the deep and heartfelt gratitude of thousands —hundreds of thousands—but gratitude is not enough."

WE ARE NOT CALLING ATTENTION to this confession of failure to throw aspersions upon the Friends Service Committee. Far from it. We have been privileged to listen in as a great organization has been taking stock and searching its heart for deeper realities. It is an example of magnificent self-searching which it would be well if all Christians everywhere should undertake in these perilous hours.

Mr. Carey is in line with the best Quaker tradition when he says, "We must pioneer in a new field of action, and return to our concern with spiritual objectives. We must tackle the intangible. We must seek ways to overcome the selfishness, the mistrust, the despair, the bitterness and the hatred which lie like a blanket over Europe. We can hope that our efforts will create a leaven which will spread further and further into each community as it passes."

This hope may be too much for our faith, but if it is, we must predict with Mr. Carey that "if we and others like us fail, chaos and war will follow."

course of the decision, both of the present antagonists may, it is true, be destroyed. But one of them must be."

There you have the tone, the core and a fairly complete outline of the contention of the Burnham book. Its relevance to the new American foreign policy is plain. If President Truman continues to follow the Burnham line, where will it take the United States? And where the world? Consideration of those questions must follow in a later editorial.

Why They Behave Like Southern Baptists

[EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE]

St. Louis, May 11

NATIONAL POLITICS played an important role in the ninetieth meeting of the Southern Baptist Convention, which adjourned here today. The convention's president, Dr. Louie D. Newton of Atlanta, invited President Truman to address the meeting, but Mr. Truman finally declined. When however he visited Missouri on the final day of the convention, Southern Baptists took it to mean that he was reproving them for their outspoken criticism of his continuation of the Vatican embassy and for their sharp disagreement with the recent Supreme Court decision on the New Jersey bus case. Nevertheless, they sent birthday greetings to Mr. Truman and received a reply in which he thanked his fellow Baptists for their prayers.

More significant was the reaction to the forthright address made to the convention by Republican candidate Harold E. Stassen. Mr. Stassen went out of his way to declare his disagreement with convention resolutions condemning the Vatican embassy and the Supreme Court decision. "Before proceeding with our discussion," he began, "in order that my view may not be misunderstood by inference, I wish to state simply and directly that I do not agree with the two resolutions which the press reports that you have passed on the questions of diplomatic representation at the Vatican and the Supreme Court decision on school buses. I do adhere to the basic American principle of separation of church and state."

Mr. Stassen's statement was received with considerable coolness, and was the subject of critical comment for the remainder of the session. It was generally agreed that the former governor of Minnesota knew that the statement would be unwelcome. Since he made it anyway, many delegates charged that he reasoned he could not carry the south under any circumstances and so deliberately used this occasion to bid for Roman Catholic votes in the rest of the country. But Baptists who said they would vote against him in 1948 because of his remarks here (and this correspondent heard several say that) were reminded that if they made their decision on this issue alone, they might have little to choose between candidates. Mr. Truman has given no indication that he intends to carry out before the election his promise to terminate the Vatican embassy. In an interview following his address, Mr. Stassen refused to elaborate his statement, but promised to make a complete exposition of his views later.

A much warmer reception was accorded the "sober optimism" of Mr. Stassen's declaration that he believes the difficulties of the international situation can be worked out by means other than war. He urged the churches "never [to] surrender to the insidious whisper of the inevitability of war." Steadfast support of the social, economic and cultural objectives of the United Nations will go far to prevent conflict, he insisted. This convention of over 8,200 "messengers" from 26,000 churches of the Southern Baptist fellowship agreed with him, and went further than he might have approved in their quest for peace. The messengers defeated a resolution supporting the President's plan for universal military training. Overriding all opposition, they addressed a plea to Congress not to cut foreign relief funds below the amounts requested by the administration. Their plea was supported by the fact that they had given $3,373,300 to world relief in 1946. This was a part of their contributions of over $115,000,000 for all purposes, a gain of 17 per cent over last year. Over $27,000,000 of the total went for missions and benevolences. Most of the remainder was spent on the work of local churches.

Never for a moment during the proceedings was it possible to forget that the Southern Baptist Convention is an assemblage, not of representatives, but of messengers and visitors from local churches. For thousands of people from all over the twenty states in which Southern Baptist churches are found, the convention is the great social event of the year. Pastors' wives select their new clothes with an eye to attendance and their husbands get the old car into shape for the journey. This week St. Louis was overrun with people carrying cameras, and street corners were blocked by knots of Baptists holding reunions. One pastor, unexpectedly encountering some old friends, was so overjoyed that he went home with them and forgot to return. When he turned up in St. Louis at the end of the week, he discovered that his forgotten roommate had all the local police looking for him. They had checked hospital admissions and even canvassed the city morgue. The object of their search is the pastor of one of the 15,216 open-country churches of this largely rural denomination. Another 4,173 churches are located in villages of less than 500. Fewer than 7,000 Southern Baptist churches are in places having more than 500 people, and only one church in seven is located in a "city" of more than 2,500 population.

Powerful forces are working to change the character of the region in which these local churches are found, and they were reflected in the actions of this convention. The south is becoming industrialized. People who can no longer make their living on the land are moving to southern cities or to other parts of the nation. One stream of migration is taking thousands of Southern Baptists to Arizona and California, and these states claimed the largest percentage of gain in membership. Some pastors who are dissatisfied are following the people and are cor-

"Stalin, in his principal theoretical work, *Problems of Leninism,* has summed up the issues as follows: . . . 'It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist interminably side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or another must conquer.'" Thus, it is a case of we or they. Those who talk about getting along with the men in the Kremlin—the appeasers like Henry Wallace—or retiring into a great American sphere which would take in the Pacific and the Americas—the isolationists like Colonel McCormick and Charles A. Beard—do not comprehend the nature of the Communist imperative.

3. This struggle for world control is complicated by the atom bomb. If the Communist forces get it, they will certainly inflict ghastly losses on the concentrated industrial centers of the United States in the all-out war which will then inevitably follow. And if they fail to gain the world control for which they will then strike because we find effective means of taking atomic retaliation, they will at least succeed in destroying civilization.

4. How, then, are the nations that do not want to be absorbed in the Communist orbit to be protected from Communist conquest by an atomically armed Soviet Union? The United Nations is impotent; the Russian veto takes care of that. (The real meaning of this veto as matters now stand in the U.N. is that "United States policy is subordinated to Soviet policy.") The hope of setting up a viable world government with sufficient power to control the atomic bomb menace is a will-o'-the-wisp. That may come some day, but this is a race with time—and a mighty short stretch of time, at that.

5. What does that leave as the only remaining, practical alternative? The extension of American power over the world sufficient to maintain a monopoly on the atom bomb—a term always to be understood as including other modern forms of mass destruction—and to keep the nations not already inside the Russian camp out of it. "A world empire established at least partly through force and the threat of force"—this must be the American policy. "By a world empire I mean a state, not necessarily world-wide in literal extent but world-dominating in political power, set up at least in part through coercion (quite probably including war, but certainly the threat of war) and in which one group of peoples (its nucleus being one of the existing nations) would hold more than its equal share of power." This American empire would be strong enough to hold the bomb, to force all other nations to stop trying to make the bomb, and to rock the government in the Kremlin back on its heels. Mr. Burnham hopes, and apparently believes, that this would bring a revolution inside Russia which would end the present Communist regime.

Mr. Burnham knows that this frank avowal of intention to form an American world empire will shock a large part of the American public. "There is already an American empire," he argues, "greatly expanded during these past five years." It takes in many of the islands of the Atlantic and most of the islands of the Pacific, "all of the Americas" including Canada, parts of Africa and Europe. "An imperial policy is not, therefore, something new for the United States. It has been and continues to be forced upon the United States by the dynamic effects of power relationships. . . . The United States cannot help building an empire." And, "the administration of the world, or most of the world, as a single state is now technically possible."

6. How is this American empire to be formed and to stop Russia? By a combination defensive and offensive strategy. Defensive steps include readiness to intervene anywhere against Russian pressure (see Greece!); world-wide propaganda aimed ultimately to reach the Russian masses and stir them to revolt; all kinds of economic and political favors for the states which turn a cold shoulder to the Russians; no aid for the states which play along with the Russians, including those admitting Communists to their governments; absolute suppression of the Communist party and outlawing of Communists in the United States; an announced and demonstrated readiness to use force anywhere it may seem necessary to stop Communist expansion. The offensive strategy would include formation under American domination of a non-Communist world federation, with Britain and the British dominions offered "common citizenship and full political union" with the United States, and all sorts of sweeping economic and political concessions to the smaller nations joining this federation. This federation would be, of course, the American empire. If states not now affiliated with Russia acted coy about joining, economic or military means should be taken to force them in. The danger is so urgent that the United States can stand for no nonsense!

"The determining facts," says Burnham in a passage which should be printed in parallel columns with the Truman Doctrine, "are merely these: Western civilization has reached the stage in its development that calls for the creation of its Universal Empire. The technological and institutional character of Western civilization is such that a Universal Empire of Western civilization would necessarily at the same time be a world empire. In the world there are only two power centers adequate to make a serious attempt to meet this challenge. The simultaneous existence of these two centers, and only these two, introduces into world political relationships an intolerable disequilibrium. . . .

"The United States, crude, awkward, semi-barbarian, nevertheless enters this irreconcilable conflict as the representative of Western culture. The other center . . . is alien to the West in origin and fundamental nature. Its victory would, therefore, signify the reduction of all Western society to the status of a subject colony. . . .

"Between the two great antagonists there is this other difference, that may decide. The communist power moves toward the climax self-consciously, deliberately. Its leaders understand what is at stake. . . . But the Western power gropes and lurches. Few of its leaders even want to understand. Like an adolescent plunged into his first great moral problem, it wishes, above all, to avoid the responsibility for choice. Genuine moral problems are, however, inescapable, and the refusal to make a choice is also a moral decision. . . . No wish or thought of ours can charm this issue away.

"This issue will be decided, and in our day. In the

ceeded in using x-rays to change the chromosome content of cells in certain trees, so that mature growth is reached in a time so short as would have hitherto been considered fantastic. For example, the new giant aspen, this report affirms, will be ready for commercial use in 30 years, instead of the 80 previously required. Any conservationist, any member of the lumber industry, any wrestler with the baffling problem of adequate housing will immediately grasp the incalculable significance of such an announcement. Science is not an enemy unless man makes it so.

Uncle Sam—Atomic Bomb Missionary

A TERRIFYING LIGHT is cast on the thinking of men who wield power in today's world by the speech which Senator Edward Martin of Pennsylvania delivered last week in Indianapolis. As a member of the Republican majority in the branch of the federal legislature responsible for the ratification of treaties, Senator Martin exerts considerable influence on the foreign policy of the United States. Speaking before the executive committee of the American Legion, the senator—who was once a major general—is reported to have said: "Our fathers settled this land with a rifle in one hand and the Bible in the other. There has never been a better formula for national defense. It is just as good today as it was then. Until the nations of the world indicate their willingness to live in peace, let us go our way with an atomic bomb in one hand and the spirit of the cross in the other." If Senator Martin is deliberately out to make the United States the most hated and most despised nation on earth, he has achieved a perfect formula for accomplishing that end. Threaten the other nations with atomic destruction; at the same time preach to them the piety of your peaceful intentions. They will hate you for your bullying and despise you for your hypocrisy. That outcome will be as certain as the outcome of a mathematical equation. Yet this general-turned-senator calls this the best possible formula for national defense!

Supreme Court Adds to Police State Threat

THE CLASS in American history will come to order. Who was James Otis? (See any good encyclopedia or history of the United States.) What was the principal basis of his revolutionary fame? His speech in 1761 against the writs of assistance used by British revenue officers to search the premises of Massachusetts citizens and seize their contents. What came of the patriot fathers' abhorrence of these writs of assistance? The fourth amendment to the Constitution: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects" and so forth. (Read the whole amendment.) Yet last week the Supreme Court, in the face of this American history, and despite the express prohibition of the fourth amendment, "resurrected and approved, in effect, the use of the writ of assistance presumably outlawed forever by our society." So wrote Justice Murphy, dissenting. And along with him, Justices Frankfurter, Jackson and Rutledge. In his dissent Justice Frankfurter went so far as to declare that the 5-to-4 verdict would undermine freedom of thought, speech and religion. The case involved Oklahoma police officers who, in arresting a man for one alleged crime and ransacking his house for evidence to sustain the charge, failed to find any, but did find evidence which secured the man's conviction on a totally different charge. No one who follows Supreme Court decisions can have failed to notice how frequently recent Bill of Rights cases have been decided by a single vote. Nor how often this single vote has weakened protections of liberty which the Founding Fathers thought they had made secure forever. This latest decision, which gives the police the right to ransack any house in an unrestrained hunting expedition for anything they may turn up, opens the door to the same kind of police state which has made life in Europe and the Orient intolerable.

Federal Aid a 'Token'—But of What?

ELSEWHERE in this issue a member of the Chicago bar, Edward R. Lewis, points out the threat to the constitutional principle of separation of church and state implicit in the federal aid to education bills now before Congress. It has been enlightening to discover the grounds on which the Roman Catholic spokesmen who supported these provisions before the congressional hearings demanded federal funds for parochial schools. The most important of these spokesmen, whose argument has been extensively reported in the Catholic press, was Rev. William E. McManus, assistant director of the education department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. Father McManus called on the Senate committee which has this legislation in hand to broaden the Taft bill to allow federal aid for parochial schools, in the form of funds for school lunches, even in states where state laws prohibit such use of public funds. Let the federal government give $242,000,000 to the public schools, Father McManus urged, and then add $7,500,000 for parochial schools "as a token." The *Register,* weekly of the Catholic diocese of Denver, in treating this as a front-page feature, headlined it: "Token Federal Aid Asked for Private School Pupils." The word to be noted, both in the text of Father McManus' proposal and in the headline, is "token." Token of what?

Economy Rears Its Ugly Head in Irish Church

ANGLICANS in Ireland are seriously considering a cut in the number of their bishops. A bill passed through its first stages at the General Synod of the Church of Ireland just held at Dublin, according to Religious News Service provides that the number of Anglican bishoprics shall be reduced from 14 to 11. "The only alternative to reducing the number of bishops," gloomily announced the Most Rev. John A. F. Gregg, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, "is for the laity to provide a considerable sum for the maintenance of existing episcopal stipends and adequate stipends for the clergy at large."

Considering the fact that there are only about half a million Anglicans in Ireland, a reduction of the number of bishops to 11 would not seem likely to leave dioceses of unmanageable proportions. Archbishop Gregg seemingly takes it for granted that there is no chance the alternative —an increase in contributions from the laity—will be adopted. In that respect his church is suffering in much the same way that the Church of England is suffering. Having grown accustomed to a clergy supported originally by state funds and later by income from investments, and having seen these sources either dry up or drop to a thin trickle, the church is not now able to obtain the sort of support from its members which a long tradition of voluntary giving would provide. Establishment seems financially pleasant while it lasts. But these are days when establishments are disappearing. And the weaknesses they have bred stand revealed.

Blueprint for Empire

DURING the same week in which Mr. Truman announced his doctrine of "containing" Russian communism, a book appeared which may influence America's destiny even more profoundly than the President's historic message to Congress. The book is called *The Struggle for the World* (John Day Company, $3.00). Its author is James Burnham, a professor of philosophy at New York University, hitherto best known for a thought-provoking study of the actual nature of the social changes that are taking place in the industrial West, *The Managerial Revolution*. So clearly does Mr. Burnham's new book reveal the desperate choices toward which this nation is being urged that it compels extended editorial consideration.

The Struggle for the World has been greeted with extraordinary journalistic fanfare. *Time,* which treated its appearance as a news event rather than as a subject for a book review, said that "only one defense of Burnham's book can be made: it is—appallingly—true." *Life* devoted thirteen pages to a condensation of its contents. It stands well up on the best-seller lists. But these things might be passed by as of minor importance were it not for one other fact. It fits the "stop Russia" policy of the Truman Doctrine so exactly that one can hardly read it without thinking, "Here, whether they realized it or not, is what the senators and representatives who voted for the initial move under the new doctrine—the Greek-Turkish aid bill—were really approving as the foreign policy of the United States."

As those who have read Mr. Burnham's earlier books know, he writes clearly, candidly, with power. The training which, while a Communist of the Trotskyite persuasion, he obtained as editor of a brilliant dialectical review, the *New International,* stands him in good stead now that he has turned his back on Marxism, communism and all their works. There is much that is true in this new Burnham book, and it is said in a way that will be neither misunderstood nor forgotten. Indeed, it is this which, in our opinion, makes the book so dangerous. If the book were all false, all a distortion of the present world situation, it need cause no worry. But so much in its description of the crisis of these times is factually sound that there is grave danger lest Americans conclude that the Burnham proposal for dealing with this crisis is also sound. That we deny.

Some dissents from the Burnham thesis which have been published elsewhere have consisted of little more than name-calling. That is, of course, standard Communist and fellow-traveler technique. But it is a waste of time in this case. What Burnham has to say is so important, and so vitally related to what is actually happening at Washington, that the only thing that matters is whether the *total* Burnham analysis is correct, and hence whether the Burnham blueprint for American policy should be followed. In this editorial we will simply try to outline what Burnham has to say, for unless that is understood it would not be fair to the seriousness of the issues at stake to pass judgment on his proposals.

In brief, the Burnham book holds that the Second World War has already given birth to a Third World War, which is a war between Russia and the United States for world control. In the opening skirmishes of this Third World War—military as well as political and economic—we are now engaged. This war will be fought to the complete triumph of the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R. The way, and the only way, for the U.S.A. to win is to establish an American world empire, in which this nation maintains a monopolistic control of all atomic weapons and scientific experimentation in the fields of atomic and biological warfare. This American world empire should be established by concession where possible, but by force where concession or persuasion proves unavailing. If it is not set up, Russia will establish a Communist world empire in which the peoples of the Western democracies will be reduced to slavery in Communist totalitarian police states.

By what process of analysis and reasoning does *The Struggle for the World* arrive at these conclusions? The steps in Burnham's logic can be outlined in this fashion:

1. In international affairs, there is no politics but power politics. "When someone condemns 'power politics' it is a sign that he either doesn't know what politics is about, or that he is objecting to someone else's power politics while simultaneously camouflaging his own." The outcome of the Second World War, including the appearance of the atom bomb, has destroyed the possibility of a world balance of power, which could have maintained a kind of stability and peace. Hence, this is a "time of troubles" (Burnham is saturated with the Toynbee vocabulary) in which the two surviving great powers will struggle for the mastery.

2. This struggle constitutes the core of all international relations today. "All of world politics and all of what is most important in the internal politics of each nation are oriented about the struggle for world power between Soviet-based Communism and the United States." The Communist intention is to control the world because Communist dogma insists that there can be no lasting safety for a socialist order in a world containing capitalist power.

olumn in the *New York Times* of last January 20. Mr. Bennett as not then listed as being associated with the organization he ow directs, but he is surely aware of that press release and knows hat I did not garble it.

Mount Vernon Heights Congregational Church, Mount Vernon, N. Y.

HUGH S. TIGNER.

Has Wallace Read Ecclesiastes?

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: You say of Mr. Wallace's speeches: "It may also be said that the anger of Congress, spread by the press across the nation, has not been caused so much by what Mr. Wallace said as by where he said it." I think that the crux of the whole matter lies not only in where he said it but in *when* he said it. We do not deny Mr. Wallace his right to freedom of speech, nor would we deny him the right to criticize the foreign policy of the U.S.A., but the time when it is said is important. Ecclesiastes speaks a word here: "To every thing there is a season, and time to every purpose under heaven—a time to keep silent, and a time to speak." Was it wise for Mr. Wallace to go to Europe and say what he did at this critical time when we are trying to formulate our foreign policy? Had Mr. Wallace not spoken at this time would the tension over the Grecian-Turkish intervention have arisen to complicate the formation of our foreign policy?

Second Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

HARRY JAMES BRAY.

The Voice of Political Experience

EDITOR THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY:

SIR: The history of the appointment and continuance of Myron L. Taylor as our ambassador to the Vatican leads one to doubt whether this violation of the Constitution will be rectified. We are now in a rather telling stage of the campaign for 1948. Mr. Truman is not going to do anything that will alienate his party or the public. He is well aware that Protestant opposition to this un-American appointment is divided and resultingly impotent, while the united and well directed pressure of the Roman Catholic Church is something to be reckoned with. Recent polls have revealed that Mr. Truman's stock is looking up, and from this time on the question to be asked when any public interest is involved will be, How will this show up in the ballot box? This is admittedly pure politics—"pure" used in an accommodated sense. And by the time it is disposed of this situation will have become too static to budge, and we will settle ourselves to see what the next aggressive move may be.

Evanston, Ill.

E. ROBB ZARING.

EDWARD R. LEWIS

is a Chicago lawyer, a graduate of Harvard college and law school, who has been active in American Legion affairs in his home town of Winnetka, Ill. Mr. Lewis is the author of *America: Nation or Confusion, A Study of Our Immigration Problem* (Harper, 1928) and *A History of American Political Thought from the Civil War to the World War* (Macmillan, 1937). A recent article by him in the *Yale Review*, "Are We Ready for a World State?" provoked widespread discussion.

ad is a necessity all over
must be—encouraged if
to shrink.
the hope of the churches
rtunities stare us in the face. Is our courage sufficient? Our vision? Our sense o urgency? Our generosity? Our Christian concern? In th last resort, the churches cannot revive themselves; w cannot revive them; only God's Holy Spirit can. But w can be his instruments, his means to his eternal purpose

eat in the School Aid Bills

By Edward R. Lewis

IN HIS dissenting opinion in the case of Everson v. Board of Education of the Township of Ewing, *et al.*, service and capital outlay. Therefore, if a state mak payments to parochial schools from state and local rev nues, the state would be allowed to disburse federal fun

is building now. Such looking ahead is a necessity all over Europe, and ought to be—nay, must be—encouraged if the churches are to grow and not to shrink.

Such strategic plans as these are the hope of the churches in the next generation. The opportunities stare us in the face. Is our courage sufficient? Our vision? Our sense of urgency? Our generosity? Our Christian concern? In the last resort, the churches cannot revive themselves; we cannot revive them; only God's Holy Spirit can. But we can be his instruments, his means to his eternal purposes.

The Threat in the School Aid Bills

By Edward R. Lewis

IN HIS dissenting opinion in the case of Everson v. Board of Education of the Township of Ewing, *et al.*, decided by the United States Supreme Court on February 10, 1947, in which the court held that it was constitutional for the township of Ewing, New Jersey, to reimburse parents of Catholic school pupils for transportation expense to and from parochial schools, Justice Rutledge said:

> Neither so high nor so impregnable today as yesterday is the wall raised between church and state by Virginia's great statute of religious freedom and the first amendment, now made applicable to all the states by the fourteenth. New Jersey's statute sustained is the first, if indeed it is not the second breach to be made by this court's action. That a third, and a fourth, and still others will be attempted, we may be sure. For just as Cochran v. Board of Education, 281 U.S. 370, has opened the way by oblique ruling for this decision, so will the two make wider the breach for a third. Thus with time the most solid freedom steadily gives way before continuing corrosive decision.*

Justice Rutledge's prediction that a third breach would be attempted is already being fulfilled. There are now pending in Congress several bills which propose to smash great holes in the wall between church and state.

I

The Aiken bill, S. B. 199, introduced by Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, provides for reimbursing parochial schools for not to exceed 60 per cent of the expense of transporting pupils for school health examinations and related school health services, and for purchase of non-religious instructional supplies and equipment, including books.

The Taft bill, S. B. 472, introduced by Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio for himself and for Senators Thomas of Utah, Ellender of Louisiana, Hill of Alabama, Smith of New Jersey, Cooper of Kentucky, Chavez of New Mexico and Tobey of New Hampshire, provides that in any state in which state or local revenues are disbursed to "non-public educational institutions for expenditure for any of the purposes for which funds paid to such state under this act may be expended, funds paid to such state may be disbursed and expended by such institutions for such purposes" under the formula provided in the bill.

Under the Taft bill, the federal funds paid to a state for public schools are made available to the state schools "for all types of current expenditures" except interest, debt service and capital outlay. Therefore, if a state makes payments to parochial schools from state and local revenues, the state would be allowed to disburse federal funds to parochial schools for all similar types of current expenditures except interest, debt service and capital outlay.

The amount to be paid to a parochial school is limited to the same percentage of the amount paid to the parochial school from state or local revenues that the amount paid to the state by the federal government bears to the total expenditures of the state from state and local revenues for current expenses of its elementary and secondary schools.

This sounds very complicated. Let us give a concrete illustration. Suppose $20,000 is paid to a parochial school from state or local tax revenue. Then suppose that the federal government pays $1,000,000 to the state under the federal aid to education act. Assume next that the state itself spends $5,000,000 on its elementary and secondary schools. Then federal aid would be one-fifth of the total spent on the state schools from state and local revenue. Consequently, $4,000 or one-fifth of the amount paid by the state to the parochial school would be paid in addition from federal funds for that parochial school. The parochial school would get $20,000 from state and local tax revenue, and $4,000 from federal funds.

In the House of Representatives, H. R. 156 has been introduced by Congressman Welch of California. It provides that federal funds may be disbursed to "non-profit educational agencies within the state"—meaning, of course, parochial schools—for all types of current expenditures except interest, debt service and capital outlay, if the law of the state permits such disbursement of federal funds.

H. B. 1762, introduced by Congressman Whitten of Mississippi, provides that the legislatures of the states shall have full power to determine which educational institutions shall receive federal aid.

II

It will be seen that these bills go far beyond what the United States Supreme Court approved by only a 5-to-4 decision in the Everson case. That case merely approved reimbursement to Catholic parents of the transportation cost of sending their children to Catholic schools. Yet that decision aroused the solemn and deeply disturbed protest of Justices Jackson and Rutledge. But now Senator Taft's bill would allow federal funds to be paid to

*The Cochran case permitted the furnishing of textbooks free to parochial school pupils.

by parallel organizations in Canada, Sweden and Switzerland to help generously in this realm, for a worried, hungry pastor cannot properly serve the church.

In addition, we are seeking to give varying grants to a thousand pastors whose homes were destroyed or looted in war; a million dollars are required for this. We have given about a thousand bicycles to enable pastors to visit their scattered flocks and to do their work. We have instituted a fund for the cure of pastors afflicted with tuberculosis.

2. Re-equipment of church institutions (orphanages, hospitals, old age homes, and the like). Hundreds of these, especially in Germany, have been damaged and cannot function until they receive a modest supply of beds and household goods, which have to be bought outside and sent in. A million dollars would be a beginning in this immense task, but we are far from that sum yet. We could profitably spend five million dollars in this realm. We recently bought 1,250 beds with bedding, chiefly for students in theological seminaries; many thousands more are required.

3. Paper is nearly as short as food in many lands, and of almost equal priority if the churches are to function. So short is it, and the supply in Sweden so booked up, that we hunt for it as men hunt for diamonds. The canceling of some order is a godsend. We buy paper by the thousand tons when we can. We buy pulp and send it to Germany for manufacture. Then the paper is distributed to the reconstruction committees of the various countries who deal it out to the churches according to their size. With these gifts, the churches print their magazines, liturgies, hymnbooks, Sunday school lessons, leaflets, pamphlets, and the wheels of the churches go round again. We never have enough money for paper; no sooner do we get money for this purpose than it is spent, and sometimes we have bought supplies on faith. The need will continue for another year at least, probably for two.

4. Bibles are generously supplied by the American Bible Society, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and others with whom we work in closest fellowship. One such society has mortgaged a large part of its expected 1947 income, so great is the demand for Scriptures. Support of the Bible societies is a vital contribution to the upbuilding of church life in Europe. The Polish churches recently asked for a million portions of Scripture, to be placed in every Polish home in a Bible Week to be held in the summer of 1947.

III

The need for strategic or long-term planning for spiritual relief will be clear to those who know anything of the conditions in Europe today. I do not mean the things needing to be done to deal with the obvious damages to buildings, agriculture, communications, industry, economics and finance. I have in mind the spiritual confusions, the shattered illusions, the broken hopes, the despairs, the uprootings of thought, and the destruction of traditional patterns of life, which afflict multitudes in Europe today. A new and terrible day of the Lord has come to Europe with clouds and lightnings and thick darkness. Fierce forces of anti-Christ are abroad, and that at a time when the churches have received a shattering blow, are often weak and small and very divided. The churches face a spiritual earthquake which will long endure. The main cultural tradition of Europe can no longer be called Christian.

Hence even a full restoration of the churches to their *status quo ante* will not suffice to meet this new day and to save civilization in Europe and ultimately in Britain and America. The horizons of the churches must be enlarged, their spiritual energy and vision increased, their approach to the problems deepened, if they are to grow and make a telling impact on the life of their nations. Many lines of approach suggest themselves, but I emphasize four of the most important.

1. *Preaching the gospel.* This is a supreme task of the churches, which each must carry on in its own way and according to its own doctrine. In order to learn what was being done and what the problems were, our department recently called together from America, Britain and ten European countries leaders of experience in this task. The needs and the opportunities were discovered to be the same; never before have the churches found so many ready to listen to the gospel. A few days ago the provisional committee of the World Council recommended that the General Assembly which will meet in 1948 set up a department of evangelism to guide and inspire the churches in their approach to the unchurched masses. Meantime the department of reconstruction, in consultation with the study department, will take what steps seem wise to assist the churches in their plans.

2. *Youth work.* No section of the community has been so shaken as the youth, in which I would include those up to thirty years. Without large help from outside, the churches cannot do this work adequately. Recently I asked the German church leader in youth work the amount of assistance he would require for his camps in 1947. He produced plans and figures for 2,000 young people, for 5,000, for 10,000, and said that the limit was not on his side but on ours; he could handle in such Christian camps as many as we had money to support. Those who came to the camps would pay fees in marks, which would be at our disposal for other schemes. A like story comes from other countries. This is a long-term effort at recovery, and will need large planning and much money.

3. *Training for the ministry.* The equipment of seminaries with additional professors, with libraries, even with beds and food, has already engaged our attention, but much more is required. The need for training laymen for various tasks in the churches must be met. The provision of scholarships abroad—we sent 175 theological students and pastors to various countries in 1946—must be enlarged, so that carefully chosen men will return revitalized to pass on the inspiration and learning they have received.

4. *The sites of church buildings* must be examined, especially where there has been a significant movement of population. New sites must be chosen for new churches. Sometimes the site of a church may have to be changed, or subsidiary buildings constructed for various purposes. An example is Lyons, France, where it is planned to build six churches in the suburbs to be dependent on the main church in the center of that large city. The first of these

parochial schools for any purpose for which state funds are disbursed to parochial schools, and Senator Aiken's bill would allow federal payments to parochial schools for transportation, school health examinations and health service, whether or not the state pays state revenue to parochial schools for such purposes.

No one can fail to realize how wide a breach the Taft bill or the Aiken bill, the Welch bill or the Whitten bill would make in the wall between church and state. Any one of these bills would practically wreck the wall.

It should be emphasized that the United States Supreme Court has so far permitted only the expenditure of state and local revenues for transportation expense of parochial school pupils, and the furnishing of free textbooks to parochial school pupils. The pending bills propose to allow payment of federal revenue to parochial schools, either for any purpose except interest, debt service and capital outlay, if state revenues may be so used, or not only for transportation expense but for non-religious textbooks and supplies and health service, irrespective of what is done from state revenues.

III

It is argued in behalf of the Aiken bill that furnishing money for non-religious books and textbooks, for health service and transportation costs is not using federal funds in support of parochial schools. But this is fallacious. Ten thousand dollars paid to a parochial school for non-religious purposes is still $10,000. To the extent that a parochial school has its non-religious purposes provided for by federal money and state money its burden is lightened and its support made easier—in this case to the extent of that $10,000. The parochial school is thus helped by tax money to carry on its religious teaching.

In short, if these provisions of the proposed federal aid bills should become law the parochial school would be aided by money contributed by non-Catholics in propagating religious doctrines to which non-Catholics do not subscribe and, what is far more important, in propagating political doctrines which millions of non-Catholics deeply reject. For example, the Roman Catholic Church strongly dissents from the principle of separation of church and state. Justice Rutledge eloquently said in the Everson case that any contribution to an essential item in the expenses of a parochial school must be considered as "aiding, contributing to, promoting or sustaining the propagation of beliefs" which it is the purpose of the parochial school to foster.

Therefore, the issue which the Taft bill, the Aiken bill and these other bills in their present form place before Congress and the American public is not a religious issue. It is a serious political and constitutional issue—the maintenance of our cherished American principle of separation of church and state. Is the present dangerous onslaught to be allowed to succeed? Shall our constitutional principle be further undermined? Americans who deeply believe in the separation of church and state as one of the foundation principles of our constitutional system and as an essential for the preservation of our constitutional liberties, should do their utmost to see that any federal aid to parochial schools, as provided in these pending bills, is defeated.

Holland Is Coming Back

By Cecil Northcott

IN Amsterdam's Rijks Museum, Rembrandt's great painting, "The Night Watch," stands waiting to be shown again to the world. Through the director's favor I was admitted to see the picture, which is just emerging from the cleaner's hands. I remembered it fourteen years ago—gloomy and covered with the dust of two hundred years which had coagulated in the varnish, darkening the wonder and splendor of the picture. Lo, a miracle has happened. Using a mountain of cotton wool and a secret cleaning mixture, the cleaner, inch by immortal inch, has removed the dirty varnish, and Rembrandt blazes out in all the electric swirl and magnificence of his masterpiece.

There is nothing miraculous about the theme of "The Night Watch." Just a group of Amsterdam burghers of 1643 marching out from their old guildhall into the sunshine, mixed up with running children and deformed camp followers, with the (supposed) eye of Rembrandt himself half cocked in the misty background. Here is life, brave, enterprising, pouring through the gnarled faces of Rembrandt's men, and the cleaning of the picture is the most notable, as it is the most symbolical, of the Dutch nation's plans in the postwar world. Not everything you see in Holland is so sparkling and confident, but Rembrandt is acting as the herald of the Dutch renascence.

This small country is poised precariously on the flanks of Europe's waste, and not until that waste begins to blossom can there be any hope of a prosperous Holland. The Dutch know it, and in the midst of their hatred of Germany—understandable as it is—they know that unless the barges begin again to go down the Rhine into central Europe to the tune of thirty million tons of goods, as in 1938, they are doomed to be poor, rationed, shabby and impotent in the world's markets. At the moment the trickle is only eight million tons a year—hardly a profitable installment to a nation which carried, brokered and banked for three-quarters of Europe.

This fact plus the passing of the old order in Indonesia makes the Dutch view life grimly. But they also view it courageously. There is a hard-crust section represented by Mr. Gerbrandy, the wartime prime minister of the exiled government in London, to whom nothing but a re-

turn to the Dutch type of imperialism in the Indies will do. Some of the more conservative sections of the church share the same view. But among the missionary leaders there is an enlightened belief that positive and righteous history is being made in Indonesia, and while I was in Holland I met a number of missionaries anxious to go back and serve the growing Indonesian church.

To be sure, there is understandable apprehension about religious liberty in a republic which may easily be dominated by an Islamic caucus. But as this group of missionary leaders argue, the tide of nationalism is flowing in Java and Sumatra, and they are eager that the Christian church, as well as their country, should play a formative part and not be condemned to conduct a rearguard action.

Rebuilding in Progress

In Rotterdam they are steadily rebuilding the great port. In the peaty depths of the city's foundations vast concrete rafts are being laid to carry new stores, warehouses and offices. The Dutch are putting public and commercial buildings before private houses in order to be ready for the opening of European trade. On the scourged island of Walcheren many are cheerfully living in old German pillboxes tidied up and painted with Dutch neatness, complete with window shutters and hen runs on the roof next to abandoned anti-aircraft guns.

In the medieval town of Middelburg the old abbey, the town hall and the Great Church are being restored—an astonishing fact to a visiting Englishman who sees buildings of that sort far down on the priority list in his own country. The salt-saturated soil is slowly being prodded into life, but it will be fifty years before Walcheren's roads are again tree lined. There the trees lie in vast barnacled heaps, killed by the salt tides which poured in through the gaps made by the R.A.F. If anyone in America wishes to give a tree to Walcheren let him write to the burgomaster at Middelburg.

In this renewal the Dutch church is playing a not unworthy part. I refer in particular to the Dutch Reformed Church, the oldest and largest of the Dutch churches, and the one from which all the others have split on points of theology and exegesis. Where you find two Dutchmen, the proverb goes, you find a church, and where there are three Dutchmen, two churches. How sadly true that is historically! The latest split in 1926 (now healed) came over an argument about the exegesis of Genesis 3. But two hopeful movements have sprung up, both of them speeded by the war and both revolving around the personality of Hendrik Kraemer, who soon takes up his new post as director of the Ecumenical Institute near Geneva.

Renewal in the Church

Under Dr. Kraemer's leadership and that of the group he has inspired with his doctrine of "congregation building," the Dutch church is moving out into the common life of the people. For a century it has been engaged in the aridities of endless theological discussion, living in on itself and gradually being dismissed by the people as little more than a historical monument. (The fact that you have to pay 25 cents even to look inside a Dutch church building on any day of the week is symbolic of its closed and uncommunicative attitude.) An examination of the records of the Dutch church synod for the last hundred years shows no evidence of the church's awareness of the moral, social and scientific revolutions occurring in that time.

Dr. Kraemer's call to the church has been to become a witnessing, irrigating body in the life of the Dutch people. The new instrument of this purpose is the *Kerk en Wereld* ("Church and World") institute at Driebergen close to Utrecht. The first seventy young men and women will soon be ready to go out from this institute into the factory, school and adult education life of Holland. Driebergen is not claiming a miracle immediately. It is beginning quietly, building first a community life of its own on the splendid estate it possesses.

Much of what the institute proposes to do is not new to American and British churchmen, but that it should happen in Holland is a sign of a new ferment of the spirit. As Dr. Boerwinkel, one of the leaders of the new movement, says: "We have a church now which not only has eyes to see the distress of the world, but also a mouth to make herself heard, and a brain in the organism of her several councils for research, and in the new institutions for home and foreign missions the church has found feet to go out into the world."

Reform in Missions

The other reformation in Dutch church life is connected with foreign missions. The main societies, led by the Netherlands and Utrecht societies, have now united as the United Missions of the Netherlands with headquarters at Oegstgeest near Leiden. This union has a far deeper purpose than simply uniting separated organizations. It is part of the "congregation building" theory of Dr. Kraemer, in which missions must be an act of the church instead of the concern of a few enthusiastic people.

Missionary training, too, is being reformed. No longer will missionary students be segregated in a special seminary for the whole of their training, but they will be expected to take the normal courses of ministerial training, thus identifying missions with the life of the church in a way almost completely novel in Holland.

Talking with Dr. Kraemer in his quiet study on the Wittesingel at Leiden, within a few yards of the spot where John Robinson bade Godspeed to the Pilgrim fathers on their historic migration to the new world, I caught something of the purpose and drive which have made him a prophet of the hour for his country and, it may be, for Europe. Held as a hostage by the nazis, he saw once again what it means to belong to the redemptive community of Christ sharing the agony and sin of the world, identifying itself with life now rather than living in isolation as a separated holy group. That day I had seen Rembrandt's other masterpiece, "The School of Anatomy," at The Hague, with the corpse lying full in the center of the picture. But Rembrandt's art leaves in your mind not the dead body but the living, radiant faces of the attentive doctors. It is life, not death, which is triumphant, and the patient Dutch are holding up their hands to greet it.

Minnesota Historical Society