

EVANGELICALS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

by

Gerald Johnston Stiles

**Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION**

in

Educational Administration

APPROVED:

David J. Parks, Co-Chairman

Thomas C. Hunt, Co-Chairman

George A. Hillery

Jack L. Arnold

M. David Alexander

**May 1980
Blacksburg, Virginia**

Dedicated to ,
 , , , and

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A special word of thanks is hereby extended to certain individuals who provided help beyond measure in the development of this paper. There were others who aided the writer who are not mentioned, but the following are cited as having contributed that extra ingredient which at times kept the writer going.

My wife, , who patiently endured and sought to keep my grammar somewhat respectable.

, who as a labor of love edited and typed most of the work.

Dr. David Parks, co-chairman of the doctoral committee and friend, who since 1971 has professionally guided my graduate program.

Dr. Thomas Hunt, co-chairman of the committee who perhaps more than any other educator has by his example given hope that the change this work has sought to effect may become reality.

Dr. Jack Arnold, Dr. George Hillery, Dr. David Alexander, the other committee members, are also gratefully acknowledged and thanked.

PREFACE

The following study was undertaken to fulfill a two-fold aim:

(1) to acquaint public school theorists and administrators with a comprehensive statement of the problems, issues, and prospects of evangelical Christians in public schooling; (2) to create an awareness among evangelicals that what is at stake for them goes much deeper than the symptomatic surface issues often making the news, and that much of the problems they have with the public schools stem from their own failure to diligently carry out the mandates of their own beliefs.

The writer has written as an evangelical and from an evangelical perspective. He is well aware of the confusion existing over who and what an evangelical is. Chapter One addresses the question and concludes that an evangelical Christian is one who has received Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior (the New Birth or conversion) and holds to a belief in an inerrant Scripture. Further, the writer, distinguishing between the terms "evangelical," "fundamentalist," and "neo-evangelical," views these three as nearly distinct groups, though in a sense all do come under the evangelical label. He makes clear the fact that he writes from the middle posture of "evangelical." The "fundamentalist" is seldom interested in remaining with public schooling, and the "neo-evangelical" is generally unconcerned about issues causing most evangelicals great discomfort.

The reader will undoubtedly detect the evangelical bias in the study and is advised to expect it and understand that the study is

purposefully designed to present an evangelical perspective to public education. The reader should note that the study does not follow the more traditional format of a dissertation by relying heavily upon statistical data. The writer does present some statistics from two surveys taken in connection with this project but readily acknowledges that both studies have limitations and are therefore presented only as suggestive rather than conclusive data. It is hoped that other researchers will take the data suggested by the Study of 31 Evangelical Youth and the Evangelical Educator Survey (see Appendices A and B) and make a more thorough study involving both large numbers and more controlled conditions.

The following study presents a thorough review of the literature concerning evangelicals and public education to determine the problems evangelicals face and the issues that are at stake. The problems and issues (presented in Chapter Three of the study) are shown to have historical roots (Chapter Two). Again it is noted that the discussion of evangelical problems and issues is from an evangelical world view in order to evoke an understanding of why certain current educational practices have upset many evangelicals. Further, it should be noted that much of the discussion to follow is based upon an assumption that pluralism in public schooling is a desirable and viable goal.

The final chapter includes the writer's conclusions and certain proposals he has deemed essential to a solution of evangelical concerns.

CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	11
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	111
PREFACE	iv
Chapter	
1. THE EVANGELICALS	1
Who They Are	1
What They Believe.	5
How They Differ	9
2. AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF EVANGELICAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION	26
Jewish Roots	26
Apostolic Christian Education.	30
Middle Ages.	34
Reformation.	36
Transplantation Era--Evangelical Dominance	39
The Waning of Evangelical Dominance.	44
Jefferson--Education for Democracy	48
Textbooks Reflect Change	50
Horace Mann--State School System	55
Evangelical Reaction to Mann	57
Decline of Evangelicalism in Public Schools.	62

Chapter	Page
Thorndike and Dewey--Scientific Influences	67
Rise of Pluralism--New Hope or Old Rhetoric.	71
3. CURRENT PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FOR EVANGELICALS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.	83
The Problem Stated	85
Lack of Policy Safeguards.	87
Problems Stemming from Legal Ambiguity	90
Societal Movement Toward Non-Traditional Religious Belief	94
Secular Humanism	97
Basic Tenets of Secular Humanism	101
Evolution--A Humanistic First Principle	107
Inadequacy of Teacher Education Programs	115
Values Clarification	117
Moral Development--Lawrence Kohlberg	127
Decreased Parental Input in Public Schooling	135
The National Education Association	145
Evangelical Failure	147
Summary	155
4. ATTEMPTS AT SOLVING EVANGELICAL PROBLEMS WITH EDUCATION	168
Learning About Religion Courses and Units	169
Evangelical Problems with "Teaching About Religion" Programs	172
Use of Myth	172
Use of the Documentary Theory of Higher Criticism . .	176

Chapter	Page
The Bible Reader--An Example of Objectionable Material	179
Religion Studies--A Vehicle for Attitudinal Change? .	182
Evangelical Support for Teaching About Religion	187
The Private Christian School Movement	190
A Positive Approach to Christian Education	190
Parental Control	193
Quality Education	195
The Matter of Discipline	197
Evangelical Criticism of the Private Christian School	199
Criticism of the Christian School Movement Coming From Outside Evangelicalism	203
Criticism of Christian Schooling from Within Its Own Ranks	207
Evangelicals Unhappy with Public Schools but Desiring To Remain with Them	210
Efforts to Create Awareness	210
New Strategies for Pluralism	215
Summary	221
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND PROPOSALS.	230
Summary of Chapters 1-4	230
Conclusions Based on Chapters 1-4	235
Proposals for Solving Evangelical Discontent with Public Schools	241
Create Awareness of the Problem	242
By Law Establish the Purpose of Compulsory Public Schooling	255

Chapter	Page
Establish Meaningful Policy	250
Re-Awaken Evangelicals to See the Role They Are to Play in the World According to Scripture	254
Prepare Evangelical Parents to Teach Their Children . .	256
Develop Contingency Plans to Guide Evangelical Action If Neutrality Cannot Be Attained	259
BIBLIOGRAPHY	261
APPENDIXES	
A. A STUDY OF 31 EVANGELICAL YOUTH.	273
B. EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY	301
C. A MODEL BILL TO INTRODUCE CREATION SCIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.	312
VITA	317

Chapter 1

THE EVANGELICALS

A recent Gallup Poll stated that one-half of all Protestants--one-third of all Americans--claimed to have had the experience of being "born again."¹ Calling 1976 "the year of the evangelical," Newsweek reported that "the most significant and overlooked religious phenomenon of the 70's is the emergence of evangelical Christianity into a position of respect and power."²

Who They Are

Who are these people called "evangelicals"? What do they believe? How do they differ from other groups claiming a Christian label? How do they differ among themselves? These are questions which must be answered before intelligent examination of evangelicals can be made in relationship to public education. (The author himself accepts the designation of "evangelical," but rather than try to speak authoritatively on evangelicalism he has elected to share the thoughts of many recognized authorities on the subject.)

As far back as Augustine, the Latin adjective evangelicus was used in church history. Augustine declared "The blood of Christians is, as it were, the seed of the fruit of the gospel" (Semen fructum evangelicorum). However, the word came into common use with the con-

tinental Reformation. The reformers' favorite self-designation was "evangelical man" (evangelci viri).³ In 1524, Martin Luther adopted the term and spoke of a "truly evangelical man."⁴ In England, the Latin word evangelicus can be traced back to John Wycliff (1384), who was named Dr. Evangelicus, and at the time of his death he left an unfinished work entitled Opus Evangelicus, emphasizing the sufficiency of Scripture.⁵ In 1532 the word was first used in the Oxford English Dictionary when the Roman Catholic, Sir Thomas Moore, referred to "those evangelicales" in the "Confutacyon of Tindale's Andswere."⁶ (It is noteworthy to add that at least two modern Roman Catholic theologians, Algermissen⁷ and R. K. MacMaster,⁸ still view evangelicals as those holding a Protestant Reformation theology.)

In the eighteenth century the word came to be applied to the Methodists and their successors within and without the Church of England. The entire movement headed by Wesley and Whitefield has come to be known as the "Evangelical Revival."⁹

A significant development in the nineteenth century was the forming in London of the Evangelical Alliance led by men such as Merle D'Aubigne and Thomas Chalmers. A doctrinal platform containing nine affirmations was spelled out. These represented the basic orthodox Protestant beliefs, including inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, the depravity of man, the mediation of the divine Christ, conversion and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, the return of Christ and judgment (heaven for believers, hell for the "lost"), justification by faith, the ministry of the Word, the practice of baptism, and the

Lord's supper. Speaking of this platform, reformed theologian John Gerstner noted that the "doctrines enumerated are not distinctly reformed but merely broadly evangelical."¹¹

In light of the historical usage of the word evangelical, the Anglican theologian John R. Stott has stated that "the classic connotation of evangelical is bound up with a theology of the gospel which goes back to the Reformation." He further stated that those who use the term without the acceptance of the heart of Reformation doctrine represent deviations and are not in the main stream of evangelicalism.¹²

Gordon Clark, the noted evangelical philosopher, made the same point and stated that it is "theological dishonesty to alter the meaning."¹³ Likewise, Kenneth Kantzer, dean of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and in-coming editor of the periodical, Christianity Today, acknowledged that while "few would suggest" that one must believe "all the doctrines to be saved," nonetheless noted that "no true evangelical would admit for a moment that anyone who clearly denied the basic reformation doctrines of the virgin birth, substitutionary atonement, bodily resurrection, and the second coming of Christ is evangelical in the full sense of the word."¹⁴

Time magazine observed recently that "evangelicalism is a worldwide movement that includes tens of millions of people of nearly every persuasion from Anglicans to Fundamentalists."¹⁵ David O. Moberg, professor of sociology and cultural anthropology at Marquette University, claimed that evangelicalism is "so diverse that it defies simple description." He noted that reports about evangelicals are fairly frequent but often "reflect stereotyped images that would be rejected

by one or all of the persons and groups that consider themselves to be evangelicals."¹⁶ The picture coming across in sociological literature, according to Moberg, is that evangelicals are "out of date, behind the times, relics of a bygone era, cultural survivors of a prehistorical past, and anachronistic replicas of our ignorant rural ancestors."¹⁷

One of the more frequent views of evangelicals is that they are generally found in the lower than average social class position. Moberg allowed that some evidence may substantiate this view but warned that "diversities are so great" that this image is "not warranted." He pointed out that "entire congregations of pre-dominately upper middle class evangelicals can be identified," and people of high stations and wealth as well as the poorest of the poor number among them.¹⁸

In an attempt to understand more about evangelicals and especially to explain their sudden re-emergence, social scientists have attempted to analyze them through empirical research. One study of a large mid-Western independent evangelical church concluded that people attended in an effort to find authority, comfort, or social opportunities.¹⁹ Another study covering twenty evangelical congregations in a Canadian city showed that 68 percent of their converts were children of evangelical parents. Another 16 percent were either married or engaged to evangelicals or had evangelical relatives or close friends involved in the conversion. Four percent were under age 15, 5 percent showed signs of deprivation. Only 7 percent of the converts were concluded to have had "rationality" as a dominant factor in their conversions.²⁰

Another conclusion some studies have purported to show is a relationship between conservative theological positions (evangelicalism) and prejudice, authoritarianism, and lack of compassion. However, Moberg pointed out "research also has shown" that among church people, generally, the "most deeply committed and intrinsically involved" manifest less prejudice than those with a "superficial, exterior kind of instrumental religiosity."²² Moberg further cited, among others, a study of the LaSalle Street Church in Chicago that revealed a constituency that is "highly orthodox in doctrine, but also strongly concerned about the social implications of their faith."²³

Helpful as these empirical studies may be, it must be kept in mind that the strictly scientific approach to matters like "conversion" ignore spiritual aspects not subject to analysis and cannot, at least to the evangelical, be expected to adequately describe evangelicals. Such studies have simply shown that evangelicals cannot be viewed distinct from other Christians by virtue of their place on the socio-economic ladder nor by their degree of prejudice or lack of compassion, and that conversion to the evangelical position has more often than not come about via an individual close to the convert. This being so, the question remains as to just what it is that does distinguish evangelicals from other Christian groups. This writer suggests that the answer to the question is based in their beliefs.

What They Believe

Several evangelical scholars have attempted to identify that

core of evangelical belief which links otherwise divergent individuals and groups together into what is identifiable as evangelicalism. Carl F. Henry, at the time editor of the evangelical periodical, Christianity Today, wrote what may be one of the fullest descriptions:

The evangelical movement is distinct...from the modern theologies for such uniform emphases as the rational and propositional nature of divine revelation; the final authority of the Bible; man's fall from a condition of original righteousness, and the involvement of the race in the sin and guilt of the first Adam, the divine promise of redemption and provision thereof through the coming of Jesus Christ in a series of supernatural acts that climax Old Testament prophecy. Evangelical Christianity asserts Jesus of Nazareth to be the supreme revelation of the Godhead; born of a virgin; sinless in life; atoning by His death for the sins of the world; and triumphant in bodily resurrection from the grave.²⁴

In Christianity and the World of Thought, a book purporting to be "an honest grappling with issues which confront evangelical Christians whose training and experience have forced an encounter between biblical faith and various academic disciplines," the editor and then president of Wheaton College, Dr. Hudson T. Armerding, contended that the authors were chosen because of a commitment to a "historic biblical faith" (something he later described as "biblical orthodoxy"). Dr. Armerding described this faith or orthodoxy as belief in a "personal, self-existent, self-revealing God who had disclosed Himself uniquely in the person of Jesus Christ and propositionally in biblical truth."²⁵ Dr. Armerding added that the authors had all committed themselves personally to Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord, an indispensable part of being an "evangelical."

Harold Lindsell, a recent editor of Christianity Today, in his book, The Bible in the Balance, has devoted an entire chapter to

the question, "What or Who Is an Evangelical?" In this chapter, Lindsell mentions seven doctrinal beliefs that relate to the term "evangelical."²⁶ They are:

1. That God is a Trinity, three persons in one essence;
2. That Jesus is the incarnate, virgin-born Son of God, sinless, holy, and the vicarious substitute for man's transgressions;
3. That Adam was the first man, that he sinned in the Garden of Eden and such sin wrought disaster for the human race;
4. That Jesus rose in bodily form from the grave, ascended into heaven, and is coming again personally, visibly, and in power and great glory;
5. That salvation is by faith alone, without works of righteousness;
6. That there is a heaven and a hell;
7. That all of the above, and other items of beliefs, are known and believed because God has revealed them in the form of an inerrant Scripture.

George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard, and Rodney L. Petersen, a staff member of Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, defined evangelicalism as "that broad ellipse of Protestant Christianity of which the two foci are the all sufficiency of the Bible as God's Word unto salvation and such salvation received as by faith alone."²⁷ It is these two points which essentially separate evangelicals from most other groups of Christians. For example, Roman Catholics would add to the Bible the traditions and teachings of "the church," while liberal Protestants would generally add the latest accepted standards of the ethical researcher. Similarly, while evangelicals believe salvation is only by faith in Christ, most of the other groups would add "works" in one form or another. These observations were supported in a Gallup Poll conducted for Christianity Today and released in the February 22, 1980, issue. The study revealed

that 100 percent of the "orthodox evangelicals" believed the Bible is the Word of God and not mistaken in its statements and teachings, while such was true of only 42 percent of the general public.²⁸

Likewise, while 100 percent of the orthodox evangelicals were reported to believe that the only hope for heaven is through personal faith in Jesus Christ, only 45 percent of the general public assented to this.²⁹

Gordon H. Clark stated, "There are...two principles which constitute evangelicalism. There is the material principle, the contents of the Gospel...and the formal principle, the source of the contents, the authority of the Word of God, the infallible Scripture alone."³⁰

This is not unlike the first two of what Phillip Schaff, renowned church historian of the nineteenth century, called the three distinguishing factors of evangelical protestantism: authority of the Bible, justification by the free grace of God through a living faith in Christ as the only and sufficient Savior.³¹ To these Schaff added the universal priesthood of all believers.

Kenneth Kantzer saw the same beliefs as "central to Luther's protest": justification prefaces the Christian life, with faith in Jesus Christ; Scripture, as illuminated by the Holy Spirit, is the only trustworthy guide in moral and spiritual matters.³²

In summary, therefore, evangelicals hold two foundational beliefs that distinguish them from other groups or classifications of Christians. First is the existence and sufficiency of the Bible, which is accepted literally and inerrantly as the Word of God and which reveals God's nature, man's fallen state, man's need for

salvation, and the means of such salvation. The second foundational belief of evangelicalism is that man's salvation is made possible only through the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ and is achieved only by faith, as opposed to works. There are other related beliefs, but these two form the substance to which the others are connected. For example, evangelicals all hold to the belief that Jesus Christ is God (Deity). They do so because they believe literally the passages in the Bible which so state. Again, all evangelicals believe in a literal heaven and hell, because, once again, the Bible repeatedly says so. It is important to note this because on the basis of a professed belief in an inerrant Scripture and acceptance of Jesus Christ as the way to God, one could erroneously equate Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, with evangelicalism. Such could not be further from the case. Not only do Jehovah's Witnesses deny doctrines held by evangelicals, such as the Trinity, the deity of Christ, and a literal heaven and hell, but Jehovah's Witnesses also teach a form of salvation that evangelicals see as including works.

How They Differ

Despite a general theological agreement on the "core" of evangelical belief, evangelicals often differ on beliefs outside the core widely enough to prevent "fellowship" even among themselves. For example, evangelicals are divided over the extent to which God's sovereignty and man's will are involved in salvation. Those called "Calvinists" emphasize God's sovereignty and stress that man is

"spiritually dead" and is therefore incapable of initiating any movement toward God. Nonetheless, God has willed to have a people for Himself and in eternity past "elected" certain people whom He draws to Himself by the Holy Spirit. Since salvation is a gift solely received via God's grace, Calvinists conclude it is illogical to suppose that man once saved could become lost. Those designated "Arminians," on the other hand, view God's action in eternity past as electing a plan of salvation, rather than electing individual people, by which those who respond through the exercises of their own free will become part of "the elect." Since man, himself, is the ultimate decider of whether he is saved or not, it follows that he can also be the cause of the loss of his salvation.

Eschatology, or the study of future things, is another area of disagreement among evangelicals. Some are "covenant theologians" while others are "dispensationalists" (descriptions of which are not germane to the study). Though agreed on a future coming of Christ, there is disagreement over whether that coming will be before, during, or after the "great tribulation," which immediately precedes the millenium, the thousand year reign of Christ. Some believe there will be no millenium at all. Others believe the millenium represents a "spiritual" reign of Christ and that He now reigns in and through believers.

Another source of evangelical disagreement is the sometimes spirited debate over the alleged "manifestations of the Spirit" connected with the charismatic movement, namely, speaking in tongues and supernatural healing. There's opposition toward charismatics

from such diverse evangelical groups as Southern Baptists, Church of the Nazarenes, and institutions such as Bob Jones University and Asbury Theological Seminary.³³

Vinson Synan, General Secretary of the Pentacostal Holiness Church, observed that "although Pentacostals consider themselves to be evangelicals and even fundamentalists, this feeling was seldom reciprocated by the mainstream of evangelicalism" until 1943 when the newly formed National Association of Evangelicals chose to admit Pentacostals to their ranks. "Since that time, the Pentacostal movement has occupied a place within the mainstream of American evangelicalism."³⁴ Nonetheless, their presence continues to represent one of the greater areas of division.

Today, the most widely debated, divisive topic among those designating themselves as evangelicals is the meaning of "inspiration" of Scripture. Unlike the other differences, the issues at stake here go to the historic heart of evangelical distinctiveness. Francis Schaeffer, perhaps the leading evangelical philosopher today, stated:

The issue whether the Bible is God's verbalized communication to men giving propositional true truth where it touches the cosmos and history or whether it is only in some sense "revelational where it touches religion" will be the crucial area of discussion for evangelicalism in the next several years.³⁵

At stake is whether evangelicalism will remain evangelical.³⁶

Evangelicals have long stood for what is theologically labeled "plenary verbal" inspiration. This view asserts that the biblical writers' words as well as their thoughts were breathed out by God and that the Scriptures in their entirety represent the Word of God.

Kenneth Kantzer has succinctly stated this view as follows:

God in His providence so guided the authors in the choice of their words and the use of their sources, without in any way negating their individuality, that their words are really His (verbal inspiration) and this guidance extends to the whole of Scripture, not merely to its more "elevated" or more "religious" parts (plenary). The result of this is that Scripture is incapable of stating error (infallible) or of wandering from the truth (inerrant).³⁷

Dr. John P. Newport, professor of philosophy at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, supported Kantzer's position when he noted:

The traditional conservative position affirms that God reveals Himself in concepts and propositions that are direct and objective. Because this revealed truth, enshrined in the Bible, is supernaturally revealed it escapes the time-bound character of most knowledge. The biblical writers were guided to write down the right thoughts and right words.³⁸

Harold Lindsell, who has written what Billy Graham has called "one of the most important" books of our generation,³⁹ Battle for the Bible, traced this view of inspiration from church history. He quoted such notables as Augustine, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, John Wesley, B.B. Warfield, and J. Gresham Machen as holding to an inerrantly inspired Bible.⁴⁰

Many labeled "evangelicals" have modified this historic position to the point of separating inspiration and inerrancy. James Orr, English theologian, viewed the purpose of inspiration to be to communicate life in Christ. Orr contended that this purpose is reached whether or not the Holy Spirit corrected the documents from which the chronicler drew his information.⁴¹ Likewise, David P. Fuller, of Fuller Theological Seminary, limited inerrancy "to those statements that are able to make men wise unto salvation."⁴² Everett Harrison, also of Fuller Seminary, claimed that the Bible must be "interpreted

and judged on terms of its own usage and intentions" and "seen according to the standards of meanings and accuracy employed in its day rather than by twentieth century standards."⁴³ In effect, these men are admitting that outside the area of "spiritual truth," the Bible can and does, even in the original autographs, contain error.

One prevalent example of this view of inspiration can be seen in Paul Jewett's book, Man As Male and Female. In it, this Fuller Seminary professor asserted that the apostle Paul was wrong in what he taught about female subordination:

Paul is...assuming the traditional rabbinic understanding of that narrative whereby the order of their creation is made to yield to the primacy of the man over the woman. Is this rabbinic understanding...correct? We do not think it is.⁴⁴

Kantzer held that this new evangelical view does not represent main line evangelicalism and cited the statement from the 1974 Lausanne conference which assembled the most representative gathering of evangelicals in this century:

We affirm the divine inspiration, truthfulness, and authority of both Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God without error in all that it affirms, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We also affirm the power of God's Word to accomplish His purpose of salvation. The message of the Bible is addressed to all mankind. For God's revelation in Christ and in Scripture is unchangeable. Through it the Holy Spirit still speaks today. He illumines the minds of God's people in every culture to perceive its truth freshly through their own eyes and thus discloses to the whole church ever more of the many colored wisdom of God.⁴⁵

A very small extreme wing of evangelicals accepts the "dictation" theory which regards the biblical writers as mere secretaries writing down the words as dictated by the Holy Spirit. This is often a charge leveled against those holding to verbal plenary

inspiration. Citing that the "libel surfaces over and over again,"

Harold Lindsell stated:

Let it be said succinctly that I do not know any scholar who believes in biblical inerrancy who holds that the Scriptures were received by dictation. Those who believe in inerrancy acknowledge that the whole Bible was written by men, and they made no effort whatever to obscure this fact...what believers in inerrancy are saying is that the Holy Spirit was also at work on the minds and hearts of the writers.⁴⁶

For a number of years evangelicalism has manifested a distinct cleavage into two camps: those retaining the term evangelical and those termed fundamentalist.

According to the church historian, Martin Marty, of the University of Chicago, it was the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals which did more than anything else to manifest the recent historical division of evangelicals into these two distinct camps.⁴⁷ One year earlier, Carl McIntire had formed the American Council of Christian Churches (ACCC) as an attempt to regroup evangelicals who appeared to be floundering after ceasing to represent the mainstream of protestantism (at this time represented by the Federal Council of Churches). But McIntire, the ACCC, and that wing which became identified as "fundamentalism" were described by Dr. J.I. Packer in his book, Fundamentalism and the Word of God, as having a "pronounced anti-intellectual bias, a readiness to support a good cause with a bad argument...fundamentalism turned in upon itself, limiting its interests to evangelism and the cultivation of personal religion...unduly susceptible to eccentric influences from its own ranks."⁴⁸

Prior to 1942, men like J. Gresham Machen, the noted evangelical scholar at Princeton, had resented the reputation evangelicals were receiving because of this developing fundamentalist wing of the movement. In 1925 Machen declared:

It is a great mistake...to suppose that we who are called conservatives hold desperately to certain beliefs merely because they are old, and are opposed to the discovery of new facts. On the contrary, we welcome new discoveries with all our hearts, and we believe that our cause will come to its rights again only when youth throws off its present intellectual lethargy, refuses to go along with the anti-intellectual current of the age, and recovers some genuine independence of mind.

Since the time of Machen, non-fundamentalist evangelicals have made many attempts to disassociate themselves not as much from the doctrines but from the practices commonly associated with "fundamentalism." Often this disassociation has taken a positive rather than a negative form. J.I. Packer, reacting to what he confessed has not always been an unjust charge of "obscurantism" among those labeled fundamentalists, countered with the following:

Obscurantism in all its forms is wholly out of keeping with true evangelicalsism. The evangelical is not afraid of facts, for he knows that all facts are God's facts; nor is he afraid of thinking, for he knows that all truth is God's truth, and right reason cannot endanger sound faith....It is not his business to argue men into faith...but...to demonstrate the intellectual adequacy of biblical faith and the comparative inadequacy of its rivals and to show the invalidity of the criticisms that are brought against it.

Dr. Harold Ockenga, an early supporter of this break from the fundamentalist wing, stated what Marty calls "the most famous passage" in the literature concerning the division between fundamentalists and other evangelicals.⁵¹

The new evangelicalism embraces the full orthodoxy of fundamentalism, but manifests a social consciousness and responsibility which was strongly absent from fundamentalism. The new evangelicalism concerns itself not only with personal salvation, doctrinal truth, and an eternal point of reference, but also with the problems of race, of war, of class struggle, of liquor control, of juvenile delinquency, of immorality, and of national imperialism.⁵²

After the formation of the National Association of Evangelicals in 1942, the fundamentalist wing of evangelicals in America did not die and today is most identifiable at Bob Jones University in Greenville, South Carolina. Dr. Bob Jones III was featured as one of the speakers at the World Congress of Fundamentalists in Edinburgh, Scotland, in June 1976.⁵³ Another featured speaker was Ian Paisley, the militant Irish nationalist. As reported in the Bob Jones periodical, Faith for the Family, May-June 1976, the title of Paisley's keynote message was "The Faith, Fight, and Fire of a Fundamentalist." Lloyd Streeter, writing in the same periodical (February 1977 issue), voiced a prevalent fundamentalist view that "not only does the preacher have the right to attack unscriptural positions, he has the responsibility to do so."⁵⁴

Jones defined a fundamentalist as a man who does four things: he believes the Bible; he defends the Bible; he declares "the whole counsel of God;" and he obeys the Scripture.⁵⁵ He made a distinction between what he labeled as fundamentalist and pseudo-fundamentalist. This latter individual, Jones claimed, is "dominated by his desire for bigness...cannot distinguish between apostasy and revival...defends men whose positions are contrary to Scripture...and is bitterly critical of the true fundamentalists."⁵⁶

Dr. George Dollar, formerly at Bob Jones University, now at

Central Baptist Seminary, viewed evangelicalism from the fundamentalist frame of reference and considered the "militant fundamentalist" as the historic and true" representative of orthodox protestantism. In his recent book, A History of Fundamentalism in America, published by Bob Jones University Press, Dollar defined "historic fundamentalism" as the "literal exposition of all non-biblical affirmations and attitudes."⁵⁷ Dollar divided fundamentalism (called evangelicalism by the other Christian groups) into three categories, and viewed those he described as "militant" as the true representatives. He labeled the other groups, including Moody Bible Institute and Dallas Theological Seminary, as "moderates" and as "modified" such groups as Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Wheaton College. According to Dollar, the moderates are faithful in their literal exposition of the affirmations and attitudes of the Bible, but must be faulted for their disloyalty on militant exposure. The modified fundamentalists, whom Dollar equated with "new evangelicals," dismiss important doctrines as unimportant and are guilty of compromise, erosion, and capitulation to satanic forces.⁵⁸

Dollar's treatment of fundamentalism shows that many fundamentalists not only accept the charge of "separatist" leveled against them by other evangelicals, but also defend the title. In fact, assessment of orthodoxy is largely defined by the purity of one's separation.

Dr. John R. Rice, editor of The Sword of the Lord and author of numerous books and pamphlets, also writes from an openly fundamentalist posture. However, Dr. Rice presents a slightly different

posture from Dr. Jones and Dr. Dollar. In his book, I Am a Fundamentalist, Dr. Rice distinguished certain terms from a fundamentalist reference. "Conservative" is a "milder term than fundamentalist." "It is carried by many who never major on soul winning... never expose false prophets...do not offend by sharp, convicting preaching against sin."⁵⁹ "Evangelical" is too limited a term, Rice said, because many "modernists" in open unbelief of the great fundamentals and denying even the deity of Christ...are advertised by the publishers as evangelical.⁶⁰ "New evangelicism," according to Rice, "is intended to be a modification, a disclaimer of any aggressive evangelicalism."⁶¹ While Dr. Rice openly accepts the fundamentalist title, he does not go the extremes of some in the area of separation. He did note, "We have clear instructions that we are not to have fellowship with Christians who live in gross sin, and who bring disgrace on the cause."⁶² He nonetheless allowed for "liberty" to follow "the clear leading of the Spirit of God."⁶³ A man, according to Rice, "must have the freedom to do what God leads him to do the best he knows."⁶⁴ Another Christian, with doubts about that leading, should "act like a Christian" and "love" his "brother" and "not with pharisaic self-righteousness, supposing he has sold out, compromised, done wrong."⁶⁵ Reacting to the radical fundamentalists, Rice disassociated himself from those whom he described as "nuts." He called upon the fundamentalist to be a "good, soul-winning, Bible-defending fundamental Christian, but don't be a hell-raising nut, an irresponsible extremist bringing reproach on the cause of Christ."⁶⁶

Dr. Rice's views magnify David Moberg's earlier assertion that evangelicalism "defies simple description." At least identification of the specific divisions of evangelicalism seems to be more complex than often thought. No longer are there simply the two camps of evangelicals and fundamentalists.

Richard Quebedeaux, author of a new book, The Young Evangelicals, has recently recognized that the traditional division of fundamentalist and evangelical no longer conveys the accurate picture.⁶⁷ As Dollar noted, fundamentalists, even those disassociating from those they label neo-evangelicals, are divided. Likewise, many who divorce themselves from separatist fundamentalism feel equally uncomfortable, especially with that wing of "neo-evangelicalism" which is increasingly modifying its view of inspiration. To more accurately describe the movement, Quebedeaux arranged evangelicals under five distinct ideological sub-groups: separatist-fundamentalist; open fundamentalist (open to self-criticism and dialogue); establishment evangelicals (more socially concerned); new evangelicals (concentrating as much on life as doctrine); and young evangelicals (holding to a less defined theology but very active in social-political affairs). Although Quebedeaux has drawn the focus a little closer, it must be remembered that many evangelicals, those subscribing to the "two foci" of the evangelical ellipse, would find it difficult to choose which of the five camps they come under. This author, for example, cannot decide whether he is an open fundamentalist, an establishment evangelical, or a new evangelical. The truth of the matter is that he is a blending of all three. While he subscribes to the doctrinal orthodoxy of the

open fundamentalist, like the establishment evangelical, he happens to be more socially concerned than the typical fundamentalist. On the other hand, unlike most establishment evangelicals, this author holds to a dispensationalist view of Scripture and is, like the new evangelicals, very concerned about real life problems.

As much as society would like to categorize neatly the evangelical movement into concise blocks, it is simply impossible. Perhaps the more accurate division would be a three-fold grouping: militant fundamentalist (orthodox and separate); main line evangelicals (orthodox and fellowshiping within the bounds of historic protestant orthodoxy); neo-evangelicals (semi-orthodox with a modified view of inspiration that no longer holds to a verbal, plenary, infallible, inerrant Bible).

While recognizing variations within each category, this three way division most clearly identifies the major sub-groups of the movement known as evangelicalism. It is this author's contention that the middle group is most representative of the movement as a whole and that both of the other sub-groups, by virtue of their distinctions, represent separate movements. In future chapters the significance of their distinctions (separatism and modified view of inspiration) will be noted as the major differences between main line evangelicals in their relationship to public schooling. The fundamentalist, because of his belief in separation, will be unwilling to remain in an increasingly pluralistic public school, while the neo-evangelical, departing from belief in an inerrant Scripture will find less and less to dispute in such schools. The main line evangelical, on the other

hand, will be the one desiring to remain in public schooling but he will feel the pressure and frustrations over what will presently be seen as conflict between his religious beliefs and the trend of modern society reflected in public schooling.

FOOTNOTES

¹The Gallup Poll Index, "Religion in America 1977-78," 1977, Report No. 145.

²Kenneth Woodward, "Born Again: The Year of the Evangelical," Newsweek, October 25, 1977, p. 68.

³John R. Stott, Christ the Controversialist, (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1974), p. 29.

⁴Ibid., p. 30.

⁵Ibid., p. 31.

⁶Ibid., p. 31.

⁷John Gerstner, "Theological Boundaries: The Reformed Tradition," The Evangelicals, ed. David S. Wells and John Woodbridge (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1977), p. 23.

⁸R.K. MacMaster, New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), Vol. 5, p. 688.

⁹Stott, op.cit., p. 31.

¹⁰Gerstner, op.cit., p. 25.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Stott, op. cit., p. 32.

¹³Gordon H. Clark, "Evangelicalism," The Encyclopedia of Christianity, Vol. 4, Phillip E. Hughes, ed., (Marshelton, Del.: The National Foundation for Christian Education, 1972), p. 122.

¹⁴Kenneth S. Kantzer, "Unity and Diversity in Evangelicalism," The Evangelicals, op. cit., p. 74.

¹⁵"Evangelicals Unite," Time, February 3, 1975, p. 60.

¹⁶David O. Moberg, "Fundamentalists and Evangelicals in Society," The Evangelicals, op. cit., p. 163.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 166.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 169.

¹⁹Robert B. Monaghan, "Three Faces of the True Believer," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, (Fall, 1967), pp. 234-45, cited by Moberg, op. cit., p. 168.

²⁰Reginald W. Bibby and Merlin Binkerhoff, "Sources of Religious Involvement: Issues on Future Empirical Investigation," Review of Religious Research, (Winter, 1974), pp. 71-79, cited by Moberg, op. cit., p. 168.

²¹Benton Johnson, "Ascetic Protestantism and Political Preference," Public Opinion Quarterly, (Spring 1962), pp. 35-46; Glenn D. Wilson and Christopher Bagley, "Religion, Radicalism, and Conservatism," The Psychology of Conservatism (New York: Academic Press, 1973), pp. 117-28; Rodney Stark et al., Wayward Shepherds: Prejudice and the Protestant Clergy (New York: Harper and Row, 1971).

²²Moberg, op. cit., p. 174.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Carl F. H. Henry, ed., Christian Faith and Modern Theology (New York: Channel Press, 1964), p. x.

²⁵Hudson. T. Armerding, ed., Christianity and the World of Thought (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), pp. 7-8.

²⁶Harold Lindsell, The Bible in the Balance (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), p. 306.

²⁷George H. Williams and Rodney L. Petersen, "Evangelicals, Society, the State, the Nation 1925-75," The Evangelicals, op. cit., p. 31.

²⁸Kenneth Kantzer, "The Charismatics Among Us," Christianity Today, (February 22, 1980), p. 249.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Clark, op. cit., p. 121.

³¹Phillip Schaff, Creeeds of Christendom (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1877), Vol. 3, pp. 206-7.

³²Kantzer, op. cit., p. 58.

³³Vinson Synam, "Theological Boundaries: The Arminian Tradition," The Evangelicals, op. cit., p. 50.

³⁴Ibid., p. 49.

³⁵Francis Schaeffer, No Final Conflict (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1975), p. 8.

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 8.

³⁷Kantzer, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

³⁸John Newport and William Cannon, Why Christians Fight Over the Bible (Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1974), p. 52.

³⁹"Bible Battles, " Time, May 10, 1976, p. 57.

⁴⁰Harold Lindsell, The Battle for the Bible (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976), pp. 41-47.

⁴¹Newport and Cannon, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁴³*Ibid.*

⁴⁴Paul King Jewett, Man as Male and Female (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), p. 119.

⁴⁵Kantzer, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

⁴⁶Lindsell, *op. cit.*, p. 32-33.

⁴⁷Martin Marty, "Tensions Within Contemporary Evangelicalism: A Critical Appraisal," The Evangelicals, *op. cit.*, p. 192.

⁴⁸J.I. Packer, Fundamentalism and the Word of God: Some Evangelical Principles (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974), p. 32.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁵¹Marty, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

⁵²*Ibid.*

⁵³"Progress Report: World Congress of Fundamentalists," Faith for the Family, (May-June, 1976), p. 29.

⁵⁴Lloyd Streeter, "Flap-doo-dle," Faith for the Family, February, 1977, p. 37.

⁵⁵ Bob Jones, "Pseudo-Fundamentalists: The New Breed in Sheep's Clothing," Faith for the Family, (January, 1978), p. 7.

⁵⁶ Ibid., pp. 7, 16.

⁵⁷ George Dollar, A History of Fundamentalism in America (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1973), p. 279.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 286.

⁵⁹ John R. Rice, I Am a Fundamentalist (Mufreesboro, Tenn.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1975), p. 7.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 8.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., p. 34.

⁶³ Ibid., p. 35.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 36.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 77.

⁶⁷ Richard Quebedeaux, The Young Evangelicals, Revolution in Orthodoxy (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), pp. 18-54.

Chapter 2

AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF EVANGELICAL INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION¹

Although Christianity as such began with the appearance of Jesus Christ, it must be kept in mind that evangelicals recognize that Jesus Christ came as a Jew to establish His kingdom. He was raised in a Jewish home, attended Jewish schooling, and taught in the Jewish synagogue. It was not until His rejection by the Jewish nation that He revealed that His "eternal purpose" had in it a development beyond that of Judaism--what is called today the "Church" or Christianity.

Jewish Roots

Recognizing, therefore, that Christianity emerged out of Judaism, evangelicals trace God's dealings with men prior to the advent of Christ. It was to Israel that God gave His promises and covenants. The Apostle Paul, writing to the Ephesian Christians, reminded them that as Gentiles they were once "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise."² Nonetheless, Paul stated that "in Christ" those who "were far off are made near by the blood of Christ"³ and, consequently, "no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God."⁴ Rather than viewing Christianity as totally

distinct from Judaism, evangelicals see Christianity as a continuation of God's dealing with man. A Bible passage often quoted in this regard is John 1:11-13: "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not; but as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become sons of God, even to them that believe on (sic) His name."

While the early Christian apostles were careful to give instruction regarding Christ's fulfillment of many of the forms and rituals inherent in Judaism, the Apostle Paul, nonetheless, informed the Corinthians that all of what happened to Israel as recorded in the Old Testament "happened unto them for examples and are written for our admonition."⁵ Hence, he wrote to a young Christian, Timothy, and exhorted him to "continue in the things which thou hast learned...that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures...."⁶ The significance of this command is that the foremost Christian apostle places, as it were, his seal of approval upon the Jewish emphasis of educating their young in the Holy Scriptures.

Moses had instructed Israel concerning the "commandments, the statutes, and the judgments which the Lord your God commanded to teach you."⁷ In so doing, he placed great stress on the role of parents, "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."⁸

Several generations later Solomon wrote in Proverbs 22:6 to "Train up (catechise) a child in the way he should go, and when he is

old he will not depart from it." A lack of recorded evidence to the contrary would seem to indicate that this responsibility was left totally to parents. Later the synagogue developed and with it a form of synagogue school.

H. Clay Trumbull, in lectures at Yale University in 1888, quoted the reknown Jewish historian and contemporary of Christ, Josephus, as claiming that it was a custom of the Jews from the days of Moses to assemble in the synagogues, not only to hear the law, but "to learn it accurately."

So thorough is this instruction of the young in the teachings of the law, that, as he (Josephus) expresses it, "if any one of us (Jews) should be questioned concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat all than (repeat) his own name."⁹

Alfred Edersheim in his classic, The Life and Times of Jesus The Messiah, quoted Philo, who predated Josephus, to show that "it was no idle boast that the Jews were 'from their swaddling clothes... trained to recognize God as their father and the maker of the world' and that 'having been taught the knowledge of the law from earliest youth they bore in their souls the image of the commandments.'" ¹⁰

While the mother played a definite role in this religious training, Edersheim quoted extensively to show "it was the father who was bound to teach his son." "To impart to the child knowledge of the Torah conferred as great spiritual distinction, as if a man had received the Law itself on Mount Horeb....That man was of the profane vulgar who had sons, but failed to bring them up in the knowledge of the law."¹¹

Emanuel Deutsch, Emil Schurer, and Christian Ginsburg are scholars Trumbull cited to document that formal Jewish schooling by the time of Christ was so developed that it corresponded quite closely to the modern Sunday schools. According to Deutsch, "eight years before Christ, schools flourished throughout the length and breadth of the land; education had been made compulsory."¹² Schurer noted that despite the fact that education of Jewish children "was, in the first place, the duty and task of parents, it appears that, even in the age of Christ, care was taken for the instruction of youth by the erection of schools on the "part of the community."¹³ The extent to which this schooling had grown is shown by Ginsburg: "Whilst in the pre-exile period the very name of schools did not exist, we now find in a very short time no less than eleven different expressions for school."¹⁴ The writings of the early rabbis stated that there existed between 460 and 480 synagogue schools in Jerusalem alone at the time of Christ.¹⁵

Although reading, writing, and arithmetic were included in the curriculum of these schools, the main objective was to become familiar with the sacred Scriptures.¹⁶

Roughly classifying the subjects of study, it was held that up to ten years of age, the Bible exclusively should be the textbook; from ten to fifteen the Mishnah, or traditional law; after that age the student should enter in those theological discussions which occupied time and attention in the higher academies of the rabbis.¹⁷

Samuel Sandmel, Distinguished Service Professor of Bible and Hellenistic Literature at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, has mentioned that there even existed in the synagogue system the "bet

ha-knesset...where adults were reminded of the education they presumably once had had."¹⁸

Apostolic Christian Education

Although the coming of Christ meant changes for those who accepted His teachings, as long as they remained within the cultural context of Judaism there remained the background of belief in and stress upon learning the Scriptures. "The truth taught by these Christian teachers was very different from that which had been... taught as truth before, but the method of the teaching was in all probability the same."¹⁹ Christ was proclaimed in the Old Testament as the long awaited Messiah. Regarding the Old Testament, He himself had said it spoke of Him, "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself."²⁰

One does not have much difficulty imagining the situation of converted Jews dealing with their children's education. It was essentially a building upon what was being taught in the synagogue school. At school they were taught a Messiah was coming. At home, the Messiah was shown to be Christ. At school the rituals and histories were presented. At home they were interpreted in light of Christ's and the apostles' teachings.

As Christianity moved outward into non-Jewish cultures, part of the educational picture changed. Many of the new converts had no background in Old Testament Judaism. Christians were no longer in a

land religiously controlling the people as Judaism had. There were no existing schools to which they could attach themselves by simply modifying the instruction. However, part of what had been carried over from Jewish roots remained, at least in the beginning, the model of home instruction supplemented by instruction in every local church gathering. Henry Gwatkin, professor of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge, has described the early situation for Christians in non-Jewish lands.

The Christians had the same education as their neighbors. Many were converts; and there was not yet much distrust of heathen education for Christian children. The schools were open to all comers, for heathenism had no articles of faith. The chief difference was the instruction given to catechumens and the educative influence of the Sunday services.²¹

It is more than likely that the impetus to the catechumenal (rudimentary) teaching came from the Jewish antecedents plus the apostolic writings. Matthew recorded Christ as saying, in what is today called "the great commission," "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations...teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."²² The Apostle Paul exhorted Timothy, "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also."²³ Paul reminded Timothy of his own experiences of having been "taught from a child the Holy Scriptures" and went on to note the sufficiency of the Scriptures as the basis of his teaching.²⁴ This same apostle wrote to Titus instructing him to exhort the older women to teach the younger women "To be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own

husbands."²⁵

For many Christian parents, despite the Sunday attempts to fulfill the requirements placed upon them by Christ and his apostles, if they wanted their children to receive schooling, it often placed them in a predicament not unlike that facing many evangelicals today--an education in schools which to a large extent reflected societal values at odds with their own.

J. F. Dobson, Greek professor at the University of Bristol, in his book, Ancient Education and its Meaning to Us, noted that there were Christians who were "bitterly opposed to the pagan education because it was so closely incorporated with pagan practices and traditions."²⁶ M. Boissier, author of La Fin du Paganisme, while noting this point further pursued the very questions which remain today.

All the schools were pagan. Not only were all the ceremonies of the official faith...but the children were taught reading out of books saturated with the old mythology....He [a Christian student] ran the danger of imbibing ideas entirely contrary to those he had received at home: The fables he had learned to detest in his own home were explained, elucidated, and held up to his admiration every day by his masters. Was it right to put him thus into two schools of thought? What could be done that he might be educated like everyone else and yet not run the risk of losing his faith?²⁷

A more recent author, Roland Allen, author of Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours, noted the problems early Christians had with schooling by pointing out, for example, that "the children... read about Venus in countries beneath the shadow of the temple of Venus with its 1000 priestesses, whose deceits and arts were known to all the city."²⁸ He continued by noting the impact the schools had and the partial inability of parents and churches to cope with it.

"They understood a great deal too much, and the home influence was then, as ever in heathen lands, far from being what it ought to be. Even a good teacher could hardly counteract the influence...and all teachers were not good teachers."²⁹

The second through fourth centuries A.D. manifested two attempts by Christians to answer the question as to what could be done. The first was an attempt to "reconcile Christianity and Greek philosophic thinking."³⁰ Justin Martyr (105-167), schooled in Greek philosophy, still wore the philosopher's mantle after conversion and wrote apologies for the Emperor Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius.³¹ Clement (160-215) "held to the harmony of the Gospels with philosophy,"³² as did Origen (185-254) and Saint Basil (331-379).³³

The second attempt was a combination of Christians establishing schools of their own at certain large centers where instruction would be given in "all things" a Christian should know, along with the efforts of active individual Christians to reach and teach young people wherever and whenever they could. Trumbull noted, "They were always ready to be teachers in any school where they might, by the teaching process, impress the truth of God on impressionable minds and the arts."³⁴

Despite the attempt to accomodate Christianity with paganism, the efforts of evangelically minded Christians were judged to be too successful by the Roman Emperor Julian, who closed the pagan schools to Christians in 362.³⁵

Trumbull offered this explanation:

It was because of the power already obviously gained over the popular mind by Christian teachers...in the schools of the Roman Empire that Julian the Apostate...determined to take the control of education into the hands of the state....The Emperor realized that the continuous life of Christianity pivoted on the school idea--on the interlocutory teaching of the young--and that, if he could put an end to this line of Christian work, ³⁶ he could hope to check the permanent progress of Christianity.

Middle Ages

By the fourth century there were two counter forces at work which proved down through the centuries to be the distinguishing contrast between evangelical Christian education and other Christian forms: (1) strict biblical emphasis and the resulting stress laid upon transmitting Christian teachings, and (2) accomodation to the surrounding cultures resulting in political gains but loss of urgency in the Gospel message and resulting evangelistic zeal. The triumph, for the time, of the latter is noted by Trumbull.

As it (the Christian church) grew in worldly prominence and lost in spiritual life, changes came in the methods of its training work. Its ritual services were expanded and its teaching exercises were diminished. Teaching gained in proportion as ritualism lost...and conversely, teaching lost as ritualism gained. Or, as Proudfit represents it, when the ecclesiastical spirit overcame the evangelical, and the church grew...worldly and material in all her instrumentalities...making more of a splendid ritual than of a pure faith, and magnifying church orthodoxy above vital piety...catechetical instruction, of course, declined.³⁷

Despite the diminished evangelical character of most of Christianity during the ensuing years to the Reformation, where that character was manifest there remained a corresponding emphasis on

"catechetical" instruction in the Scriptures. Andrew Miller, nineteenth century author of a still widely printed and circulated church history, saw the early Paulicans (mid sixth century) manifesting an evangelical character and with a missionary zeal resulting in converts across "Asia Minor, Pontus, the borders of Armenia, and to the westward of the Euphrates."³⁸ He further noted their movement into Bulgaria where they acted as a "religious mission" and which resulted in their doctrines being diffused throughout Europe.³⁹ A Greek monk in Bulgaria named Cyril, assumed to be a product of Paulican influence, is said to have "invented an alphabet, taught the ...people the use of letters, translated the liturgy and certain books of the Bible into the dialect of the Moravians."⁴⁰ Trumbull cited the Waldenses, Albigenses, the Wiclifites, the Hussites, and the Brethren of the Common Life as the groups peculiar in adhering to a "Bible-School idea...as a means of religious instruction and training."⁴¹ It is interesting to note that these groups, with some question about the Albigenses, are those which most represented the evangelical character prior to the Reformation.

Frederick Eby, educational historian from the University of Texas, expressed an opinion that the "educational activities of the many evangelical sects scattered throughout central Europe have uniformly been ignored by educational historians" and recognized that there was widespread literacy among these groups.⁴² He further noted, "The point of greatest significance in all the efforts of the evangelical Catholics, like the Brethren of the Common Life, and of the heretical sects, lies in their interest in diffusing a knowledge of

reading so that every individual might know the Scriptures for himself."⁴³ The perception of one contemporary to the success of the Waldenses to achieve this goal is seen in the following quote from Reinerius, an emissary from Rome to the Waldenses.

He who has been a disciple in their fold for seven days looks out some one whom he may teach in his turn; so there is a continual increase of them. If any would excuse himself from learning, they say to him, "Only learn one word every day, and at the end of the year you will have three hundred words; and so you will make progress...." I have heard one of these poor peasants repeat the Book of Job by heart, without missing a single word; and there are others who have the whole of the New Testament by heart, and much of the Old; nor...will they listen to anything else, saying that all sermons which are not proved by Scripture are unworthy of belief.⁴⁴

Reformation

Two of the great doctrines of the Reformation were the need for personal salvation and the sufficiency of the Scriptures. These two doctrines shaped apostolic education and more than any other factors have influenced evangelical educational concern to the present. In fact, these points delineate historic evangelicalism.

Philip Curoe, late educational historian from Hunter College, noted that the Protestant principle of individual judgment as sufficient to "ferret out the truth as contained in Holy Writ" implied that the "Holy Writ be put in the language of the people."⁴⁵ Samuel Chester Parker, the former dean of the College of Education at the University of Chicago, has noted, "The early Protestant theory was that an individual's Christian religious life, convictions, and salvation were to be worked out through a direct study of the Scriptures,

acceptance of the obvious teachings of Christ as presented there, and direct appeal to God through prayer for help in leading a Christian life."⁴⁶

Luther, himself, argued at great length for the study of the Bible as the primary necessity for a religious life. He said:

Above all things, let the Scriptures be the chief and most frequently used reading book, both in primary and high schools. Is it not proper and right that every human being, by the time he had reached his tenth year, should be familiar with the Holy Gospels, in which the very core and marrow of his life is bound?⁴⁷

Luther was not alone among the reformers in recognizing the importance of universal vernacular education to evangelical Christianity. John Knox in Scotland, Puritan educational reformers in England, Dutch Reformed leaders in the Netherlands, and Calvin and his followers in the Netherlands, Scotland, England, and America all proposed, and in some respects were able to achieve, a measure of universal education during the Reformation period.⁴⁸

Although an understanding of the Scriptures was the primary educational goal of evangelical reformers, both Luther and Calvin maintained that "the liberal arts and good training are aids to a full knowledge of the Word."⁴⁹ Luther is quoted by Roland Bainton, the great Reformation historian, as saying, "The Scripture cannot be understood without the languages, and the languages can be learned only in school."⁵⁰ Consequently, in both Lutheran and Calvinist lands the "3 R's" were stressed along with music. In addition, the vernacular schools in Lutheran lands provided some history and physical education.⁵¹ Luther was a firm believer in vocational education

but felt that the home and not the school was the agent responsible for it.⁵² He nonetheless advocated an accomodation in the school day to provide time outside the school to learn a trade.⁵³ Luther's lieutenant, Melanchthon, who had charge of reorganizing secondary education in Germany, wrote numerous textbooks in all the seven liberal arts.⁵⁴ Clyde Manschreck, a student of Roland Bainton, in his biography of Melanchthon mentioned that "Melanchthon feared the obscurantism that would abolish education or chain the intellect." He, like Luther, while recognizing that God reveals His message to the lowly rather than the proud, had no intention of undercutting education, but rather the pride of those who relied on sophisticated "speculation to grasp God."⁵⁵

Johann Sturm developed a prescribed secondary school curriculum in which "were found a selection of the ancient secular classics, ancient religious writers, the Medieval liberal arts, and the humanist and reform writers, so patterned as to conform to the Reformation conception of a liberal education."⁵⁶ Cubbarley, speaking of Calvinist schools, noted, "The education they provided was not only religious but civil; not only intellectual but moral, social, and economic."⁵⁷ The great significance of this point is the fact that evangelical belief demands that all true knowledge comes from the same source--God. There can not be a religious and secular dimension.

Transplantation Era--Evangelical Dominance

Between 1628 and 1640 about twenty thousand English Puritans migrated from England to New England. Settling in towns, they established conditions of living similar in many ways to those in England.⁵⁸ Perhaps less noted is that "practically all the early settlers in America came from among the peoples and from the lands which had embraced some form of the Protestant faith."⁵⁹ The French Huguenots settled along the coast of the Carolinas; the Calvinistic Dutch and Walloons settled in and around New Amsterdam; Scotch and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in New Jersey and along the Allegheny Mountains into the South; English Baptists and Methodists located in eastern Pennsylvania; English Quakers in Philadelphia; Swedish Lutherans populated Delaware; German Lutherans, Moravians, Mennonites, Dunkers, and Reformed-church Germans settled in the mountain valleys of Pennsylvania; and the Calvinistic Puritans in New England.⁶⁰ Curoe has termed the period in America prior to the Revolution the "Transplantation Period."⁶¹ But it was more than just a transplanting of people; it was an "attempt to reproduce in the new world...the educational ideals and the schools with which the immigrants were familiar in the old world."⁶² Central to the American educational transplant was the role of the family. Historian Bernard Bailyn observed:

The forms of education assumed by the first generation of settlers in America were a direct inheritance from the medieval past....The most important agency in the transfer of culture was

not formal institutions of instruction or public instruments of communication, but the family and the character of family life in late sixteenth and early seventeenth century England is critical for understanding the history of education in colonial America.⁶³

This overview shows how parental instruction in the home has always been recognized by evangelicals and their predecessors the Jews, as a mandate. It was not different in the new world. Marvin Lazerson has written that prior to 1800 in America the "most important learning took place within families, at work, and in religious institutions."⁶⁴ Despite whatever attempts were made to carry out this mandate, parents had been seemingly consistent in their failure to live up to all it demanded. The synagogue school developed mostly because of parental failure to keep pace with outside antagonistic views. The early Christian parents needed catechumenal schools to assist them in not only teaching their religious beliefs, but in meeting the religious influence of paganism. During Reformation times Luther noted that "parents continually neglected their educational duty."⁶⁵ He therefore called upon the state not only to set up schools but to require parents to send their children. In the American colonies "it early became evident...that...voluntary efforts on the part of the people and the towns would not be sufficient to insure that general education which was required by Puritan religious theory."⁶⁶ The result was the Massachusetts laws of 1642 and 1647. The 1642 law requiring compulsory attendance began by stating, "This court, taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and masters in training up of their children...."⁶⁷

Bailyn has pointed out that forces were at work during the entire colonial period that "radically transformed" the role of the family as the primary and nearly exclusive force in transmitting culture.

Schools and formal schooling had acquired a new importance. They had assumed cultural burdens they had not borne before. Where there had been deeply ingrained habits, unquestioned tradition, automatic responses, security, and confidence, there was now awareness, doubt, formality, will, and decision. The whole range of education had become an instrument of deliberate social purpose.⁶⁸

A clear factor in the new role of formal schooling in the colonies was the inability of parents and churches to cope with the needs of the rising generations. "Within a decade of their founding all the colonies passed laws demanding obedience from children and specifying penalties for contempt and abuse."⁶⁹ With the transformation of the roles for family and schooling, the net effect, according to Bailyn was as follows:

And the fact that so much of the acquisition of culture has taken place away from the direct influence of family elders and so much of it gained either directly from the environment, from the child's contemporaries, or from formal pressures, has helped to create a situation where, as Margaret Mead puts it, "children of five have already incorporated into their everyday thinking ideas that most elders will never fully assimilate."⁷⁰

Although the New England colonies greatly differed from the Middle and Southern colonies in the extent to which they assumed responsibility for education outside the home, one must not lose sight of the fact that evangelical interest in these other colonies prompted them to call for religious training as well. In 1710 South Carolina passed a statute which provided that "a free school be erected for the

instruction of the youth of this province, in grammar and other arts and sciences and useful learning and also in the principles of the Christian religion."⁷¹ Christian religion meant evangelical Christianity. In the middle colonies, German Reformed and Lutheran bodies maintained schools which had the Bible as their chief text.⁷² Likewise, "the Bible or Pastorus' New Primer, a thoroughly scriptural handbook was used as a mainstay in instructing youthful readers among Quakers and Mennonites."⁷³ The form that education took differed, sectarian variations there were, but the fact remains that colonial education was essentially an evangelical enterprise assisting parents and the various churches in educating their young. Despite the differences, there was that common core of an acceptance of the Bible as God's inspired word, and man's need for a salvation experience as revealed in the Bible. The intensity of the effort made in each area (home, church, state) corresponded to the intensity of the belief held by the constituents. The framework that was being created to assist evangelical parents and to which even greater faith would be placed, would ultimately be divorced from evangelical ties--leaving evangelical parents unprepared to assist their children to meet the increased pressures of the changing society from the evangelical perspective.

Evangelical interest in and intensity of effort toward formal education was spurred on by the "Great Awakening"--that colony-wide movement of the eighteenth century.⁷⁴ While much has been made of the impact this movement had on higher education, Robert Michaelson has

pointed out that "it is clear...that most of the leaders of the movement...were keenly concerned for education at all levels."⁷⁵ Rather than being "an obscurantist movement, the awakeners wanted a kind of schooling which would produce men who were both learned and zealous."⁷⁶ Here again is the evangelical belief that religion and the "rest of life" are not to be viewed as distinct and separable. R. Freeman Butts has noted the theological underpinnings of this belief held by evangelicals in the colonies.

It was assumed that all knowledge emanates from God and is implanted in man for His purposes. This meant that the highest type of knowledge is revealed to man through the Scriptures. Learning is a matter of disciplining the mind in such a way that the reason⁷⁷ will be prepared to understand the highest reaches of truth.

Princeton University began as a product of the Great Awakening. Early in its history it was "concluded that what was a good education for prospective clergymen could also be a good 'means of raising up men that will be useful in other professions--ornaments of the State as well as the church.' "⁷⁸ This development was not totally unlike that of the equally evangelical Yale which had in its original charter (1701) that Yale be a college "wherein youth...may be fitted for public employment, both in church and civil state."⁷⁹ It is most significant that these early years of Princeton coincided with the prelude to the American Revolution and the ensuing patriotism that accompanied it. John Witherspoon, president of Princeton from 1767 until 1794, "eagerly combined piety and patriotism in his life and work."⁸⁰ Princeton's historian, T. J. Wertenbaker, assessed that patriotism became a "rival" to piety within ten years of Witherspoon's

ascendancy to the presidency.⁸¹

With Princeton, Yale, and other evangelical institutions leading the field in turning out teachers for the schools created from the Awakening, the increased emphasis given to patriotism was to prove to be the seed which would produce "bitter fruit" for evangelical interests in what was increasingly becoming public schools. While "few doubted that one of the school's primary goals should be the raising up of moral men,"⁸² and that it was "assumed that the principles of morality were both divinely inspired and evident in nature,"⁸³ forces were at work which were eventually to divorce morality from religion, at least orthodox evangelical religion, and move the goal of American public education from piety (or piety and patriotism) to simply patriotism. Under such a scheme, the term "morality" would be void of religious connotation, unless "religion" were defined in non-theistic terms.

Cubberley cited 1750 as the end of what was previously noted as the "transplantation era" and the beginning of a period with a new theoretical purpose of education.

After 1750...it was increasingly evident that European traditions and ways and types of schools no longer completely satisfied; and that the period of transplanting of European educational ideas and schools and types of instruction was coming to an end.⁸⁴

The Waning of Evangelical Dominance

Samuel Parker has suggested that the real catalyst for the change in education was the issuing in 1762 of Rousseau's Emile.

Similarly, the publication of the Emile soon brought to a focus in Switzerland and Germany strivings for educational reform, which in less than half a century...created a new type of educational institution--the secular national elementary schools of the nineteenth century.⁸⁵

Edwin H. Rian, vice president of Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, in a series of lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1948, cited the Revolutionary War as the beginning of the "era of transition in education," from church control to state control.⁸⁶

Central to the transition in educational aims was the movement of many in society away from evangelical orthodoxy towards more liberal religious views. Butts and Cremin, in A History of Education in American Culture, explained the role the Revolutionary War played in expediting this transition.

The first blush of success over the victories of the Revolutionary War was taken as a repudiation of British religious and intellectual thought as well as political and economic dominance over America. It was only natural then that French ideas of the Enlightenment should be hailed as appropriate to America, especially in view of the felt kinship between the American and French Revolutions. Thus, while the French Revolution went from victory to victory through Europe, the secular outlooks of deism and rationalism became more popular in America.⁸⁷

Deism as a religion held sway in intellectual circles for only twenty or thirty years, but it paved the way for "a more lasting and indigenous American secular philosophy."⁸⁸ Deism's importance in the diminishing of an evangelical character of America is related to the fact that such key individuals as Thomas Paine, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin were themselves deists. Despite the deistic influence among America's leaders, however, the mass of

Americans remained less touched by enlightenment views.⁸⁹ For this reason, schools for the time being continued to reflect their evangelical roots. But the die was cast. Scholars educated in deism and rationalism began to attempt a construction of a "world view that was based upon the findings of science instead of the supernatural guidance of man's affairs."⁹⁰ Louis Leonard Tucker, in a biography of Yale president Thomas Clap, published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia, has described the enlightenment thought.

It was as Carl Becker has written, an age when God was placed on trial; an age when miracle stood before the bar of reason. Riding on the wave of optimism that had risen with the revolutionary findings of seventeenth century science... the rationalists began to propagate a set of ideas antithetical to the standard Christian body of belief. Seeking to emancipate man from the shackling grip of medieval superstition and theological dogma, they posited that it was within the power of man to erect the "heavenly city" on earth.⁹¹

It was the application of the interpretations of the rationalists, especially Newtonian Science, that led deists to break with traditional theism. The core of their cleavage was the very heart of evangelical Christianity. "...the Deists demystified Christianity, discarding such supernatural elements as revelation, the divinity of Christ, biblical miracles, and the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures."⁹² The deist "accepted only what scientific investigation, mathematical description, and human reason could accept and describe."⁹³

In the early 1800's many evangelicals, though seemingly unaffected by deism and rationalism, like Witherspoon, were caught up in the growing nationalism--a fact which would move them as far from

historic orthodoxy as deism and rationalism. Democratic values simply blended with the evangelicals' religious convictions. Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, "The Americans combine the notions of Christianity and of liberty so intimately in their minds, that it is impossible to make them conceive the one without the other."⁹⁴ As noted previously, by virtue of seeing all knowledge as coming from God, this development (blending religious views and political views) was not of itself inconsistent with historic evangelicalism. Sidney E. Mead has observed the fact, however, that "two different forms of the same religion" were developing.⁹⁵ He labels one "Protestant Evangelicalism" and the other "the religion of the democratic society and nation."⁹⁶ This latter form he saw as "rooted in the rationalism of the enlightenment" and being "articulated in terms of the destiny of America, under God, to be fulfilled by perfecting the democratic way of life for the example and betterment of all mankind."⁹⁷ It was the latter form that was to rise in dominance of American society, become "representative" of protestantism, and be instrumental in changing the orientation of schooling.

As the American population became more diverse, and consequently less evangelical, the pressure to implement the democratic ideal would come into conflict with the evangelical dominance of public schooling. For years schools would more represent the protestantism rooted in the enlightenment than evangelicalism. While the liberal protestantism of the former would still prove offensive to many non-protestants, it would ultimately alienate the evangelicals as well.

Jefferson--Education for Democracy

One individual whose thoughts played an important role in the development of America's move away from the evangelical base for public education was Thomas Jefferson. It was Jefferson who was the first to conceive of "public schools, free and tax supported, as the basis of an informed, democratic citizenry" apart from any religious connection.⁹⁸ Lawrence Cremin has stated, "I suppose there is a sense in which we can portray the whole course of American educational history as the gradual realization of the Jeffersonian ideal."⁹⁹ Himself a deist, Jefferson believed in an education placing reason ahead of revelation; innate knowledge and perfectability as opposed to innate depravity and dependance upon the grace of God. In a letter to one named Peter Carr, dated August 10, 1787, regarding "a liberal education," Jefferson claimed that it was lost time to study moral philosophy because everyone could distinguish between right and wrong. He then exhorted Carr "to fix reason firmly in her seat," to "question even the existence of God with boldness," and to read the Bible as one would read the histories by Tacitus or Livy.¹⁰⁰ In 1779, Jefferson had written concerning the elementary curriculum of the proposed Education Bill in Virginia. "Instead...of putting the Bible and the Testaments in the hands of children at an age when their judgments are not sufficiently mature for religious inquiries, their memories may be stored with the useful facts from Grecian, Roman, European, and American history."¹⁰¹

In 1822, Jefferson wrote to a Dr. Thomas Cooper a letter in which he explicitly expressed his personal distaste for Calvinistic evangelicals.

The blasphemy and absurdity of the five points of Calvin, and the impossibility of defending them render their advocate impatient of reasoning, irritable, and prone to denunciation.¹⁰²

Jefferson apparently had Calvinistic evangelicals in mind as he formulated much of his educational views. In the same letter to Dr. Cooper, Jefferson stated,

In the districts where Presbyterianism prevails undividedly ...their ambition and tyranny would tolerate no rival if they had power. Systematical in grasping at an ascendancy over all other sects, they aim, like the Jesuits, at engrossing the education of the country, are hostile to every institution which they do not direct, and jealous at seeing others begin to attend at all to that object.¹⁰³

His solution was two-fold. First was the "diffusion of instruction" and second was the "progress of Unitarianism" which Jefferson stated rather optimistically would "ere long be the religion of the majority."¹⁰⁴ Two years later he stated, "I trust there is not a young man living in the United States today who will not die a Unitarian."¹⁰⁵

Despite the appearance of Jefferson and other deist scholars to be "non-sectarian" in their educational approach, they were in actuality working to perfect a framework within which their own "religious" views could be disseminated. While it is true that under the "new" concept of democratic idealism the deist and other non-evangelical groups were discriminated against, the means proposed by Jefferson, and continued later by those equally acting out of

liberal religious convictions, to deal with man's freedom of religious thought were to prove not a solution of neutrality, but rather a triumph for non-theistic religions.

Many evangelicals of Jefferson's day could not foresee the logical outcome of the new emphasis upon democracy as a goal of education, essentially because they interpreted "democratization" in terms consistent with Christianization. C. Gregg Singer, chairman of the history department at Catawba College in North Carolina, has said,

Jefferson had a vision of an earthly city, which is now known as the American dream. It is true that this vision captured the loyalty of many in this country who had little or no real comprehension of the philosophy which lay behind it. It would come as a sad shock to many Americans and to many Christians if they were to recognize the true nature of the democratic philosophy which they so often, and so erroneously, identify with the Christian way of life.¹⁰⁶

Jefferson wrote in 1824 that the American government was "destined to be the primitive and precious model of what is to change the condition of man over the globe."¹⁰⁷ What evangelicals for the most part missed was that his dream was not that of their evangelical fathers but rather a reflection of the new "humanistic self-confidence."¹⁰⁸

Textbooks Reflect Change

The forces of religious liberalism, an increased reliance upon science, and a more diversified populace worked against evangelical dominance throughout the 1800's. Perhaps the most conspicuous area of the impact of liberalism can be seen in the developing content of school textbooks. David Tyack has pointed out "textbooks offer

useful clues to the actual content of instruction" due to the fact that in large degree the text is the curriculum.¹⁰⁹

This is true today but was especially true in the days before electricity and the advent of audio-visual teaching aids. John H. Westerhoff, associate professor of religion and education at Duke Divinity School, has assessed the schoolbook as "the school's most important resource for meeting its calling" during the post-Civil War period.¹¹⁰ Westerhoff, in claiming that history of the McGuffey Readers' various editions "is best understood as a mirror of changes occurring in the history of American public education,"¹¹¹ noted that while McGuffey "communicated his own unique frontier Presbyterian world view and value system through the compilation of his readers," these readers "did not seem to represent the emerging needs of the second half of the nineteenth century."¹¹² The consequence was that the later edition (1879) of the McGuffey Readers, without McGuffey as editor, lost the dominant theistic world view. Westerhoff noted,

While each of the 1836-37 editions contains numerous stories from the Bible, the Sermon on the Mount and the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer are the only pieces of Scripture to remain in the 1879 edition.

None of the first edition emphasis on salvation and piety remains. In their place is a morality of industry, self-denial, sobriety, thrift, propriety, persistence, modesty, punctuality, conformity, and submission to authority. The spirit of self-reliance...individualism, and competition fill the 1879 edition.¹¹³

As evangelicals became less of a force in American society, Tyack has stated, textbooks, though still reflecting a "common denominator" of evangelical Protestantism, were "denatured theologically."¹¹⁴ Butts and Cremin maintained that textbooks taught "Christian theism."¹¹⁵

However, what Tyack referred to as a "common denominator" and what Butts and Cremin referred to as "Christian theism," fall far short of meeting the requirement of the label "evangelical." True it is that much of what was found in major works, such as the later McGuffey's Readers, presented moral aphorisms not inconsistent with evangelical Christianity, but they were equally not inconsistent for the most part with the values of the more liberal Unitarian either. What readers do find perusing textbooks of the 1800's is the elimination of the core of evangelicalism--that which distinguishes it from other Christian-theistic groups. The basic colonial texts (The New England Primer), the Shorter Catechism, Lindley Murray's Readers, and the early McGuffey Readers had presented man in a fallen state, dependent upon the grace of God, and had given instruction as to how to come under that grace in the Holy Scriptures. This material was missing from later textbooks.

Edwin H. Rian observed that "the change which occurred in the schools in America during the nationalistic period is especially marked in the textbooks."¹¹⁶ He said:

Noah Webster's blue-backed Spelling Book, first issued in 1782 was widely used; in fact, it sold at the rate of one million copies a year. This contained many more sayings, a catechism, and portions of the Bible, but by 1829 the ethical and religious lessons had been omitted and only six pages contained verses from the Bible. The New American Spelling Book replaced the word "Adam" with the word "apple" to illustrate the letter "A" in the alphabet.

The Little Reader's Assistant included no religious teaching at all, and The Art of Reading, by David Stamford, had only 20 of 232 pages devoted to religion. The Franklin Primer, published in Franklin County of Massachusetts in 1826, was filled with diversified interests for the children, with only two compositions on religion.¹¹⁷

While evangelicals, for the most part, remained blind to the forces at work changing the ultimate orientation of public schooling, some did recognize and speak against them. In 1799, the Presbyterian General Assembly noted that "a vain and pernicious philosophy has in many instances spread its infection from Europe to America."¹¹⁸ This "infection" had so affected public schools of the 1840's that the Presbyterian Synod of New Jersey appointed a committee to suggest measures to be taken that would deal with the neglected Christian education of children and youth. The report was presented in 1845 by Dr. J. J. Janeway, a former vice president of Rutgers College. The report was significant in three ways. First, it identified an evangelical understanding that evangelicalism was no longer being served by public education. "A race of irreligious and infidel youth" was all that could "be expected to issue from public schools" when the schools lost their religious aim.¹¹⁹ Secondly, it indicated the fact that evangelicals had wrongly come to rely on schooling outside the home for the training of their youth. If the Christian education of children and youth was being neglected, the fault lay, in the minds of many evangelicals, largely with the schools and not the home. A third significance of this report lay in the remedy proposed.

Let all the churches, of every denomination in our country, engage in this great enterprise...and then citizens...may seek an alternative in the law. They may, with a fair prospect of success, apply for a rule of the state, that every tax-payer, that every man, when he pays his tax for education, may signify to what denomination of Christians it should be applied...if any should decline exercising their privilege, their money would be entirely at the disposal of the state.¹²⁰

Here may be the beginning--not of evangelical conviction that parents, rather than the state, should educate their children--but of awareness that in so doing, the state should not have the right to tax them for a public education of which they were not availing themselves.

Presbyterians were not alone at the time in concluding that American public education was no longer the vehicle to which they might safely entrust their children. Throughout the 1830's and 40's a similar development was taking place among conservative Lutheran groups. These represented a large number of recent immigrants "who had left Saxony largely because of the growing rationalism in the state church."¹²¹ Reacting partly to the increased secularism in the schools and partly out of a conviction that it was the duty of the home and church to educate, a move was made to establish Lutheran parochial schools.

It is significant to note that the movement toward Protestant parochial schools came at a time of increased movement away from the dominance of the private academy in secondary education in favor of the new free public high school. There is reason to believe that evangelicals found in the academy movement an education they could, if not truly be satisfied with, at least live with. The academy, while reflecting the desire to have taught "more practical subjects" remained "deeply religious."¹²² One early academy, Phillips Academy of Andover, Massachusetts, identified its purpose to be not only instruction in secular subjects, but "more especially to learn them the great end and real business of living...the promotion of true piety and virtue."¹²³ Though the first high schools in America were

established in 1821, it was not until after the Civil War that this institution was to replace the private academy and not until well after the turn of the century did the academy cease to be a strong competitor.

Horace Mann--State School System

The one man generally conceded to be the most influential in the triumph of the concept of state-controlled free public schools is Horace Mann. Joy Elmer Morgan, editor of the Journal of the National Education Association in 1936, and author of a short biography of Mann, commemorating the 100th anniversary of Mann's appointment to the secretaryship of the Massachusetts Board of Education, noted that Mann's contribution in this regard is "so fundamental that he is known as the Father of the American Public School."¹²⁴ Historian Henry Steele Commager, along the same lines, claimed, "If a single name had to be chosen to represent American Education, it would be of necessity, Horace Mann."¹²⁵ Frederick Eby stated: "The most epochal event in the development of nineteenth century American education was the appointment of Horace Mann to direct the public schools of Massachusetts in 1837."¹²⁶

While Horace Mann was himself a "faithful church goer," his religious sympathies were anywhere other than with the orthodox evangelical upbringing he had received. Looking back upon a religious system he felt "blighted" the "inward joy" of his youth,¹²⁷ Mann's

sympathies and theology lay with the Unitarians. The Calvinistic philosopher-theologian, Rousas J. Rushdoony, has noted that for Mann, "Calvinism was sectarianism, and anything else in varying degrees catholic and libertarian."¹²⁸ Much has been made of the relationship of Mann's educational views with Protestantism by those who have quoted him for example as saying, "Our system earnestly inculcates all Christian morals; it founds its morals on the basis of religion; it welcomes the religion of the Bible; and in receiving the Bible, it allows it to do what it is allowed to do in no other system--to speak for itself."¹²⁹ However, despite this point of mutual respect between evangelicals and Mann for the Bible, Mann greatly differed in what he personally hoped to see accomplished through widespread reading of the Bible. Evangelicals desired the "salvation of souls" resulting in subsequent good works; Mann and the Unitarians desired the salvation of society, the spirit of freedom that would create the essence of Jefferson's dream of a democratic utopia. Lawrence Cremin has observed that the "Question which was then central to the common school and has remained so ever since" was what can be the moral foundations of a common educational program in a religiously diverse society?¹³⁰ Mann's answer included teaching the "core of a body of religious doctrine in which all could agree."¹³¹ Cremin said,

For Mann, these were the great principles of "natural religion"--those truths which had been given in the Bible and demonstrated in the course of history. The fact that this new corpus of knowledge closely resembled his own optimistic, humanistic Unitarianism did not seem to trouble him...the overwhelmingly Protestant people of Massachusetts seemed willing to go along with him, once he had fought and defeated the more vigorous sectarians among them.¹³²

Cubberley assessed Mann's significance as "No one did more than he to establish in the minds of the American people the conception that education should be universal, non-sectarian, and free, and that its aim should be social efficiency, civic virtue, and character rather than mere learning or the advancement of sectarian ends."¹³³

By his success in achieving what had amounted to a heterogeneous series of community school systems molded together into a state school system, Mann felt assured that there now existed a vehicle by which society could be changed and uptopia be brought in. The fact that the system represented the state demanded ultimately that democratic values would rule out the "sectarian interests" of evangelicals.

Evangelical Reaction to Mann

A major factor relating to evangelical educational reaction to the impact of the Enlightenment and its subsequent effect on public education, via Horace Mann and his associates, was the tremendous growth and emphasis laid on the Sunday school. With public schooling now aiming at the secular end of social efficiency, many evangelicals turned to the formation of Sunday schools to replace what their public schools were eliminating. Referring to the despair many evangelicals manifested over the inroads of liberalism and rationalism in the late eighteenth century, H. Clay Trumbull, perhaps the foremost nineteenth century authority on Sunday schools, turned his pen upon evangelicals themselves rather than against liberals and rationalists.

Even though it be shown that influences of evil are at work in the world, is that in itself sufficient to account for the failure of the church of Christ to maintain its purity and its power? Is the church, indeed, dependent for the savor of saltiness on the measure of good which it absorbs from the community about it? Or is its very mission to be at its best when the world is at its worst? Why then should it be concluded satisfactory to account for the low state of the Protestant churches of Europe and America in the eighteenth century, by an enumeration of their temptations and an identifying of their tempters, without giving chief prominence to their general neglect of the church school, or the Sunday school.¹³⁴

Trumbull said that the church school or Sunday school idea, something he had gone to great lengths to show as God's chosen agency for the instruction of His church and those who would be reached by it, was obscured during the later part of the seventeenth and first half of the eighteenth centuries.¹³⁵ Yet starting from the later half of the eighteenth century until his own day in 1888, "America has been practically saved to Christianity and the religion of the Bible by the revival of the Sunday school,"¹³⁶ Trumbull stated.

At the time when the Sunday school was introduced as a practical power in the American community, unbelief and error were sweeping away the barriers of sound religious conviction in the older portions of our country; while an incoming flood of godless immigration was threatening to engulf hopelessly all vestiges of Christianity as a vitalizing force....The new agency practically stayed the process of error and unbelief....¹³⁷

The extent of the Sunday school movement can be seen by the fact that by 1887, eight million children were enrolled in Sunday schools taught by one million teachers.¹³⁸ The significance of the movement was noted in 1876 by Monsieur F. Buisson, president of a French Commission studying the principles and methods of primary instruction in the United States. Buisson wrote, "The Sunday school is not an accessory agency in the normal economy of American

education; it does not add a superfluity; it is an absolute necessity for the complete instruction of the child."¹³⁹

While Trumbull saw the survival of evangelicalism to lie in the revitalization of Sunday schools, other evangelicals saw it to be a reawakening of parental responsibility. F. W. Grant, evangelical author of the Numerical Bible and editor of Help and Food magazine, wrote in 1896 about the anti-Christian impact on the prevailing public and higher education, which he summed up as the "barter" of "everything that makes up our Christian heritage for a mess of German pottage."¹⁴⁰ Grant touched upon the failure of parents by stating, "Too long have Christians held their peace, and allowed their children to be taught whatever seemed proper to those in authority."¹⁴¹ He did not put forth reformation of the schools or the establishing of new ones as the remedy for the dilemma, though he admitted that "if Christians were to awake to their responsibilities, they might check the growth of infidelity in those schools...or they might establish others on Christian principles."¹⁴² Neither of these two alternatives coincided with what he calls the "sad fact that education is in the hands of the world."¹⁴³ Therefore, first, parents must alert their children to the dangers inherent in the "world" of the school. Secondly, the children should be surrounded at home by an atmosphere of Christianity "and taught of Christ, and early brought to the gracious Savior."¹⁴⁴ Third, the children are to "be sympathized with; their interests and lessons talked over, so that they feel happy in the joy and fellowship of home."¹⁴⁵ All of this would contribute to the

establishment of the youth's character "and be so confirmed in the faith and knowledge of the Word of God, that the most brilliant theories would seem to him as old wives' fables compared with the precious verities upon which he has grown strong."¹⁴⁶

Robert Wells Veach, associate director of the department of social service of the New Era Movement, about this time, called for reformation in both the home and the Sunday school. Concerning the home he stated,

Somehow the church must so reorganize its religious education as to give a larger place to the home. The church must stand more definitely for the sacredness of the home and of the right of parents to enough leisure time to make the home a center of Christian culture and companionship. Parents must be trained in the proper instruction of children, in the meaning of sanitation, food values, of the sex life, of family worship, private prayer and the ideals of right social living....The home cannot delegate its educational function to the church.¹⁴⁷

Veach went much further in calling for a reform of Sunday schools. Here he called for a "well articulated system" that would synchronize "week day sessions and night sessions as well as Sunday sessions" and would "include what we know as week-day religious schools and daily vacation Bible schools."¹⁴⁸

Two near contemporaries of Trumbull, Grant, and Veach--Walter Scott Athearn and George Albert Coe--while not necessarily sharing Trumbull's great estimation of the then current impact Sunday schools were having in contrast with the impact of public schools, were in basic agreement with Buisson's assessment that American public education needed something more "to educate the whole child." Like Veach, to them it was apparent that the "something more" was more than

the Sunday school of their day. Athearn, professor of religious education at Boston University in 1917 said,

We do not have in this country a system of public education, we have only a public school system. But this system of schools does not work with the whole child. It is but one-half of an educational arch; we must complete the arch by building a system of church schools closely coordinated with the public schools.¹⁴⁹

Athearn differed from Veach in that he perceived a need to coordinate the religious education with that of the public schools. George Albert Coe, professor of moral and intellectual philosophy at Northwestern University in 1904, believed that the modern public school was not an opponent to evangelical Christianity in principle, but rather in its practical working. He said,

There may be adequate reason why state schools should abstain from positive religious instruction, but in that case state schools cannot be regarded as more than a part of a proper educational system. Religious education there must be, either with-in or without the state schools....¹⁵⁰

Due in large measure to the rural nature of much of America, the strength of the Sunday school movement and private academies, and the results of the preaching of evangelists like D. L. Moody, the proponents of the rationalistic liberal theology in education made only slow headway throughout the late 1800's. Looking at the practical changes in American education from an evangelical posture in 1980, one is struck by the fact that alongside the significance of the theoretical change on the part of the educational hierarchy, the actual change in practice seems less than drastic. The theoretical framework for change was laid, and given the right developments the practice would catch up with the theory.

Decline of Evangelicalism in Public Schools

For approximately 80 years after Horace Mann and the official birth of schooling by the state, evangelicals held on without (as measured by the official stated aims of the hierarchy) real authority (that which was recognized by the state and the theorists). With America moving into the twentieth century, three significant forces worked together to effectively remove the evangelical from a practical domination in American public schooling. The first of these forces was a weakening in society of evangelical orthodoxy. This weakening came both from without and within. Despite the tremendous effects of such revivalists as D. L. Moody, Billy Sunday, and "Gypsy" Smith, the social applications of biological Darwinism and "higher criticism" were both working to undermine the authority of the Scriptures. Biological Darwinism provided many of those choosing not to submit to the sovereign claims of the evangelical's God with a scientific reason not to believe in the need for a God. The "higher critics" abounded out of the new fields of sociology and anthropology, as well as archaeology, history, and philology, with repeated claims that the text of the Bible contained error or simply should be viewed as symbolical instead of literal in interpretation.

Speaking of society in general, David Beggs and R. Bruce McQuigg of Indiana University have said that in the later nineteenth century "material gain became more important in people's thinking;

more emphasis was placed on prosperity and happiness in this world and less on the life to come."¹⁵¹

Many evangelicals appeared to be caught up with this progressive materialism and like others attempted to use certain Scriptures to justify amassing as much wealth as possible. In so doing they not only left the evangelical track theologically but they became less occupied with preserving the orthodoxy of their children's education. In addition they ceased to manifest to many common people that evangelicalism was something worthy of being sought. A. C. Dixon, the famous evangelist at the turn of the century, spoke to this very issue in a book entitled Lights and Shadows of American Life:

Money-making with a low motive will also cast a shadow. What object have you in view? Has your ability to make money been prostituted simply to money-making? Is it now a great greasy game with you? Has it become play, or war? Are you simply ambitious to excel, and to have it said that you own more money than others? If so, John Ruskin draws your picture....That money-making is an all absorbing game and we knock each other down more oftener [sic] in playing at that than at football, or any rough sport....¹⁵²

Dixon went on to quote several Scriptures that should guide an evangelical. The first was "The love of money is the root of all evil, which while some covet after, they have erred from the faith, and pierce themselves through with many sorrows." He then noted that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Finally, he asserted that the Scripture conversely enjoined upon the believer to "Lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven."¹⁵³

W. S. Fleming's book, God in Our Public Schools, widely distributed by the National Reform Association and for which Dean Luther Weigle of Yale Divinity School wrote the forward, cited some interesting statistics from Wilber F. Crafts' Practical Christian Sociology. From 1850-1870 the population gained 66% while evangelicals gained 87%; and while the population gained 30% from 1870-1880, evangelicals gained 50%.¹⁵³ Fleming continued by noting that beginning with 1900 the wide gap between church gains and population began to diminish; church growth was only 7% higher than population growth from 1910-1919, 1% higher from 1920-1929, and .3 of 1% lower in 1930-1939.¹⁵⁵ He cited an Inter-Church Movement survey in 1920 which revealed that 7 out of every 10 youth in the nation were "unchurched."¹⁵⁶ Fleming put the blame on public schools.¹⁵⁷ But this writer sees his notation concerning "appalling religious indifference" and "spiritual illiteracy"¹⁵⁸ to be as much, if not more, an indictment against the evangelical community which apparently lost its vision of church and home responsibilities--leaving the education of its children to others.

The second force effecting removal of evangelical domination from public schooling was the reinforcement and solidification in the minds of most Americans that schools had a secular rather than religious aim. Two factors contributed to this idea: the schools' dominant role of "Americanizing" vast numbers of European immigrants who had no basis in democracy and the reinforcement of the desirability of democracy as a goal for education, which was brought about by World War I. Americans were rallied to war to "make the world safe for

democracy." Was it not reasonable to use the preventative means of education to keep America safe for democracy?

A third force was the new pattern of urbanization brought about by the rapid technological development of industrialism, a catalyst working to disarm that effective enemy of change--rural religious conservatism.

Tyack has observed that "industrialism, demographic shifts, and urbanism were altering country life."¹⁵⁹ One of the greatest changes was the pressure put on rural folk to conform to the "new" orientations to education. A. D. Mueller, professor of psychology and education at the Massachusetts State Normal School, in his book, Progressive Trends in Rural Education, expressed a prevalent view of his day regarding rural education and the reasons for needed change.

Besides...objections growing more or less directly out of the lack of funds, there are many of a more human nature that might be mentioned, such as poor management and supervision (it is almost impossible to find school boards in the majority of districts which are at all qualified to direct education properly); poor attendance regulations; little community spirit and pride; petty jealousies; penuriousness; old traditions; etc.¹⁶⁰

Tyack claimed that those who mounted this "attack" on rural education believed that "what was basically wrong with rural education was that rural folk wanted to run their schools and didn't know what was good for them in the complex new society."¹⁶¹ Control of education had to be taken from these people and put in the hands of professionals, who, in turn, would work to enlighten communities by starting with the youth. To a large degree the "old traditions" that needed change were connected with evangelicalism.

With evangelical dominance conclusively removed by 1920, the task remained to remove all ingrained remnants of evangelicalism, which to most people had become cultural rather than religious-- Christmas programs, recitation of the Lord's prayer, and Bible reading.

The dean of Boston College's Law School, Robert F. Drinan, stated prior to subsequent Supreme Court rulings that a removing of these "remnants" would not likely cause a substantial change in "the basic nature or role of the public school in our society."¹⁶² Drinan viewed such things as Bible reading and prayer recitation as "tokens of religion" which were "consciously or otherwise employed by religious groups, educators, and parents in order to evoke the troubling and stark predicament of an educational system divorced from religion."¹⁶³ Rather than voicing great fear over removal, Drinan expressed an opinion that "elimination of these symbols of religion might serve to dramatize the fact that the substance of religion has been absent from public education for many decades."¹⁶⁴ This would produce a forced recognition of the public schools as "truly the completely secular school" and lead to dealing with the real issues that must be faced in maintaining a proper accomodation with religion on a neutral basis.

The removal of these last vestiges was generally accomplished through litigation. The very fact that they were litigated, with subsequent protests, testified to the important symbolic meaning placed upon these practices by people on both sides of the issues. As long as the practices were allowed, evangelicals, the group usually

fighting to retain the remnants, seemed to feel that "things weren't really that bad." The continuation of once meaningful practices, even though removed from their roots, convinced many evangelicals that America was still a "Christian nation" and that schools still served, though not as well as they once did, to help direct youth into the right path, which of course was Christianity or "the way of the Bible." Most evangelicals were apparently unaware that very few students, if any, were being influenced by these remnants. However, to the opponents of these practices, the remnants symbolized a lingering continuation of evangelical influence in public education. Despite advancements made by non-evangelicals in gaining admittance into control of public schooling, victory was not conceived as being complete.

Thorndike and Dewey--Scientific Influences

The impact E. L. Thorndike and John Dewey made in developing educational theory and influencing educational practices was even more important to evangelicals than the litigation.

Edward Lee Thorndike, professor of educational psychology at Teacher's College, Columbia University, was the "most eminent" of a "new school of objective psychologists, who applied their findings to educational practice."¹⁶⁵ Butts and Cremin have described the intellectual thought from which this school developed.

Despite the hold of religious views upon the American mind and American education, the new scientific outlooks began to produce a radically different conception of man's nature, his

mind, his learning process, and therefore his education. In these views man came to be viewed as a reflection of the natural world describable by the methods of science...the impact of evolution led to the view that man was an essential part of nature....Since man is continuous with the rest of nature, the development of his mental behavior is subject to the same kind of history and scientific analysis as is his physical body and behavior. Supernatural explanations for the origin of man and his development are not necessary; natural explanations will suffice.¹⁶⁶

Having ruled out "supernatural explanation" and with implicit faith in the findings of scientific research, Thorndike presented his famous "laws," including stimulus-response. To Thorndike, education meant "to change what is into what ought to be."¹⁶⁷ Despite his emphasis on science and the "scientific method," Thorndike did recognize that one's "conception of ultimate values" would greatly influence that decision of "what ought people to be."¹⁶⁸ To know what is and whether what is, is what ought to be, implied the necessity of having a means to test and measure. By his emphasis on tests and measurements, Thorndike contributed greatly to the fulfillment of a vacuum created by the removal of a biblical standard of absolutes. Rushdoony has shown how Thorndike connects with the Enlightenment and represents a continuation of the stream that washed away the impact of evangelicalism in the American public educational picture.

His stimulus-response (S-R) psychology presupposed a doctrine of man common to Enlightenment thought...Locke's conception of the mind as a blank tablet made the mind essentially passive and hence subject to conditioning and radical direction by the educator. Instead of a mind with great past, tradition, family, and religion, coming to school to be educated, led out further into its own heritage, education in the tradition of Locke and the Enlightenment is essentially a passive activity and is conditioning rather than education. An important aspect of Thorndike's objection to transfer of training was his conception of the mind as essentially passive and hence incapable of such activity.¹⁶⁹

Thorndike apparently saw public schools' limited time with children, high pupil-teacher ratios, and limited budgets, as the factors limiting schools in assuming a role greater than the home in the formation of the attitudes and habits of children--"not only to inform a child's mind, but also to remake his conduct."¹⁷⁰ In the following quote from his book, Education, Thorndike explicitly stated the ultimate impact that he could envision schools eventually having.

In so far as the school is given the facilities--in so far as it becomes social settlement, employment bureau, mother's helper, institutional church and the like--in so far it should increasingly aim to control the pupil's future in matters of conduct directly as well as by control of his intellect, tastes and general work in life.¹⁷¹

According to Butts and Cremin, "John Dewey responded creatively to the currents of thought that were sweeping in and about the American educational scene."¹⁷² Having accepted "the evolutionary and biological conception of man as an organism that lives in a process of interaction with his environment," he did differ from the behavioral psychology of Thorndike by rejecting the "assumptions that the primary impulses to behavior come from physiological and neurological sources."¹⁷³ Drawing from the empirical and scientific assumptions of William James and Charles Pierce, he fitted them into the social conceptions of mind being expressed by George H. Mead.

Dewey's significance in this overview of evangelical involvement in education has been stated by Robert Michaelson. "With Dewey and his followers, then, the significant transition of the primary locus of education in America from church and family to public school was fully accomplished."¹⁷⁴ Michaelson has noted that "subtle shift

in emphasis" with Dewey as compared with most nineteenth century Americans. "He narrowed the educational focus until it was centered almost entirely on the common, public school."¹⁷⁵ To Dewey education was the "supreme human interest in which, moreover, other problems, cosmological, moral, logical, come to a head."¹⁷⁶ Dewey was adamant in his rejection of evangelical Christianity because it was, to him, irreconcilable with democracy. In his book, A Common Faith, Dewey stated, "I cannot understand how any realization of the democratic ideal as a vital moral and spiritual ideal in human affairs is possible without surrender of the conception of the basic division to which supernatural Christianity is committed."¹⁷⁷ By "division" Dewey was referring to a distinction between the "saved" and the "lost." The function of the schools under Dewey's system was to promote social unity. The problems for education centered on the "lack of harmony and consistency among existing social relations, habits, expectations, requirements, and other more or less conscious influences."¹⁷⁸ The common school to Dewey fulfilled the demand for a "selected environment having for its primary purpose the "harmonizing and intellectualizing of the extremes of habit" formed under various and unremitting circumstances."¹⁷⁹ The implications of this for evangelicals were tremendous. Not only was the basis for education predicated on presuppositions striking at the very root of theistic belief, but the school would be actively engaged in the process of remaking youth. The product envisioned was not the product desired by evangelicals.

It should be noted that Dewey's ideas were not totally unlike those of the early evangelicals. They too had a concept of the "right social order." Like Dewey, they considered the habits and views of those with whom they differed as contributing to disharmony. They also saw the schools to be most effective instrument by which they might provide the environment to accomplish their goals. The differences between Dewey and evangelicals lay chiefly in the question of "Who determines the desired goal?" This difference led further to the question of "Who controls the schools?" and "Who has what rights over the child?" These questions still remain today.

Rise of Pluralism--New Hope or Old Rhetoric

A line of educators, who believe in and are committed to the task of remaking society by remaking children, continues even now. One such widely acclaimed educator today, more in line perhaps with Thorndike than Dewey, is B. F. Skinner. Skinner has stated that he "wants university students to know how to control better if they are to be in teaching or politics."¹⁸⁰ Educators committed to using schools to remake society have not always agreed on the desired goal. Whoever they are, and whatever their goal, evangelicals have had to be cautious to compare that goal with the goal evangelicals believe has been revealed by God in the Bible. From the time of Thorndike and Dewey, many evangelicals have concluded that their only hope lies in a divorcement from public schooling and a remarriage to private

education based upon biblical presuppositions and leading towards the goal they accept as from God. In our day, this is perhaps one of the most significant and widespread developments in American education. The Christian school movement will be dealt with in a future chapter.

A definite new direction has been more recently manifested under the descriptive title of "pluralism." Recognizing that despite attempts through the years to form a monolithic view of man, Americans have for the most part chosen to retain certain ethnic and religious identities. Attempts to force change in these areas have nearly always had the long range effect of loss of public school support. Many persons currently believe that public education should take this pluralistic nature of America and use it to foster qualities such as empathy, understanding, and tolerance for those who differ. Recognition of the pluralistic nature of society, coupled with the current emphasis on inquiry approaches to problem solving and value clarification, is being viewed by many to be the most viable way to maintain objectivity and neutrality in the public schools. Under a pluralistic system, rather than to seek to present "the one best way" or to exclude views not considered to be in the mainstream, all views would be given equal exposure. The success or failure of the view to gain acceptance would rest upon the ability of the viewpoint itself to convince the listeners.

A considerable number of evangelicals who have chosen to remain in public education are seriously studying the implications of pluralism as it relates to their involvement in education. Currently,

the chief question appears to be whether or not the practice will match the rhetoric? Is pluralism a genuine opportunity to permit a free exchange of ideas? Or will pluralism prove to be the means whereby evangelical youth "clarify" what has been taught at home to be more in conformity to the relativistic value system that we have seen to be consistently working against the evangelical belief?

FOOTNOTES

¹One cannot expect to trace adequately the full involvement of evangelicals in education in one chapter. Therefore, the author in his attempt to trace the main developments has tried to deal with salient individuals and time periods. It should be noted that while certain people and years are identified with specific stages of developments, the developments themselves were generally taking place over longer time spans and involved other people.

²Ephesians 2:11, Holy Bible (KJV).

³Ephesians 2:13, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁴Ephesians 2:19, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁵I Corinthians 10:11, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁶II Timothy 3:14-15, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁷Deuteronomy 6:1, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁸Deuteronomy 6:7, Holy Bible (KJV).

⁹H. Clay Trumbull, Yale Lectures on the Sunday School (Philadelphia: John D. Wattles, Publisher, 1893), p. 7.

¹⁰Alfred Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Associated Publisher and Authors, 1968 reprint), p. 177.

¹¹Ibid., p. 178.

¹²Trumbull, op. cit., p. 8.

¹³Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶Peter P. Person, An Introduction to Christian Education (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1972), p. 23.

- ¹⁷Edersheim, op. cit., p. 179.
- ¹⁸Samuel Sandmel, Judaism and Christian Beginnings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), p. 145.
- ¹⁹Trumbull, op. cit., p. 38.
- ²⁰Luke 24:27, Holy Bible (KJV).
- ²¹Henry Melvill Gwatkin, Early Church History (To A.D. 313), Vol. 2 (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909), p. 201.
- ²²Matthew 28:19-20, Holy Bible (KJV).
- ²³II Timothy 2:2, Holy Bible (KJV).
- ²⁴II Timothy 3:15-16, Holy Bible (KJV).
- ²⁵Titus 2:4-5, Holy Bible (KJV).
- ²⁶J. F. Dobson, Ancient Education and Its Meaning to Us (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932), p. 162.
- ²⁷M. Boissier, La Fin du Paganism, Vol. 1, p. 200, cited by Ellwood P. Cubberley, The History of Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920), p. 93.
- ²⁸Roland Allen, Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1977), p. 35.
- ²⁹Ibid.
- ³⁰Cubberley, op. cit., p. 94.
- ³¹George Park Fisher, History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887), p. 71.
- ³²Cubberley, The History of Education, op. cit., p. 94.
- ³³Ibid.
- ³⁴Trumbull, op. cit., p. 48.
- ³⁵Fisher, op. cit., p. 91.
- ³⁶Trumbull, op. cit., p. 48.
- ³⁷Ibid., p. 64.
- ³⁸Andrew Miller, Short Papers on Church History, Vol. 1 (A.D. 32 to A.D. 1106) (London: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.), p. 299.

- ³⁹Ibid., p. 302.
- ⁴⁰Ibid., p. 320.
- ⁴¹Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 64-65.
- ⁴²Frederick Eby, The Development of Modern Education (Engelwood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 28.
- ⁴³Ibid., p. 29.
- ⁴⁴Trumbull, op. cit., p. 66.
- ⁴⁵Phillip R. V. Curoe, History of Education (New York: Globe Book Company, 1921), p. 88.
- ⁴⁶Samuel Chester Parker, A Textbook in the History of Modern Elementary Education (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1912), p. 35.
- ⁴⁷Ibid., p. 44.
- ⁴⁸R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Western Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955), p. 206.
- ⁴⁹Cubberley, A Brief History of Education (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1922), p. 175.
- ⁵⁰Roland H. Bainton, Here I Stand (A Life of Martin Luther) (New York: New American Library, 1961), p. 262.
- ⁵¹Butts, op. cit., p. 225.
- ⁵²Ibid., p. 227.
- ⁵³Curoe, op. cit., p. 89.
- ⁵⁴Butts, op. cit., p. 229.
- ⁵⁵Clyde Leonard Manschreck, Melanchthon, The Quiet Reformer (Nashville: Abington Press, 1958), p. 96.
- ⁵⁶Butts, op. cit., p. 229.
- ⁵⁷Cubberley, A Brief History of Education, op. cit., p. 176.
- ⁵⁸Parker, op. cit., p. 55.
- ⁵⁹Cubberley, A Brief History of Education, op. cit., p. 189.
- ⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 189-190.

- 61 Curoe, op. cit., p. 123.
- 62 Ibid., p. 123.
- 63 Bernard Baylin, Education in the Forming of American Society (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 15.
- 64 Marvin Lazerson, "Consensus and Conflict in American Education: Historical Perspectives," Parents, Teachers, and Children (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1977), p. 16.
- 65 Cubberley, The History Of Education, op. cit., p. 312.
- 66 Ibid., p. 364.
- 67 W. Richard Stephens and William Van Til, Education in American Life (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972), p. 16.
- 68 Baylin, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
- 69 Ibid., p. 23.
- 70 Ibid., p. 48.
- 71 Donald E. Boles, The Bible, Religion, and The Public Schools, rev. ed., (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 20.
- 72 Ibid., p. 19.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Robert Michaelson, Piety in the Public School (New York: The MacMillen Co., 1970), p. 48.
- 75 Ibid., p. 49.
- 76 Ibid.
- 77 Butts, op. cit., p. 256.
- 78 Michaelson, p. 50.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Ibid.
- 82 Ibid.
- 83 Ibid., p. 52.

- ⁸⁴ Cubberley, The History of Education, op. cit., p. 520.
- ⁸⁵ Parker, op. cit., p. 182.
- ⁸⁶ Edwin H. Rian, Christianity and American Education (San Antonio, Texas: The Naylor Co., 1949), p. 23.
- ⁸⁷ R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, A History of Education in American Culture (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950), p. 166.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ⁸⁹ Henry Bamford Parkes, The American Experiences (New York: Vintage Books, 1959), p. 64.
- ⁹⁰ Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 176.
- ⁹¹ Louis Leonard Tucker, Puritan Protagonist: President Thomas Clap of Yale College (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962), p. 144.
- ⁹² Ibid., p. 145.
- ⁹³ Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 282.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 186.
- ⁹⁵ Sidney Mead, "American Protestantism Since the Civil War: From Denominationalism to Americanism," American History (Recent Interpretation), Book 2 (New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1970), p. 180.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ⁹⁸ James E. Wood Jr., "Religion and Public Education in Historical Perspective," Journal of Church and State, 14:3, 1972, p. 399.
- ⁹⁹ Lawrence A. Cremin, The Genius of American Education (New York: Vintage Books, 1965), p. 40.
- ¹⁰⁰ Wilson Whitman, Ed., Jefferson's Letters (Eau Claire, Wis.: E. M. Hale Co., n.d.), pp. 76-77.
- ¹⁰¹ Boles, op. cit., p. 28.

¹⁰² Gordon C. Lee, Crusade Against Ignorance: Thomas Jefferson on Education, Classics in Education #6 (New York: Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1962), p. 75.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 79.

¹⁰⁵ John Warwick Montgomery, The Shaping of America (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship Inc., 1967), p. 53.

¹⁰⁶ C. Gregg Singer, A Theological Interpretation of American History (Nutley, N. J. : The Craig Press, 1969), p. 38.

¹⁰⁷ Montgomery, op. cit., p. 67.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ David B. Tyack, ed., Turning Points in American Educational History (Lexington, Mass.: Zeros Corp., 1967), p. 178.

¹¹⁰ John H. Westerhoff III, McGuffey and His Readers (Nashville: Abington, 1978), p. 22.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 20.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 21.

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 105.

¹¹⁴ Tyack, op. cit., p. 179.

¹¹⁵ Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 326.

¹¹⁶ Rian, op. cit., p. 44.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 45.

¹¹⁸ Lewis Joseph Sherrill, Presbyterian Parochial Schools (New York: Arbo Press and the New York Times, 1969), p. 2.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

¹²⁰ Ibid., p. 15.

¹²¹ William Warren Swete, The Story of Religion in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930), p. 387.

¹²² Cubberley, The History of Education, op. cit., p. 464.

- 123 Ibid., p. 463.
- 124 Joy Elmer Morgan, Horace Mann (His Ideas and Ideals) (Washington, D.C.: National Home Library Foundation, 1936), p. 3.
- 125 Henry Steele Commager, Living Ideas in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), p. 566.
- 126 Eby, op. cit., p. 554.
- 127 Rousas J. Rushdoony, The Messianic Character of American Education (Nutley, N. J.: The Craig Press, 1976), p. 19.
- 128 Ibid.
- 129 Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 215.
- 130 Lawrence A. Cremin, ed., The Republic and the School: Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men (New York: Teachers' College Press, 1968), p. 12.
- 131 Ibid., p. 13.
- 132 Ibid.
- 133 Cubberley, The History of Education, op. cit., p. 690.
- 134 Trumbull, op. cit., pp. 103-104.
- 135 Ibid., p. 104.
- 136 Ibid., p. 122.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 Ibid., p. 123.
- 139 Ibid., p. 132.
- 140 F. W. Grant, "Modern Education and Educational Institutions," Help and Food, Vol. 14 (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1896), p. 126.
- 141 Ibid., p. 121.
- 142 Ibid., p. 127.
- 143 Ibid.
- 144 Ibid., p. 128.
- 145 Ibid.

- 146 Ibid.
- 147 Robert Wells Veach, The Meaning of the War for Religious Education (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1920), p. 240.
- 148 Ibid., p. 241.
- 149 Walter Scott Athearn, Religious Education and American Democracy (Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1917), p. 14.
- 150 George Albert Coe, Education in Religion and Morals (New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1904), pp. 73-74.
- 151 David W. Beggs III and R. Bruce McQuigg, America's Schools and Churches: Partners in Conflict (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965), p. 42.
- 152 A. C. Dixon, Lights and Shadows of American Life (Boston: William H. Smith, 1903), p. 48.
- 153 Ibid., pp. 50-51.
- 154 W. S. Fleming, God in Our Public Schools (Pittsburg: The National Reform Association, 1942), p. 62.
- 155 Ibid., p. 63.
- 156 Ibid., p. 66.
- 157 Ibid., p. 68.
- 158 Ibid., p. 67.
- 159 David B. Tyack, The One Best System (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), p. 22.
- 160 A. D. Mueller, Progressive Trends in Rural Education (New York: The Century Co., 1926), pp. 8-9.
- 161 Tyack, op. cit., p. 21.
- 162 Robert F. Drinan, Religion, The Courts, and Public Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963), p. 70.
- 163 Ibid.
- 164 Ibid.
- 165 Butts and Cremin, p. 335.
- 166 Ibid., p. 333.

- 167 Rushdoony, op. cit., p. 186.
- 168 Edward Lee Thorndike, Educational Psychology, Vol. 1 (New York: The Teachers College, 1921), p. 30.
- 169 Rushdoony, op. cit., p. 190.
- 170 Edward Lee Thorndike, Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), p. 30.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 Butts and Cremin, op. cit., p. 343.
- 173 Ibid., p. 343-344.
- 174 Michaelson, op. cit., p. 62.
- 175 Ibid., p. 62.
- 176 John Dewey, quoted by Henry Steel Commager, op. cit., p. 586.
- 177 John Dewey, A Common Faith (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), p. 84.
- 178 Pickens E. Harris, Changing Conceptions of School Discipline (New York: Macmillan Co., 1928), p. 298.
- 179 Ibid.
- 180 Francis A. Schaeffer, Back to Freedom and Dignity (Downers-Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), p. 38.

Chapter 3

CURRENT PROBLEMS AND ISSUES FOR EVANGELICALS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Anyone who is acquainted with evangelical Christians today, or who reads evangelical periodicals, is aware of the great concern being expressed over public education. Often this concern reaches the secular media, as in the West Virginia textbook controversy, the rise of private Christian schools, opposition to sex education, and other similar matters. There can be no doubt that dissatisfaction with public education is one of the major social concerns of evangelicals.

Chapter One characterized "evangelicals." Then, Chapter Two traced the historical path of evangelicals in American education. Now attention is turned to the basic problems and issues in public education facing American evangelicals. The intent of this paper is not to exhaust the subject through facts that might be gleaned from the available literature, but rather, to point out from the literature areas where issues exist and thereby manifest the scope of the problem. The author freely admits that he writes from an evangelical position and defends this point on the basis that this chapter is purposefully designed to present an evangelical perspective to the problems.

As shown in Chapter One, evangelicals are not a united, organized entity. Many differences exist among them. Furthermore, some who either label themselves evangelicals or are so designated by others, have moved outside the perimeters of historic evangelicalism: a personal salvation experience based upon the work of Christ on the cross, and the acceptance of the Bible as God's inerrantly authoritative revelation to man. Those persons taking this different posture hold to the term "evangelical" but often do not share the concerns of most historic evangelicals. Others may exhibit concern, yet lack the intensity of conviction that mainliners exhibit. Still another subgroup, the separatist-fundamentalists, are often concerned about issues which can only be resolved by making the schools openly evangelical Christian. Since this work is primarily concerned with the mainstream evangelicals and not as much with either of the extreme wings, this chapter is for the most part limited to an examination of the issues and problems as perceived by one in the middle posture. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that the concerns being discussed will often overlap either or both ends of the movement. Therefore, it should not always be inferred that those at the extremities of the movement are not equally concerned, or unconcerned, about the issues under consideration.

Individual evangelicals, like almost every other grouping of Americans, are not always able to articulate either the source of certain complex problems, or formulate rational and workable solutions to those problems. It is hoped that these efforts of the writer will

aid not only those who work in public schools but also evangelical parents in identifying issues and real problems.

The Problem Stated

Briefly stated, the present state of affairs causing problems for evangelicals in public education is attributable to the fact that there has never been worked out on a large scale meaningful policy to regulate the matter of religion in the schools. This has in part been due to the ambiguity of the law as interpreted by the courts. The lack of policy has allowed dominant values of the day to find expression in the classrooms, often without regard to minority groups. Modern society has increasingly accepted the basic tenets of what is labeled "secular humanism." Without adequate policy to check the influx of secular humanism into the schools, basic tenets of this "anti-evangelical" world view, such as an evolutionary explanation of origins and the relativity of values, have manifested themselves. Two major vehicles by which secular humanist dogma have entered the schools are the value clarification movement and Lawrence Kohlberg's "moral development." Compounding the problem and perhaps more basic to evangelical concern has been a shift towards an educational view raising teacher input over that of parents. For evangelicals this has meant a direct challenge to what they perceive as a God-mandated responsibility.

While public schooling can be faulted for allowing aspects of secular humanism to ascend in its midst to a place of dominance, evangelicals themselves have also contributed to their own problems.

Failing to assume the biblical injunction to "train up" their children, many evangelical parents have entrusted their children to outside agencies, Sunday schools in particular, which have themselves proved ineffective to the task. This failure on the part of evangelical parents is attributed by many analysts to parents not remaining distinct from "the world." In the long run, the failure of evangelicals themselves will contribute to their problems more greatly than the humanism of the public schools. Should the public schools ever become truly neutral and evangelicals remain unprepared, meaningful change from the current situation is unlikely.

To a large extent evangelicals have focused most of their attention on the symptoms rather than root causes. Consequently, activity has centered on trying to reintroduce prayer by a constitutional amendment, preserve Christian holiday celebrations, outlaw the teaching of evolution, and other similar measures. This is not to say that from an evangelical posture all these efforts have been wrong. However, these battles have not focused on the real issue, which will only be solved by recognizing that historic evangelicalism is now a minority viewpoint in an increasingly secular society, and unless adequate policy is developed to protect evangelicals and all other minorities, the battle over the real issue will be lost. The real issue, therefore, that should concern evangelicals is whether parents will retain primary rights over the education of their children. All other issues involved come back to this one underlying question.

Lack of Policy Safequards

A significant problem area for evangelicals, though it may not always be perceived as such, is the lack of consistent, developed policy regarding religion in the public schools. This problem pervades the whole structure of public education--state and local. The National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA) has observed from a national canvas of state and local school districts that "Written general policies on religion and public education...are scarce."¹ Daryl Fair, writing in the Policy Studies Journal has noted that "formal mechanisms for evaluation of church-state policy by government agencies have in general been lacking."² While not commendable or even excusable, this situation is nonetheless understandable. For most administrators, religion is a touchy subject. The practice seems to have been an attempt to avoid costly and energy consuming legal battles. In following this practice, administrators have tended to: (1) assume a posture that infers the U.S. Supreme Court has spoken conclusively to outlaw all religion from public schools, and (2) draft policy statements as needed to pacify those vigorously opposing any lingering vestiges of traditional religious influence. This administrative pattern is vividly illustrated in a recent study of Virginia's public school policies on religion. The study analyzed information from 91% of Virginia's 133 school divisions and revealed that 65.3% of those participating had no policy.³ Of those lacking a policy, the reason

most cited (58.8%) for not having a policy was that the issue had not been raised. Of those with a policy, nearly 33% stated that their policy was developed in response to a specific issue having been raised.⁴ The second highest reason given for those not having a policy was a belief that the Supreme Court had answered the question completely.⁵

Such a method of dealing with church-state policy has tended to produce a situation wherein the few policy statements that have been developed are either very vaguely worded or simply list a few prohibitions against theists, more especially orthodox Christians. For example, a frequently recurring item in policies is the limitation of Christian holiday celebrations. Some simply outline policy regarding off-campus "released-time" classes. Such policies, however, fail to deal with the real issue of how to constructively handle religion on campus.

The Virginia study cited above noted 29 categories where policy might become necessary to guide teachers and administrators. Some are: released time, use of facilities, religious music, library books, use of the Bible, and assembly programs. Significantly, the average policy contained only 8.3% of the 29 categories.⁶ Louis Rittweger, author of the study, concluded that "the vast majority of the policies submitted provide less than adequate guidelines for the myriad of decisions to be made by the public schools in the education-religious arena" and that most policies were stated in negative ways, only specifying non-allowable behaviors.⁷

The current paucity of policy statements regarding religion and the limitations of those that do exist are unfortunate in the light of the fact that the Supreme Court had opened the door in 1963 for an ordered means of dealing with the subject. Outlawing the devotional practices of Bible reading and prayer, the court was nonetheless clear in stating: "Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion when presented objectively as a part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistently with the First Amendment."⁸

In a concurring opinion Justice Brennan demonstrated the fact that the court was passing to the public school administrators the task of developing a policy framework within which public school educators could consistently and legally approach the matter of religion. Brennan said: "To what extent, and at what points in the curriculum religious materials should be cited are matters which the courts ought to entrust very largely to the experienced officials who superintend our nation's schools. They are experts in such matters, and we are not."⁹

That the "experienced officials" failed to catch the ball is history, and for evangelicals, being an increasingly invisible¹⁰ and socially impotent¹¹ minority among the educational hierarchy, it has meant a lack of safety which well defined and thoughtfully worked out policy would have provided. Hence, where policy exists, non-Christians more often than not are protected from Christian influences, while little if any protection is afforded to evangelical Christians. This problem must be resolved if evangelicals can expect to see sufficient

protection for their rights to warrant staying within public education. Furthermore, it is a problem that apparently will only be resolved if pressure is brought to bear on city, county, and state administrators from the legal community, informed community leaders, the academic community, or a combination of such sources.

Problems Stemming from Legal Ambiguity

A conference on "Education, Christian Faith, and the Law" was held April 1979 in Atlanta, Georgia. Sponsored by the Oak Park, Illinois, based Christian Legal Society (CLS), a non-profit professional association of Christian lawyers, judges, law students, educators, and interested citizens, the conference noted in its brochure that "Today education is part of a cultural crisis....Many Christians share a contemporary suspicion that many of our hopes and expectations for the power of education have been misplaced." The conference explored the legal issues and strategies. It was the most significant gathering in recent years of evangelical legal minds to discuss legal aspects of education.

Having attended the conference, this writer saw that most speakers and audience participants agreed that many of the current problems evangelicals face, along with many other theists, stem from an over emphasis on the "establishment clause" of the First Amendment at the expense of the "free exercise clause." One such speaker was Edwin McGaffney Jr., associate director of the Center for Constitutional

Studies and law professor at Notre Dame Law School. McGaffney, in an address entitled, "Pierce to Wolman: the Path of True Law Has Not Run Smooth," went so far as to say that concern over the establishment of religion today is to worry about a "non-plausible issue." He stated that it was beyond comprehension, given the plurality of our current population, that any one religion could be established in the United States. The real issues, McGaffney felt, center over violations of the "free exercise" clause--the attempt of government to prohibit or penalize a person from carrying out his religious convictions.

Numerous times during the conference this theme, violations of free exercise, appeared. Discussion centered around issues currently being litigated by members of the Christian Legal Society and by the society itself. Many of these issues dealt with practices relative to the Christian's inability to divorce his religious beliefs from secular activity. Among specific cases that were discussed was the Huntington Beach Union High School District Case currently before the U. S. Supreme Court; it involved a group of high school students who sought injunctive and declaratory relief in the Superior Court of Orange County, California. Their complaint stemmed from a denial to them to conduct a voluntary student Bible study club on the school campus during the regular school day. The Center for Law and Religious Freedom of the Christian Legal Society (CLS) prepared a brief on behalf of the students before the United States Supreme Court. In the brief the CLS spokesmen addressed the issue of overbalance given to the establishment clause at the expense of the free exercise clause.

As the two Religion Clauses have been interpreted in this century, it has been specifically noted that in certain situations there is a conflict between the Free Exercise and Establishment Clauses. The United States Supreme Court has recognized this internal conflict within the First Amendment Religion Clauses and has called it a "paradox." (Schempp, Supre, at 299)

As a result of this internal conflict, the Free Exercise Clause was for a short time subordinated to the Establishment Clause and other First Amendment rights and freedoms in importance. The only time that Free Exercise of Religion was given its true constitutional value was when it was somehow fused with freedom of speech or other related First Amendment rights.¹²

Having noted this historical conflict, the CLS writers observed that in the case of Sherbert v. Verner (1963) the Supreme Court "again recognized the full importance of the Free Exercise Clause."¹³ The case involved a Seventh Day Adventist who had refused a job requiring her to work on Saturday, her religious beliefs setting this day aside as the Sabbath. She sought unemployment benefits, but was denied because she had refused gainful employment. The writers of the brief noted,

If a strict neutrality approach to the Establishment Clause had been the position of this Court, then it is apparent the government would be prohibited from paying unemployment benefits to the plaintiff, i.e. aiding a religious practice by supporting a person with public funds who did not work for religious reasons. The Court, however, accomodated the sabbatarian in subordinating the Establishment Clause to the Free Exercise Clause, implying that the Free Exercise Clause takes preeminence over the former. This case was indeed a turning point for freedom of religion.¹⁴

The writers further noted that the ruling of the Court was not based upon whether they found substantial infringement, although substantial infringement was found, but rather that there was any infringement. The Court held, "If the purpose or effect of a law is to impede the observance of one or all religions or is to discriminate

invidiously between religions, that law is constitutionally invalid even though the burden may be characterized as being only indirect."¹⁵

The Court further said that if the action of the State was to be upheld,

[It] must be because [it] represents no infringement by the State of [the] constitutional rights of free exercise, or because any incidental burden on the free exercise of...religion may be justified by a "compelling state interest in the regulation of a subject within the State's constitutional power to regulate...."¹⁶

At the 1979 CLS conference much discussion centered over the need to litigate on the basis of the Court's reaffirmation of the superiority of the Free Exercise Clause over the Establishment Clause and the need to communicate this emphasis both to educators and lower court judges who might not be up to date in their understanding of more recent developments. Other speakers, however, cited problems for evangelicals, and others, stemming from legal ambiguity.

Don Howarth, a board member of the CLS, and Lisa Runquist, representing the law firm of Gibson, Dunn, and Crutcher in Los Angeles, presented a paper entitled, "Religious Observances in Public Schools," in which they noted the current test used for determining whether a certain practice constitutes an establishment of religion. The test was given in Lemon v. Kurtzman:

First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principle or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion, Board of Education v. Allen, 392 U. S. 236, 243 (1968); finally, the statute must not foster "an entanglement with religion," Waltz v. Tax Commissioner, 397 U. S. 664, 674 (1970).¹⁷

Howarth and Runquist noted problems with the test.

This standard, particularly the "entanglement" element, has generated considerable ambiguity and ad hoc decisionmaking.

It leaves significant play for bias and offers little predictability or guidance for actions, resulting in diverse and contradictory decisions rather than uniformity.¹⁸

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the above paper, several conferees noted that what may be needed, in light of the current ambiguity of the courts, is for educators and lawyers to work together to establish policy guidelines consistent with clear interpretations of the Court. Until such action happens, however, it was felt that evangelicals should proceed cautiously in establishing their right to the free exercise of their beliefs.

Societal Movement Toward Non-Traditional Religious Belief

Paul Kurtz, editor of The Humanist, has stated that "...in a very real sense the present age may be characterized as predominately humanistic, for humanistic concepts and values pervade contemporary life."¹⁹ James Stahr, editor of the evangelical Interest Magazine, has viewed modern society similarly. He wrote, "The evolutionary view of man and the religion of secular humanism long ago replaced Christianity in the thinking of modern man."²⁰ Kurtz claimed that the "remarkable resurgence" of humanism has produced "large segments of the population...unaffiliated with any organized religious sect," who are "humanistic in outlook and belief."²¹

A significant factor contributing to the problems of evangelicals from a lack of policy safeguard and the legal ambiguity that surrounds the area has been that the viewpoints and practices of this resurged humanism have found their way into public schooling as

"non-religious beliefs." That this is perceived as a problem by evangelicals is seen in a study conducted by this writer in 1976 of a group of 31 evangelical youth, their parents, and teachers.²² (A description of the study appears in Appendix A.) The results of the questionnaire sent to the parents revealed that all but one who responded could recognize the presence of this religious world view in their children's textbooks. All respondents detected its presence in the supplementary materials being used in their children's schools.

A questionnaire was sent to the social studies and literature teachers of the 31 students. The perception of the parents was confirmed by half of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire. (See Appendix A.) Significantly, while half of the teachers responding noted the presence of religious values in textbooks, 77.7% of them agreed that evangelicals are not treated fairly in these textbooks. The percentage was even higher (85.7%) for those who agreed that the supplemental materials used in their classes were not fair to evangelicals.

Another study conducted by this writer in 1976 concentrated on evangelical Christian educators. A questionnaire was sent to 61 academic deans or chairmen of the departments of education at all the evangelical colleges listed by Moody Monthly magazine as having an academic major in education. In addition, six magazine editors were chosen to participate from across the evangelical spectrum. (The questionnaire results can be viewed in Appendix B.) This survey showed that evangelical educators overwhelmingly (90% of the respondents) see public schools generally biased in favor of humanistic, secular religion.

Because humanism strikes against the very core of theistic beliefs--the existence of a personal God--the allegation of and perception of humanism in public schooling has evoked a cry for relief from evangelicals.

Robert T. Hall, professor of philosophy at Steubenville College in Ohio, admitted in the Humanist magazine that "not only have schools seemed to have become actively...secularistic," but that it also may be true that "the rights and responsibilities of parents who are religious believers are indeed being disregarded."²³

Nicholas Piediscalzi and William E. Collie, codirectors of the Public Education Religious Studies Center (PERSC) at Wright State University are among educators actively studying the subject of religion in the schools who have also observed the societal trend away from traditional religion. In their book, Teaching About Religion in Public Schools, they stated, "religions, in the narrow sense of the term are no longer institutions of primary influence and power in most Western and many Eastern societies."²⁴ Piediscalzi and Collie have documented the significant emergence of groups in society entering public schooling, that come under a "broad" definition of religion. Along with secularism, scientism, and nationalism, they list humanism.²⁵ Calling these "faiths by which people live," Piediscalzi and Collie observed that despite any semantical problems of whether they should be termed religious or not, they nonetheless "function as religions."²⁶ Due to the nature of our society, public schools, as agents of an areligious government do not have a responsibility to either promote or stem the movement of society away from traditional religion. However, because the schools are

agents of what is widely proclaimed as a government neutral to religion, they do have the responsibility to protect the rights of any and all religions from the ever present dominance of the majority. That this responsibility is not being adequately fulfilled is a major concern for evangelicals.

Secular Humanism

Of the non-traditional religions, evangelicals are most concerned with "secular humanism." The noted evangelical scholar and spokesman, Carl F. H. Henry, at a 1973 national symposium sponsored by PERSC at Wright State University, stated, "It is not the establishment of a sectarian religion in the traditional sense, but the educational disestablishment of such religion in favor of a religion of secularism that presently reflects the pulsebeat of much education in the public arena."²⁷ The religion of secularism to which Henry referred was secular humanism. He explained, "The threat of religious establishment in the United States today comes not from any form of biblical faith--Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish--but from secular humanism."²⁸

Stuart Fowler, associate editor of the Reformation Today magazine, is an evangelical who has not only pointed out the threat of secular humanism to evangelicals, but also stressed the complexity of the problem. In remarks made at a conference in Australia, and reprinted in a collection of articles by Reformation Today, Fowler dispelled the common idea that evangelicals are simply opposed to change; that they

are but reactionaries who have failed to keep up with the twentieth century. He stated,

When we begin to examine the determining religious principle of today's permissiveness, what alarms us is not that the permissive society is a society of change--every society is--nor that it is a society in which the traditional moral value system is crumbling--this was inevitable--but that the changes in moral values that are taking place are taking place under the dominating influence of the humanistic doctrine of the self-regulating man.²⁹

According to Fowler, the humanistic doctrine "that man has within himself all that he needs to correctly regulate his life" is the "dominant influence in modern society."³⁰ This, if and when it enters public schools, creates a serious problem for those who reject the doctrine. When it is accepted, "it follows that all moral regulation and restraints other than those that are self imposed are not only unnecessary, but are morally harmful, hindering the attainment of moral maturity."³¹ The logical outcome of this humanistic assumption has in several instances found its way into public school textbooks. One example of this is in Prentice-Hall's Behind the Mask: Our Psychological World. Accepting a relativist view of morality, the author of the text stated, "Admittedly, the issue of sex outside of marriage is open to many arguments, both for and against; it doesn't make any difference what side of the fence you are on--the problem lies in our snickering attitude toward sexual behavior."³² The student reading this is being told that he alone is the arbiter of moral truth. If he concludes for himself that sex outside of marriage is moral, than it is so. For someone else to take an absolutist stand and claim, as do most evangelicals, then he has a "snickering attitude," and is viewed as a source

of problems relating to moral development. This quote is not an isolated case from the Prentice-Hall text. The book infers that those who take an absolutist stand against homosexuality are guilty of seeking to deny individuals their "right" to be homosexual.

In other words...it is not so much the act of homosexuality that causes grief, but instead the laws that prohibit it and the society that finds it repugnant.³³

The fact of whether the act of homosexuality causes grief or not is open to debate in psychological circles. However, this is not as important to our discussion as is the blatant assertion that those who cut against the grain of relativism are the ones who cause "grief." Many evangelical young people feel they have been put to an unfair disadvantage in discussion of value issues when well meaning teachers and textbook authors have attempted to "develop" the individual's morality to the point that he accepts the relativity of ethics. Many evangelicals view attempts such as these to be simply the subtle indoctrination of religious beliefs alien to their own.

Evangelicals have sometimes found humanism a difficult foe to identify because when it is presented it is usually not labeled as "humanistic" in a religious context. Identification is further complicated by its variety of forms. This complexity has been pointed out by philosopher J. P. von Pragg, chairman of the International Humanistic Ethical Union, in the main paper delivered at that group's 1966 congress. Pointing out that humanism is "not bound up with any particular philosophy," von Pragg went on to show that it has been "upheld by idealist, materialist, naturalist, or existential philosophies."³⁴

What it all boils down to, according to von Pragg, is that despite their differences, humanists are united by their rejection of God and their affirmation of life.³⁵

Stuart Fowler has likewise pointed out the importance in recognizing the "humanistic stream...has many diverse, sub-streams."³⁶

Observing that humanism can be optimistic, pessimistic, materialistic, idealistic, individualistic, or socialistic, he nonetheless noted that "all are bound together by a common religious root, finding common expression in the doctrine that man is ethically self-regulating."³⁷

Because humanism is so diversified, Fowler has shown that the out-workings of the basic doctrine may greatly vary. He stated,

It may for example lead to the view that the state exists purely to serve the individual, or it may lead to the view that the interest of the individual must be subordinated to those of the state. It may lead to the contention that every individual must do what he considers right, or to the view that men must recognize the moral values of a supposed communal conscience, or to the view that moral values are to be determined by experts on the basis of empirical data.

The lesson is that, if we reduce humanistic thought to a stereotype we will remain blind to its pervasive influence in contemporary society.³⁸

The diversity of humanistic belief often has led educators themselves to be blind to the fact that beneath the debate by humanists over how their first principles should be put into practice, there exists a core of agreement that evangelicals must resist. Seeing only the open exchange of views and failing to recognize the religious nature of the first principles has often led persons to the charge that evangelicals are resisting a strawman. Such is not the case. The variety of humanistic belief is no more a rationale for its dominance in public education than

the variety among evangelical Protestants was once justification for allowing it to dominate. Because Protestants differed over certain theological issues was no cause to allow indoctrination of that to which they were agreed into those persons who did not hold such beliefs. Likewise, the disagreements of religious humanists should not be cited as a rationale to allow the consensus that does exist among them to remain a dominant force working to the detriment of those religions, including evangelical Christianity, that do not accept the assumptions upon which humanism rests.

Basic Tenets of Secular Humanism

Since evangelicals view secular humanism as such a formidable and pervasive foe and since humanism is often a difficult entity for public school educators to identify, it is necessary to establish a clear understanding of the basic tenets of humanism. Without this understanding, one cannot fully appreciate either the extent to which humanism exists in public schooling or the reason why such presence would contribute to evangelical discomfort.

The basic tenets of the religion of secular humanism can most easily be discovered by reading the Humanist Manifestoes (I and II).³⁹ Among the more prominent and applicable to this study are: (1) A denial of the existence of God, and more especially, His non-participation in creation. ("As non-theists, we begin with humans, not God, nature, not deity.") (2) The mind of man is the source of purpose and goal in human

life. ("We can discover no divine purpose or providence for the human species...humans are responsible for what we are or will become.")⁴¹

(3) Morality is relative. ("Moral values derive their source from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanction.")⁴²

A more recent description of the core of humanistic belief has been given by Morris B. Storrer, professor emeritus at the University of Florida. Recognizing the differences that exist among humanists, Storrer has still shown that "humanists have been able to agree on several foundational principles."⁴³ These are:

- (1) there is no supernatural authority;
- (2) the goal of human existence is human well being and happiness in this life;
- (3) there are no absolutes, morality is situational;
- (4) there is dignity for every human individual and equal rights for all; and
- (5) there must be proper freedom of individuals to do as they choose, so long as they do not harm others.⁴⁴

The element of humanistic belief that "moral values derive their source from human experience," often posits them in direct opposition to evangelicals on many moral issues, yet since humanism is frequently not recognized as religious, its beliefs are allowed to be expressed, while an expression of evangelical belief, since it is clearly definable as religious, is kept out because it is seen to violate the separation of church and state doctrine.

Robert Hall, in the article cited earlier, addressed this problem especially as it relates to moral education. Avoiding the semantical issue of whether or not secular humanism is by definition a religion, Hall stated that humanism "should be included in religious

studies," and, "for the purposes of education...treated as such" (religion).⁴⁵ Hall further commented,

Religious studies courses which ignore secular humanism are misrepresenting the variety of beliefs which actually exist in our society. And moral education which promotes only a secularistic (or a Christian or a Jewish) foundation for moral values is misrepresenting the extent of the moral consensus.⁴⁶

There is no evidence to show that most evangelicals who wish to remain with public schooling want to deny humanists the right to hold beliefs contrary to their own; or even to be able to put them forth as one option among others. The results of the evangelical educators' questionnaire developed by this writer at the Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center in Ferrum, Virginia, in the fall of 1976 indicated just the opposite. (See Appendix B.) From among the many items to which the evangelical educators responded, 90% favored equal exposure of creation and evolution. If equal time were allowed for an evangelical presentation of a major social issue with religious implications (astrology), 76% would allow the presentation of non-evangelical views. In addition, 94% saw no problem in presenting the basic tenets of the "major religions of the world, provided there is also a presentation of the tenets of evangelical Christianity." What most evangelicals do want is to eliminate the favoring of non-traditional religious belief over the traditional ones. If Robert Hall's view cited earlier is indicative of a majority of humanists, then it would appear that a solution to this problem can be found. However, that such is the case, is yet to be manifested.

Dr. Onalee McGraw, coordinator for the National Coalition for Children and an educational consultant to the Heritage Foundation, sees humanistic education as "the latest manifestation of the so-called progressive life-adjustment philosophy that has dominated our schools and teacher education for decades."⁴⁷ She views the "essential thrust of humanistic education...to train students 'how to make moral and ethical decisions' deemed appropriate by the tenets of humanism."⁴⁸ The assessment by Dr. McGraw is widely held among evangelicals, who believe that humanists have influenced modern public education to such an extent that they may be viewed as being responsible for effecting such innovations in educational practice as inquiry approaches, value clarification, behavior modification, and the like. The perceived need for such new methods is seen to be an implication that the previous approaches, values, and behavior needed to be changed.

Ronald A. Cordero, assistant professor of philology at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, offered this viewpoint in a recent article, "Ethical Theory and the Teaching of Values," in a major educational journal. He explained that in the past there prevailed an "ethical absolutism that took for granted that changeless ethical facts, as such existed."⁴⁹ He called this the "classical approach." Under the approach, questions regarding moral issues "were taken to have objective, universally true answers."⁵⁰ Today, however, Cordero pointed out that ethical researchers have recently advanced theories which seriously impugn" this concept and lead to the need for a major rethink - ing of value education.⁵¹ One major modern theory, according to Cordero, rejects ethical absolutes as misguided and erroneous, while the other

leading theory simply suggests that value judgments may not only not be universally true, but never true. Since the ethical researchers are not presently agreed as to which of these two theories will eventually succeed, Cordero has noted a dilemma. Simply to wait until one or the other gains acceptance would mean a perpetuation of "the classical value education." This is untenable to Cordero and probably many other humanists. Cordero stated,

Unless we are ready to reject both of these major trends in twentieth century ethical theory as mistaken, we cannot consistently persevere in the "classical" approach to value education.⁵²

According to Cordero, a temporary approach is needed. This would entail investigation into subjects rather than assertions about whether the subject was right or wrong. Teachers must "carefully avoid the application of value terms to their subject" until the ethical researchers reach consensus.⁵³ Having conclusively rejected the moral absolutes of the classical approach, Cordero appears confident that there will come a time when values can be taught in an absolute way. It will be when "ethical researchers" come to agreement. An evangelical who reads this literature becomes convinced that for such educational philosophers, the new approaches are but means to an end: reformation of society on humanistic grounds. If this is true, evangelicals believe that unless there's recognition of the reformation goal of humanism, any effort to reform public schooling on their part will be futile and time wasted. Many evangelicals who have concluded this are now working to establish private Christian schools.

Paul Kurtz, in his essay already mentioned, "What Is Humanism?," projected the same humanistic optimism as Cordero. Kurtz believed that

intellectual victory has been achieved over the traditional approach to values, and stated that many humanists "now believe that the battle against orthodoxy has been won...and applaud the fact that many or most educated people are humanists in one form or another."⁵⁴ He saw the challenge for humanism "to suggest in positive terms what humanism can offer in the place of the orthodoxy it has replaced."⁵⁵ The same thought is apparently behind the drafting of the Humanist Manifesto II. Kurtz and Edwin H. Wilson, writing the preface to the document, noted the challenges facing the twenty-first century and alleged that "traditional theism...is an unproved and outmoded faith...reasonable minds look to other means of survival."⁵⁶ With convictions such as these held by humanistic educators, many evangelicals are not surprised that the humanists have been in the forefront of the new practices of values clarification and moral development. Evangelicals view the practices as attempts to fill a vacuum created by the asserted defeat of traditional morals and values. The practices are logical moves from the non-traditional perspective. Evangelicals and other traditionalists cannot deny humanists the right to present their views or proposals as options in the public arena. The humanist and others have even a duty to present in a proper way their indictments of traditional values and their proposals for change. However, to make all the options in a public arena but variations of non-theistic belief, not only limits inquiry in favor of indoctrination but also denies a significant segment of the population a vote in assisting the next generation to formulate the values that will play a major role in shaping the kind of society

they and their children will live in. The fact that 62.5% of the teachers responding to the 1976 study of 31 evangelical youth thought non-evangelical youth were not as interested in exploring evangelical values as they were in exploring other values may be an indication that many teachers, after years of training in educational institutions espousing a humanistic world view to the exclusion of the evangelical, have subtly become convinced that evangelicalism is simply a dead horse that no one could possibly be interested in. Significantly, however, more evangelical students (of those involved in the study) than not, disagreed with the teachers' conclusion, a fact that should at least cause a questioning of teacher perception. Other results of the study showed that 61.5% of the students said that they experienced no derision from other students when they had shared their values in class discussion. This may suggest that non-evangelical youth, even if not specifically interested in viewing an evangelical alternative, are not opposed to it.

Evolution--A Humanistic First Principle

Dr. Richard P. Bliss, director of curriculum development at the Institute for Creation Research in San Diego, sees the "religion of secular humanism" as half of a "partnership" with the "doctrine of evolution" that is preparing young people "for a life of belief in the supreme adequacy of man and the non-existence of God."⁵⁷ This in part reveals the persistent resistance given to indoctrinative evolution by

evangelicals. The relationship between evolution and secular humanism is a necessary alliance. The noted humanist, Corliss Lamont, in his classic work, Humanism as a Philosophy, stated,

To begin with, biology has conclusively shown that man and all other forms of life were the result, not of a supernatural act of creation by God, but of an infinitely long process of evolution stretching over at least three or four hundred million years.⁵⁸

Statements such as this reveal evolution to be the foundation upon which humanism rests. Because life originated "not of a supernatural act of creation by God, but of...evolution," man, himself a product of this "infinitely long process," becomes not only the center of man's attention, as opposed to God, but likewise becomes the source of authority, purpose, and activity.

Sir Julian Huxley has gone so far as to state that evolutionary naturalism is the "basic hypothesis" of the humanist.⁵⁹ A more recent statement of the relationship between humanism and evolution is expressed by the American Humanist Association. An invitation to join this group printed in the Humanist (December 1978) began, "If you see humans as the product of this world, of evolution and human history... then consider membership in the American Humanist Association."⁶⁰ This same invitation offered to new members a complimentary copy of Lamont's book cited above.⁶¹

Elizabeth Leonie Simpson, author of a book commissioned as an interpretation of "humanistic education" for the Ford Foundation, has defined "anti-humanistic education" as that which occurs "when teachers believe that human purposes and goals are determined from without, from external authorities whether groups, individuals, or personalized all

powerful forces (emphasis added), rather than from the individual.⁶²

This view, intended to identify what is a negative belief for a teacher to hold, expresses a conviction based upon the assumption that man is not here due to divine purpose (to which purpose he must submit), but rather is here due to a process of evolution, leaving him free to set his own purposes and goals. No serious responsible evangelical leader would challenge an individual's right to hold such a view; but to insist that all teachers hold to and act upon the belief that "all powerful forces" (obviously a reference to Deity) have nothing to do in the determination of human purposes and goals is to insist that all teachers be in fact secular humanists. This is a proposition that evangelicals obviously cannot accept.

Phillip May, an Englishman writing in a recent book published in this country by Moody Press, cited two British humanists who demonstrate the fact that evolution plays a vital role in laying the basis upon which the humanist concepts of morality and progress rest. The first humanist May cited was Sir Julian Huxley, who was quoted as saying in the Ninth Fawley Foundation Lecture at the University of Southampton in 1962 that "The evolutionary idea must provide the main unifying approach for a humanistic educational system."⁶³ The second, H. L. Elvin, author of The Humanist Frame, was cited to show the purpose to which such instruction is aimed. Elvin is quoted as saying, "We have to educate so that young people will think of man as an evolving species in an environment that he himself is changing and should change only with consciousness of what he does."⁶⁴ It is the fear that what

Elvin desires is currently being implemented in much of American schooling that has in part caused Dr. Bliss to speak out.

Bliss has pointed out that there is already a fulfillment of the humanist desire to educate according to the pattern described by Elvin. According to Bliss, "the method of teaching evolution is most subtle" and "entails a K-6 series...that builds psychologically beginning with the concept of eons of time and the 'factual' nature of an evolutionary geological column."⁶⁵ This concept is necessary if young people are to "think of man as an evolving species." Bliss has reacted most strongly by the charge that "evolution is communicated in an environment of 'scientific' bias."⁶⁶ The child is led to believe he is learning facts while in truth he is being presented with "assumptions that cannot be tested and are in fact manufactured by evolutionists to complete their picture of life's development."⁶⁷ Those who believe Bliss is overreacting with his charge that what is being presented is a set of "assumptions that cannot be tested and are manufactured," might note that he does not stand alone in making the allegation. Among the number of scientists who believe in evolution yet who have admitted that unproved assumptions have been presented as fact is Loren Eiseley, author of The Immense Journey, who stated in that work,

With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins, which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past.⁶⁸

Among the educators expressing the same charge has been David Volt of the University of Alabama.

Science, in its virgin purity, may be non-religious, non-sectarian. But it quickly assumes a sectarian posture. Ideally, science is willing to question all presuppositions, but in reality, science becomes a series of established paradigms--paradigms which go unchallenged in scientific communities, except occasionally, and then only in terms of a new sectarian position.

And it is sectarian science that is presented in the public schools, but the students are not told this. Science is presented, in most schools, as the final authority--science is made to appear to have all the answers (or, if not yet, it will have the answer soon).⁶⁹

An editorial in Christianity Today in January 1973 addressed the issue of the one-sided approach to evolution in science courses and stated the convictions of many evangelicals:

The very determination of the evolutionists to prevent objections to naturalistic evolution from being raised in public science courses is evidence that the objections have some merit; otherwise, simply to present them would be the best way to have them rejected by the students. So what we are facing, is a kind of trial of Galileo in reverse. The "religious" party is saying, "We have questions that may undermine some of your scientific dogmas," and the "scientific" party is in effect replying, "Your objections are not scientific and may under no circumstances be permitted to undermine the confidence of the students in our teachings."⁷⁰

As indicated in this editorial, many of the scientists and other educators arguing against the inclusion of a creationist theory into science courses have argued from the position that religious suppositions form the basis of creation scientists and not the "objectivity" that "true" science demands. This line of reasoning ignores the fact that evolution itself is part of the presuppositions of another religion--secular humanism. If creationists are to be faulted for attempting to observe "proofs" for their beliefs, it must also be pointed out that many evolutionists start from a position that

has "a priori" ruled out the supernatural. While it is true that evolution is a "must" for humanism, creation is also a "must" for a majority of evangelicals who hold to an inerrant Scripture, which they believe teaches an act of creation. If creation is true, evangelicals must be able to see evidence of this in the creation. They believe they do, but feel they are widely refused a hearing of their findings in public schools. Many want to do this on purely scientific grounds, leaving religion out of the picture. To that end they are increasingly working to develop materials appropriate in public education.

Dr. Ariel A. Roths, director of the California office of the Geoscience Research Institute, and professor of biology at Loma Linda University, argued for the inclusion of the creation account and that religion need not be totally left out of a discussion of origins. He wrote, "My thesis is that learning about the creation viewpoint and its relationship on the scientific basis with the evolution viewpoint is not the same as establishing religion."⁷¹ Roths noted, "There is a difference between communication and indoctrination, between knowledge of facts and the commitment of religion."⁷²

Dr. Henry Morris, formerly head of the Department of Civil Engineering at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and currently director of the Institute for Creation Research in San Diego, California, and president of Christian Heritage College, is perhaps the most widely acclaimed proponent of creation science. Morris has described the position of most creationist scientists as follows,

The scientific creationists themselves are men and women who have acquired all the standard credentials of the scientist, but who maintain that creation explains the facts of science

better than evolution does. To them it is not primarily a question of religion (after all, people can be religious and moral while still believing in evolution), but of science. They are convinced that the creation model correlates the scientific data more effectively.⁷³

Another leading proponent of creation science is Wendall P. Bird, currently an attorney from Atlanta. Bird is a former editor of the Yale Law Journal. In a recent article published by the Institute for Creation Research, Bird stated,

We are not trying to bring the Bible or Genesis into public schools....We are not trying to exclude evolution from public schools, unless creation is also excluded. We are asking public schools to be neutral between theories of the origin of the world, life, and man, and to give academic freedom of choice to students between these theories.

We are asking public schools to present the scientific evidences for creation along with the scientific evidences for evolution.⁷⁴

For a fuller treatment of evangelical desires relating to the teaching of creation and evolution, the reader should refer to Appendix C, which is a "model" bill designed for evangelicals seeking legislation that would give creation fair treatment. The model bill was developed by several members of the Christian Legal Society and distributed at that group's 1979 conference.

Reacting to the strong opposition raised in "scientific" circles to a California decision requiring the creationist view of origins to be taught alongside the naturalistic, evolutionary one, Christianity Today stated,

The emotional reaction of a large part of the scientific and educational establishment to California's initiative, lends support to the charge that for them evolutionary naturalism is not a demonstrable scientific fact but a hallowed religious dogma that must be defended by strict censorship of all contrary arguments and facts.⁷⁵

Christianity Today's charge that evolution is a "hallowed religious dogma" is not specifically stated by Hamilton Cravens, associate professor at Iowa State University, but he has said that "educated Americans" have been more greatly affected by evolutionary thought than usually assumed. He stated that "evolutionary thought has played a seminal role in our cultural history since the late nineteenth century."⁷⁶ The effect of this fact has been to hold out to educated Americans, who have most come under the dominance of scientists, "the majestic vision of a science of social control."⁷⁷ Cravens also charged that there is complete disdain offered those who challenge the theory; they are summarily dismissed as "religious zealots, disgruntled ghetto dwellers, or as rebellious and privileged adolescents."⁷⁸ Craven's recognition of evolution's seminal role in holding forth a vision of social control is but another linking of evolution with the religion of secular humanism. The fact that it has played such an important role for such a long period of time lends weight to the evangelical charge that the humanistic model has long had its roots growing in the educational sector.

Bliss has also charged that the one-sided presentation of the evolutionary theory of origins goes beyond its dominance in science courses and more importantly lays the groundwork for much humanistic material being taught in the social studies, a field increasingly dominated by those who view education's task as remodeling society--a remodeling evangelicals fear to be along humanistic lines. He stated,

In most of today's school systems educational materials are selected by a few educators, who have usually been trained by humanistic university professors. The influence of this philosophy becomes apparent when one examines the science and social

science curriculum used in our schools. These materials place emphasis on the centrality of man and his ability to be the master of his own destiny.⁷⁹

Dr. Michael B. McMahon, assistant professor of education at the University of Virginia, spoke against the dominance of scientific naturalism in public education. Writing in Intellect magazine, Dr. McMahon observed that "so great has been the reliance on objectivity and scientism in modern education that not only learning experiences, but the whole enterprise of schooling, have been cast in a positivistic mold."⁸⁰ McMahon relates the fact that this reliance on scientism is directly related to the religious assumptions of humanism by noting that "professional educators" are "dedicated to the postulates that man is self-sufficient, that human society is the arbiter of its own morality, and that knowledge is exclusively the product of scientific inquiry."⁸¹

Inadequacy of Teacher Education Programs

Part of the school problem evangelicals face may be the failure of teacher training programs to prepare public school teachers to deal with the religious values of their patrons. If it is true that neutrality is a goal of public education and that public education is committed to the concept of pluralism, then to base teacher education programs nearly exclusively on the thought of men and women committed to a single basic world view--humanism--is untenable. While men like Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, B. F. Skinner, and Lawrence Kohlberg represent differing schools of thought within the confines of secular

humanism, they nonetheless do agree on basic humanistic presuppositions. To omit a single, major world view diametrically opposed to what is being studied, is likewise untenable. Yet three-fourths of the teachers responding to the questionnaire in the study of 31 evangelical youth admitted that they were not exposed to a proportionate number of evangelical scholars in their university training. Further, one could expect if pluralism and neutrality were goals of public education, that given the apparent failure of teacher preparation programs to prepare teachers to deal fairly with religious diversity, local school divisions closer to the people would use in-service programs to encourage their teachers to understand better the different values held by their patrons. However, three-fourths of the teachers responding cited that no such encouragement had been given them by their respective school divisions. Consequently, 40% of these teachers were admittedly not knowledgeable concerning basic evangelical Christian values and the relationship between these values to the content of class discussions. Of the remaining 60%, 83.3% could not accurately answer all three questions listed in the questionnaire concerning basic evangelical belief. This lack of knowledge is not only a fact widely recognized by leading evangelical educators (90% of those responding to the 1976 Christian educator survey cited previously agreed to the statement that "most public school teachers do not understand what evangelical Christians really believe"), but is recognized by evangelical parents and students as well. In the 31 student survey, 70% of those responding to the parent questionnaire felt that public school teachers do not understand

evangelical belief; 60% of the evangelical students felt this way concerning their literature teacher, and 40% felt the same about their social studies teacher.

Values Clarification

A major effort has been expended by educators, apparently influenced by humanism, who see a need to re-educate society on a strategy termed "values clarification." Many evangelicals have noted this effort and view it as part of their problem. Alan L. Lockwood, associate professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and a specialist in moral education, has called the values clarification approach and Lawrence Kohlberg's moral development approach "the two most widely discussed approaches to values education."⁸²

Leaders in the movement include Sidney Simon and Louis Rathes of the Center for Humanistic Education in Amherst, Massachusetts. Their works have been considered standard material in social studies education programs for approximately a decade.⁸³ In listing several traditional approaches to values, they termed one, "cultural or religious dogma, presented as unquestioned wisdom or principle." These men claimed that all the traditional approaches are wrong.⁸⁴ They based their conclusion on the humanistic assumption that values are relative and situational. They stated,

We have no doubt that such methods as those listed, and there are others that could be listed, have in the past controlled behavior and even formed beliefs and attitudes, but we assert that they have not and cannot lead to values in the sense that we are

concerned with them--values that represent the free and thoughtful choice of intelligent humans interacting with complex and changing environments.

The reader will note that with each of the approaches there is the idea of persuasion. The "right" values are predetermined and it is one method or another of selling, pushing, urging those values upon others. All the methods have the air of indoctrination, with some merely more subtle than others. The idea of free inquiry, thoughtfulness, reason seems to be lost. The approach seems not to help the child develop a valuing process, but rather how to persuade the child to adopt the "right" values.⁸⁸

Convinced that there are no universally "right" values (other than their own), Simon and Raths see the only way to arrive at values is to use the humanist's only viable source--the mind of man. Although Simon and Raths and other humanists uphold "free and thoughtful choice," it is apparent from the above quote that choice based upon the "rightfulness" of revealed truth by God is not considered thoughtful. Further, at least one leading values clarification proponent, Howard Kirschenbaum, has openly admitted that parents and teachers who hold to absolutist convictions will find the values clarification approach inadequate. Kirschenbaum, codirector of the National Humanistic Education Center, and a frequent speaker and consultant on values education, has recently written:

If our attitude is that premarital sex is not necessarily moral or immoral in and of itself but only in terms of how the couple treats one another as persons, then we are quite willing to accept the couple's choice, either way. If on the other hand, we believe that premarital sex is always wrong, then a moral education that focuses only on the skills, attitudes, and concepts for making moral decisions without addressing the decision itself will not be sufficient.⁸⁶

Dr. Thomas Hunt, associate professor of social and historical foundations of education at Virginia Tech, referring to the type of question

asked in the values clarification approach regarding sex, has commented that "It does not take much thought to understand why some citizens question the authority and/or competency of public school teachers to initiate such questions."⁸⁷

Kirschenbaum chose to make the point using the issue of pre-marital sex, but he could equally have used a number of other issues. The point is that the values clarification strategy admittedly must be relativistic. To Kirschenbaum "this need not be an obstacle...we may supplement...with a religious training or other training that adds the components we feel are missing."⁸⁸ However, evangelicals assert that the effect of the repeated use of this strategy in public schools is to subtly indoctrinate into the minds of students that all truth is relative and that the most important thing is not your position on a moral issue, but your tolerance of those who hold different views. While evangelicals should certainly be tolerant of those with whom they disagree, to make that tolerance more important than the issue is a religious proposition they should not be compelled to make. Bonnidell Clouse, professor of educational psychology at Indiana State University and contributing editor to the Journal of Psychology and Theology, has similarly criticized values clarification when she stated,

However, for those who do not accept a relativity of truth and ethics, and most evangelical Christians do not, values clarification presents another sort of problem. The materials available for using this technique with such subjects as literature, mathematics, foreign languages, and physical education would meet with little objection. But in matters of morality and religion, the assumption that values are not absolute but are relative to individual preferences and feelings, which is a basic presupposition of values clarification, makes many of us uncomfortable.⁸⁹

While proponents of values clarification often react to the "indoctrination" of other methods of value development, Richard A. Baer Jr., associate professor at Cornell University, has noted that these men, by pressing on their readers "a number of significant assumptions--very specific understandings of man and the world," are themselves engaged in "a form of indoctrination."⁹⁰ Two of the assumptions Baer cited are very much related to evangelical concern. They are (1) that the individual is free to make value decisions in an open and rational manner and (2) that each person is the final arbiter of moral truth, of what is right and wrong and proper for his own life. To the first of these assumptions, Baer noted that this is a position defended by "important thinkers" in the Western World, but that there have been and are "at least as many first-rate minds" who have taken a different position.⁹¹ He cited Augustine, Calvin, Pascal, Dostoevski, and Freud as examples. Augustine, he asserted, held (as do many evangelicals) that:

One will either be a slave of God, and thus genuinely free, or a slave of sin, and thus not free at all. In other words, one will either orient his life towards what is ultimately real, and thus live as a free person, or he will commit himself to some partial reality--what the Bible terms an idol--and will consequently remain in bondage.⁹²

Baer contended that the values clarification people have no objective basis upon which they can uncritically impose their views upon the educational structures and process in a pluralistic society. Theirs is but one of several competing views.

Baer called the assumption that "each person is the final arbiter of moral truth, of what is right, and what is wrong...an extreme

form of individualism or privatism and is an instance of ethical relativism."⁹³ He further stated that these men offer no rationale for this assumption and set it forth as acceptable truth, despite the fact that "this view of ethics has never been widely held throughout human history and is in direct conflict with the beliefs of many segments of our population."⁹⁴

Alan L. Lockwood also questioned the ethical relativism of values clarification. He has stated that relativism wherein "each person's values are right for him" neither provides a "consistent basis from which we can determine our obligations or guide our lives," nor can it "generate a satisfactory method for resolving interpersonal conflicts of value."⁹⁵ Lockwood concluded values clarification presents "a truncated and myopic view of morality and trivializes the complexity of value issues in human affairs."⁹⁶ Further, and of greater concern to evangelicals, Lockwood has asserted that "a values education program...grounded in ethical relativism must accept the possibility that its students will embrace ethical relativism as their moral point of view."⁹⁷ Evangelical parents, for the most part, appear unwilling to risk such a possibility.

The leading values clarification scholars (Kirschenbaum, Harmin, Howe, and Simon) have attempted to answer criticism regarding their approach. In an article appearing in Phi Delta Kappan they said,

We can honestly say to parents that we are not trying to impose any set of values. Rather, we are trying to teach a valuing process. In that sense it is also a relativistic procedure. Responses are not judged as better or worse; each student's views are treated with equal respect.

But here the relativism stops....⁹⁸

The authors then went on to describe how values clarification does promote certain types of thinking, feeling, choosing, communicating, and acting and is not "value free." For example,

If we urge critical thinking, then we value rationality. If we promote divergent thinking, then we value creativity. If we support moral reasoning as Lawrence Kohlberg defines it, then we value justice. If we uphold free choice, then we value autonomy or freedom. If we encourage "no-lose" conflict resolution, then we value equality...we can only say that values clarification is not and never has been "value-free."⁹⁹

Stating further that there are "terminal values implicit in the valuing process: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,"¹⁰⁰ these architects of values clarification turned to the charges of relativism coming from the church and cognitive developmental psychologists. The charge was as follows,

On what authority do we propose an educational approach, that...has as its core the values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?...Can it be argued and proven that on religious, philosophical, or psychological grounds these or any other values are absolute?¹⁰¹

The answer to the charge was simply, "We don't know."¹⁰² They asserted that "values clarification does not answer all questions of human existence." Rather, "it does describe a valuing process and say that if people use the process they will experience more positive value in their living...."¹⁰⁴ The reason why they do teach students to think morally despite the fact that "research does not answer" the kind of question such as "What are the best concepts to value?" is simply that they themselves value these concepts.¹⁰⁵ There is therefore no claim to be working towards "terminal" ends on the basis of empirical evidence, but rather on the basis of their own values.

While these recent "clarifications" of values clarification do better explain certain aspects of the approach, the evangelical comes away with no better feelings toward it. Not only have the authors failed to dispel the atmosphere of relativity inherent in the approach, they have given an open acknowledgement that the morality of the approach is based on their own concept of morality, which is humanism and designed to achieve certain ends that must be defined in humanistic terms. Having given no substantive definitions to the vague terms identified as ends (rationality, creativity, justice, freedom, and equality), the authors left the direct impression that these are simply humanistic related goals--autonomy or freedom meaning to do what evangelicals consider sin without the appellation of "sin," equality meaning the right to be what many evangelicals see as a negation of God-designed roles, rationality being the only reliable and intellectually plausible means of arriving at truth (understood apart from revelation).

The public schools unquestionably must remain neutral to religious values. Evangelicals cannot expect the public schools to espouse as the only option what evangelicals consider to be "right," but they can and should expect that one of the alternatives presented in an inquiry approach, such as the clarification of values, will be that which they do consider "right." Evangelicals should not be faulted for demanding that the approach to the matter being investigated does not dogmatically assert that the rightness of one's position can only be determined according to the culture or the situation. Michael B. McMahon stated, "The promulgation of any single faith in public schools

of a pluralistic society is undefensible--particularly when that faith masquerades in neutral garb."¹⁰⁶ Evangelicals, for the most part, do not doubt the sincerity of most teachers and would not accuse them of being part of a conspiracy. However, the 31 student study mentioned previously pointed out the fact that even with well meaning teachers there is a problem. All of the teachers responding to the teacher questionnaire thought that their classes provided an atmosphere in which students could feel free to explore values. All but one felt that this was true of most public school teachers. Likewise, all claimed to encourage value exploration; yet, 59% admitted that their evangelical youth were not encouraged to interject their religious values in class discussions. One-fourth of the teachers admitted that they did not feel student expressions of religious convictions were an integral part of value discussions; 54% stated they do not have discussions in class involving religious convictions. Consequently, 85.9% of their evangelical students, according to the teachers, do not often share their convictions in class. The significance of all this is that teachers profess to have an open, neutral, encouraging atmosphere, while openly admitting that the boundaries of its openness do not extend to the religious dimension of life, especially to the evangelical posture.

Mrs. Mel Gabler, an evangelical who has worked vigorously in Texas to check the humanistic trend in textbooks, has gone a little further and suggested that textbooks often go beyond subtly omitting the evangelical view. She believed that textbooks overtly espouse

humanistic relativism under the guise of neutrality. Mrs. Gabler pointed out that the alleging of an inquiry approach of itself does not guarantee objectivity. If the material is not fairly chosen it can and will result in a child being convinced he is right because he came to what he thought was his own conclusion "without realizing that the subject matter provided him had been carefully selected to assure this eventually."¹⁰⁷

An example of what Mrs. Gabler reacted to is found in Silver Burdett's Man and Change (Contemporary Social Studies Curriculum). After presenting some selective quotes from the major religions, the book asks the elementary student, "Do you now agree with the following lines written more than a thousand years ago by a wise man of India?"¹⁰⁸ First of all, the quotes were selected to evoke a positive response; secondly, the quote to follow was alleged to have come from a "wise" man. Immediately, the child was clued to the fact that if he wanted to be "wise" he also will give his assent. What the student was "led" to consent to was,

Cows are of many different forms and colors; their milk is always white. The path of virtue, like milk is one; the groups that teach it are many.¹⁰⁹

Children are thus led to believe that it really doesn't make any difference what religious or non-religious belief they profess; all groups which teach what is here called, but not defined, "the path of virtue," are equally good. This same book presented the following:

Our neighbors are different. Some believe in one God; some believe in many. Some like grubs while others like chips. Some have kings; others chiefs; and others presidents. But is there a right and a wrong way to do things?¹¹⁰

This quote forced the child to the following conclusion, which he assumed he made on the basis of free and objective inquiry: If it is all right for the people in other lands to enjoy eating grubs (and who can say that it is wrong, taste being simply a matter of preference), then it is also all right to believe in many gods. This conclusion lines up well with the assumption that "right" and "wrong" and "truth" are only to be viewed in a culturally defined way. But to those who believe that there is an authoritative statement from the one and true God, the conclusion that the child is conditioned to reach strikes against a fundamental religious belief. Furthermore, it lays the ground work upon which can be developed the belief that tolerance of other views is more important than anyone's personal belief.

It should be stressed again that informed evangelicals are not reacting as much to a value-clarification strategy as they are to the fact that the strategy followed is often used to indoctrinate humanistic assumptions. It is one thing to allow free inquiry to arrive at an understanding of what truth and morality are; it is another thing to say that truth and morality are only understood in relativistic terms and found by free inquiry. The January 1973 Christianity Today editorial quoted earlier stated this position,

Christians cannot expect that the public schools promote a Christian world and life view, but they can and should insist that whenever the subject matter moves into the area of philosophical or quasi religious commitments, the student be told what is happening and be made aware that other credible options are available. More than this we should not ask of public schools, but less than it we cannot accept unless we are willing to make of them established churches of secular materialism.¹¹¹

Moral Development--Lawrence Kohlberg

Another humanistic educator with whose works traditional theists, including evangelicals, often have trouble and through whom secular humanism is seen to have been brought into public schooling is Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University. Kohlberg's "moral education" theory is currently receiving much attention in the public school arena. This writer has already noted Alan Lockwood's statement that Kohlberg's moral development approach and the values clarification approach are the two most widely discussed approaches to values education. Like the values clarification expositors, Kohlberg is attempting to fill the void created by the alleged triumph of humanism over traditional morality.

McGraw noted that Kohlberg's six stages of moral development "are derived from earlier theories of John Dewey and Jean Piaget."¹¹² (Evangelical concern with the philosophy of John Dewey was treated earlier in this work in Chapter Two.) The association with Dewey and Piaget is clearly spelled out in an article by Kohlberg and Rochelle Mayer in the Harvard Educational Review entitled "Development as the Aim of Education." The preface to this article stated,

The authors offer an explanation of the psychological and philosophical positions underlying aspects of educational progressivism, most clearly identified with the work of John Dewey, with two other educational ideologies, the romantic and the cultural transmission conceptions, which historically have competed in the minds of educators as rationales for the choice of educational goals and practices. Kohlberg and Mayer maintain

that only progressivism, with its cognitive-developmental psychology, its interactionist epistemology, and its philosophically examined ethics, provides an adequate basis for our understanding of the process of education.¹¹³

Kohlberg rejected what he called the "social relativity" of the "cultural transmission" ideology in favor of what he termed "universal principles." This is also where he disagrees with the values clarification proponents. To Kohlberg, "social relativity" is defined as "the doctrine that values are relative to and based upon the standards of the particular culture and cannot be questioned or further justified."¹¹⁴ A "universal principle" is defined as "a universalizable, impartial mode of deciding or judging, not a concrete cultural rule."¹¹⁵ In distinguishing between "universal principles" and "cultural rules," Kohlberg contrasted one of the Ten Commandments, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," with Kant's Categorical Imperative, "Act only as you would be willing that everyone should act in the same situation." The former was perceived by him as a rule for specific behavior in a specific situation in a monogamous society. The Bible, evangelicals believe, presents it as a rule for specific behavior among all people who are willing to line up with God. Kant's Categorical Imperative, according to Kohlberg, is a rule to guide people for choosing among behaviors that is universally applicable because it "transcends and subsumes particular social laws."¹¹⁶

Kohlberg has presented what he felt was a "new approach" that avoided what he termed the "morass of sentimental confusions, value-bias, and cultural relativity," in which he accused the psychoanalytic and semantic approaches to morality to have been floundering.¹¹⁷ However,

Kohlberg had simply shifted the foundation to a different base. Rejecting the "equation of science with rationality" and accusing the "relativists of not correctly understanding philosophical modes of inquiry," Kohlberg and Mayer have stated that philosophy, not science, is the clarifier for concepts dealing with critical evaluation of beliefs and standards.¹¹⁸ Science, he felt, is limited to "casual explanation and prediction," but philosophy is concerned about "normative beliefs or standards."¹¹⁹ Kohlberg and Mayer have further stated that "there is fairly widespread agreement among philosophers that criteria for the validity of ethical judgments can be established independent of scientific or predictive criteria,"¹²⁰ and "most philosophers accept the methodological non-relativism of moral judgment just as they accept the methodological non-relativism of scientific judgment."¹²¹ That these are rather sweeping generalizations that may be difficult to prove should be apparent.

Having stated that his foundation is philosophy, Kohlberg has informed his readers that the school of philosophy from which he is coming is ethical liberalism. Stating that "progressive ideology," with which he identifies, rests on the value postulates of ethical liberalism and that his position "recognizes that value universals are ethical principles formulated and justified by the method of psychology,"¹²² Kohlberg revealed that he has not approached the subject value-free. Furthermore, he has revealed that he is working out of a form of humanism that regards man as autonomous and capable of developing the highest concept of morality over and above that which evangelicals regard as given by God. Children taught according to the Kohlberg

model do not reach the highest level when they act out of a desire to please God, or in obedience to "the revealed will of God" (the evangelical posture), but rather when they have acted in such a way as to "avoid self-condemnation" (a humanistic posture). Likewise, in a list describing the highest level one can reach in valuing human life, the highest level is significantly not when one sees that other human beings are made in the image of God, but when one attains to a "universal human value of respect for the individual."¹²⁴

Dr. Ruth Beechick, children's editor of Accent, a B/P Publication, is among those who have given an evangelical response to Kohlberg. She noted that "Kohlberg does argue along with Christians, that values cannot be relative."¹²⁵ Like evangelicals, "He sees that there must be a standard."¹²⁶ Beyond this point, the two depart.

Dr. Beechick noted,

But he would derive this standard by scientific means: what science finds is true in people becomes the thing that ought to be true. Science therefore takes the place of religion. Or, for Christians, it takes the place of God and His Word.¹²⁷

Carl A. Elder, author of Values and Moral Development in Children and Value Judgments: Decisions for Today, is another who has attempted to analyze Kohlberg from the evangelical vantage. Like Beechick, Elder has seen aspects of Kohlberg's work to which evangelicals can relate, but also like Beechick, he has observed that for evangelicals Kohlberg falls short. Elder has suggested that Kohlberg's work, to be used by evangelicals, needs to have added to it a consideration of four questions:

- (1) What effect does the "sin" principle have on the moral

development of children?

(2) What effect does the "conversion" experience of the child have on his or her moral development?

(3) What are some of the biblical guidelines concerning moral development?

(4) Is there a biblical pattern of moral development?¹²⁸

In answering the first question, Elder suggested that the "sin"

principle as presented in the Scriptures has the following effects:

(1) The sin principle helps to explain moral dilemmas of the child as well as all mankind.

(2) The sin principle operates in children and causes conflicts in their moral development and moral decisions.

(3) The sin principle operates in those adults who have charge of the child and weakens the child's moral development through bad examples.

(4) The sin principle operates in society as a whole and as a result tends to undermine and jeopardize the moral development of children.

(5) If the sin principle is allowed to follow its ultimate course, no amount of morality will save its victim.¹²⁹

Conversely, according to evangelical belief, Elder pointed out, "the conversion experience" (a term used by evangelicals to describe the salvation experience of an individual) has a positive influence on the moral development of children. This is manifested in the following ways:

(1) The conversion experience is the only answer to the sin principle.

(2) The conversion experience gives to the child the sense of forgiveness and hope which are necessary for his moral development.

(3) The conversion experience brings to the child a new and personal awareness of God and moral values.

(4) The conversion experience enables the child to receive help and guidance from the Holy Spirit, which is a new power source for moral development.

(5) Conversion is also experienced by many parents and workers with children and as a result, greatly influences the moral development of children.

(6) The conversion experience brings to the child a new understanding of love as he or she relates to others.

(7) The conversion experience gives to the child a new sense of importance.¹³⁰

Evangelicals cannot ask that public schools teach the sin principle or the conversion experience, but they should insist that teaching which contradicts these teachings or which purports to have the same effect be likewise recognized as "religious" in nature and handled as such. This is especially needful as it relates to non-traditional religious beliefs, like Kohlberg's, predicated on the alleged objectivity of scientific fact.

Among the biblical guidelines concerning moral development that Elder cited is the role and relationship of adult instructors, especially parents.¹³¹ He noted that the Scriptures (Proverbs 4:1) state that children are to hear the instruction of their parents; parents are to teach their children to love God with all their mind, heart, and soul (Deuteronomy 6:5-7); parents are to instruct in moral training so as to equip their children to have life (Proverbs 22:6). This instruction is to be accompanied by discipline and correction, according to Proverbs 22:15, 23:13. Parents who do not do so will suffer shame (Proverbs 29:15). Parents are to set a godly example (Proverbs 20:7), and parents and other adults are warned in Mark 9:42 not to cause a child to stumble from the faith.

This role of adults, according to Elder, is a real weakness of Kohlberg's theory. He cited from Norma K. Stone to this effect,

Since both Kohlberg and Piaget emphasize the independence of moral growth from adult instruction, there is clear implication that maximum growth could be achieved without it. Yet both acknowledge the force of interaction with the environment, of which adults must be considered a vital part; and they have recognized the age-related but not age dependent nature of the stages. Kohlberg seems to be begging the question by admitting the influence of cognitive stimulation on the transitional

growth from one stage to the next but not the influence of teaching to enhance and consolidate such growth.¹³²

The Kohlberg approach comes from a conviction that there are certain universal moral stages in a continuum ranging from lowest to highest. Kohlberg himself has said, "I have stressed that this moral form presupposes a concern for stimulation to a higher stage of reasoning."¹³³ He further explained, "The educator must be a socializer, teaching value content and behavior and not only a Socratic or Rogerian process-facilitator of development."¹³⁴ Educators using this approach are therefore admittedly working to assist children to achieve a higher stage than they are at. Since "most adults are at stages three and four,"¹³⁵ these educators are often in the position of attempting to raise the child's value beliefs above those of his parents. To the evangelical this is fine as long as it means that children whose parents are (what evangelicals consider to be) immoral and unethical are being brought to morality and ethics. But when children are encouraged and actively stimulated to achieve a "level" that implies or states that a person is at a higher level when he acts out of concern for his fellow man, than out of concern to do the will of God, then the evangelical parent will rise up in protest and ask who gave the educator that right or duty. In such a case, the answer would be that it came from the "religious" presupposition that one's duty to his fellow man is the highest and noblest duty of an individual. And that is what the religion of secular humanism teaches.

Evangelicals are not the only ones questioning the Kohlberg approach. Jack R. Fraenkel, writing in Social Education, has noted,

in reference to the claim that Kohlberg has identified his universal principles in all nine cultures that he examined:

This is a rather small sample from which to infer the sweeping conclusion that the description of moral development for all people in all cultures has been found.¹³⁶

Ronald S. Brandt, interviewing Edward Fenton, director of the Carnegie-Mellon Education Center and leading proponent of Kohlberg's theory, asked about this questioning of the "fact" of the universal principles. Fenton replied,

In a couple of Kohlberg's articles there are implications that the stages are universal. But when you get Larry in a careful moment...he says that in the societies studied...we have identified stage one, two, three, and four thought. We've also identified stage five thought in the relatively advanced societies--United States, Great Britain, Israel, and Canada. Since studies have been done in only nine societies, you really can't say that the stages are universal.¹³⁷

Fraenkel also questioned the "fact" of whether there are six stages. In the article just cited Fraenkel stated,

The fact that there really are six stages has by no means been established. Only three individuals have been identified as being at stage six--Kohlberg himself, one of his graduate students, and Martin Luther King.¹³⁸

These last two points, that Kohlberg's conclusions are largely based upon small samples and that his findings from these samples are, at best, sketchy, should be sufficient to point out the need for a "go slow" introduction into public schools. This is especially true considering the emotional nature of the subject.

Finally, it is only fair to note that Kohlberg himself has suggested that practicing teachers who work with moral education "can and should be more eclectic" than simply using his approach.¹³⁹ On the

other hand, those, who like himself, do research "serve most usefully by testing a single intellectual approach or theory in order to both refine it and see its limits."¹⁴⁰ By so stating, Kohlberg has shown that he is less dogmatic than are some of his followers who would attempt to use this approach as the panacea for moral education and thereby contribute to evangelical discomfort.

Decreased Parental Input in Public Schooling

Chapter 2 showed how evangelicals have a firm belief that the ultimate responsibility for educating the child rests with the parents. Certain developments were mentioned that have taken place within the educational system during the late 1800's and 1900's to move control away from the local sphere, where parents would logically have greater input, to a more centralized one. Small local schools with a teacher who generally socialized within the community could more easily be approached by parents than the larger, centralized ones. Parents more often than not viewed the school as an ally, reinforcing the influence of home, rather than as a force challenging it. Though many evangelicals were oblivious to the process, there was developing, although slowly and often not deliberately, an educational mindset that viewed the educational task not to aide parents, but rather to aide society. Added to it has been the growing assumption that teachers "know more than parents" and therefore have the responsibility to correct parental inaccuracies, even in value areas where mankind has never had consensus.

M. Stanton Evans, chairman of the American Conservative Union, has commented on this development in such a way that many evangelicals would readily nod their assent. Evans said,

This fixation with the schools, getting authority over children at any early age, and with using such authority to remedy alleged defects in the family, is suggestive of totalitarian attitudes. Every culture is concerned, of course about the education of its young. But in totalitarian states such efforts have a special and characteristic twist. The object of the schooling here is to change the young people into something different from young people before them, and indeed quite different from people in general as they have hitherto been known to history. Without exception, these regimes have tried to replace the natural influence of the parent with the pervasive tutelage of the state. Hostility to traditional family relationships is thus a leading feature of totalitarian societies, and we have reason to be disturbed when it becomes a feature of our own.¹⁴¹

Evans linked this "mindset" which aims at correcting alleged parental inadequacies to the continuing battle in the public schools over sex education, an area where evangelicals have frequently manifested their discontent. Evans noted that parents who object to sex education are often portrayed as falsely charging that their children are being exposed to pornography, while the program is portrayed as an attempt to help youth avoid venereal disease and pregnancy. He has suggested that while "the explicit nature of some of the materials" does raise serious questions, this is "incidental to the underlying problems associated with the movement."¹⁴² According to Evans, there are interrelated and recurring notions which appear throughout the sex education literature. Among these notions is "the idea that sex education should be taught, not simply in terms of fact, but according to certain value assumptions--which boil down to a belief that sexual

indulgence is natural and healthy if it feels good and doesn't hurt any person."¹⁴³ Another recurring idea is that sex education should be taught as a means of limiting population increase. He quoted from a Planned Parenthood official and a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare official to the effect that many proponents of this movement consider sex education as "social engineering."¹⁴⁴

Evans suggested that "the combined effect of such instruction is to separate the idea of sexual activity from the idea of procreation, the first being perceived as good, healthy, and fun, the second as antisocial and to be avoided."¹⁴⁵ Barbara Morris, author of The Religion of Humanism in the Public Schools, quoted in her book from a paper entitled "Sexuality and the Schools," written by Marianne and Sidney Simon and published by the Adirondack Mt. Humanistic Education Center, Upper Jay, New York. In the article the Simons stated essentially what Evans charged. They said,

Schools can no longer be permitted to carry out such a horrendously effective program for drying up students' sense of their sexual identity. The schools must not be allowed to continue fostering the immorality of morality. An entirely different set of values must be nourished.¹⁴⁶

Evans contended that while such ideas have gained wide currency in society, "there is equally little doubt that many parents hold contrary opinions and don't want their children instructed in such manner." This, Evans stated, "shows us the real preoccupation of the sex education movement--the need to do something about the parents.... The most persistent theme of the sex education enthusiasts...it is up to the school to overcome the difficulties parents create for their own children."¹⁴⁷ Dr. Harold Lief, of the University of Pennsylvania, a

sex education proponent, is quoted from his Sexual Behavior book by Evans, to this end.

All the evidence we have demonstrates that parents are very poor sex educators. Either their overriding concern with morality or their own hang-ups prevent them from talking about sex with comfort and ease....¹⁴⁸

The fact that parents may be very poor sex educators, may in fact be true. It may very well point up the need for evangelicals to re-evaluate these deficiencies. However, the issue at stake here is the fact that Lief and others view "an overriding concern with morality" as an obstacle to effective sex education. James Allen, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, has stated, "The biggest problem in sex education is not the children, but the damn parents."¹⁴⁹ With this mindset a guideline used in New York public schools asserted, "It is definitely not recommended to do the unit on sex education on a 'parent permission' basis."¹⁵⁰ Evans concluded his comments,

The ultimate meaning of the sex education battle is... an assertion by the government agents in the schools that they have an interest which supersedes the authority of the parent-- in this case affecting not simply cognitive skills but involving the most intimate matters of emotional and psychological development.¹⁵¹

Barbara Morris noted,

Anything a child needs to know about sex at any given stage of his development can be explained in a very brief period of time....It doesn't take 12 continual years unless...you are trying to establish or alter values, attitudes, and behaviors.¹⁵²

As discussed, society today no longer holds to an evangelical consensus and teachers generally represent the majority values inherent in society. Many evangelicals view as a grave problem this mindset that sees the task of education to reform society, apart from meaningful

parental input, away from that which does not conform morally either to their own standards or those of the majority. Morality today is often defined so as to make evangelical beliefs appear immoral. The Simon term, "immorality of morality," provides one example. Unfair labeling is not only true in the area of sex education but also in the discussions of homosexuality and abortion. Many educators, influenced by humanistic training, view evangelicals and other anti-abortion people, who insist abortion is murder, as insensitive and unloving. Evangelicals are often accused of placing a higher value on what are perceived as arbitrary rules than on the "real problems" of people, especially women who do not want babies and might suffer emotional stress if they must give birth to a child. Likewise, when evangelicals take a biblical stance against the current movement toward "sameness" regarding sexuality, they are portrayed as immorally working to prevent women from reaching self-fulfillment. The point is that given a mindset that the educational task involves an aiding of society and a correcting of what is perceived as the faulty values of the home, when there is no universal agreement as to what the educational product will be, many parents, not just evangelicals, are increasingly manifesting fear over what is viewed as a usurpation of parental authority and rights. There is an increasing notation by evangelicals and resentment over what they feel is unwarranted and arrogant disdain of parental values, when those values are inconsistent with those of the educators.

John Avey, a former high school English teacher and a Roman Catholic, writing in The Alternative magazine nearly 10 years ago, described the above situation, which he asserted was widespread

throughout the educational world. His comments reflect what this writer has heard over and over again from evangelical participants in public education. Using a former colleague as an illustration and referring to a particular conversation with him, Avey related the response he was given when he suggested that the reading list assigned for an English honors course was too much for fourteen and fifteen year old children. Joe, his colleague, responded,

These kids have to be shaken up. They come to school with the prejudices of their homes and the church and they just don't think. It's our job as teachers to challenge them, to start them thinking.¹⁵³

Avey claimed that "thinking" in this context means "adhering to certain skeptical and even cynical attitudes toward popularly held middle and working class beliefs; while "challenge" means that the teacher "does" everything in his power to start a child "thinking" about...the possibility of atheism, for example."¹⁵⁴ Avey declared this approach has "effectively demolished the concept of truth" for many students.¹⁵⁵

Acknowledging that the approach described above is probably more prevalent at the college level, Avey described what he saw as an all too prevalent intellectual progression. Upon arrival at college the student is generally "passive" and accepts the views of parents and those who most closely affect his daily life--a factor, Avey stated, that usually means an "unexamined adherence to what might be called the standard emotional response to words such as patriotism, God, law, right, wrong."¹⁵⁶ When this student enters college and comes into contact with magazines, books, and people who question the standard responses, he enters a second stage. This is usually the introduction

to what might be called non-prejudicial thought. The student quickly observes that "the professors speak a different language; they do not accept beliefs and values of the parents and the neighborhood; indeed, they find those values and beliefs ludicrous, biased, bigoted." It is at this point that the student is faced with a dilemma. He has come to realize that reality is more complicated than his parent-group has led him to understand. He cannot get away in class with giving the standard responses acceptable in his previous environment because professors often destroy such responses with incisive arguments based on what appears to the student to be irrefutable evidence. Therefore, the student concludes,

Both the method and the beliefs of the two groups are somehow distinct: if you believe in God, you must believe in God the way Uncle Louis does; Uncle Louis believes in a way that is uninformed, bigoted, not at all intellectually sophisticated and, therefore, not only his way of believing but the concepts he believes must be erroneous....

The professor, on the other hand, believes in agnosticism in such a way that a freshman soon comes to admire not only his method (documentation, quotations, well reasoned arguments), but the fruits of the method, i.e. agnosticism, cynicism about the prejudices held by the working class.¹⁵⁸

Unable any longer to hold intellectually onto the method of beliefs he received from his parents, the student is, in the wake of a persistent demonstration by his professors that thinking "intellectually" produces certain conclusions (usually at variance with the home), forced to abandon the content of parental belief.¹⁵⁹

What is wrong here, according to Avey, "is not that the student has learned ways to challenge the beliefs of his parents," but that, "he has not learned ways to challenge the beliefs of those professors

who challenge the beliefs of his parents."¹⁶⁰ He has charged that no one ever tells the student,

Yes, it is true your parents don't think in the sophisticated way the professors do. But it does not therefore logically follow that the views held by your parents are undesirable and the views held by the professors desirable. What matters is whether or not such views are true.¹⁶¹

Avey called for a third stage to be promoted within education characterized by questioning the conclusions of the professors using their own methods. Currently, students are told that the battle is only between what they came to school with and what they are getting now. Avey felt that students must be made aware of another battle involving a questioning of the information they are now getting. He further noted that "in all of the major areas of thought, there is a reasonable, scholarly, well documented, rational, humane, intellectual position diametrically opposed to the relativists...quite in line with the conclusions of the parents and church."¹⁶² Information stating this position, however, is hard to find on campus. Avey has called for an opening up of this material to students, who then will be in a position to challenge the dogmatism of educational reformers and move education to true inquiry.

Sharing much of the same concern as Avey, Dr. James J. Veltkamp, professor of education at Christian Heritage College in El Cajon, California, has asserted that part of the problem is the "theoretically unlimited freedom" accorded teachers.¹⁶³ Veltkamp said,

As researchers, challengers, testers, interpreters, and counselors, these empowered educators enter the classroom to mold the minds and direct the lives of young people. In view of this awesome culture forming, life shaping power, even secular

thinkers are beginning to ask certain significant questions, such as (1) What right have these instructors to such academic freedom with its tremendous potential for influence? and (2) Who supervises those thinkers and teachers to whom we entrust so much, while in the name of academic freedom, safeguards are multiplied to free them from all supervision? These questions themselves epitomize the monopolistic power of the national liberal-arts religion of secularism, with its mythological quest for truth.¹⁶⁴

Many educators will bustle at these statements by Veltkamp because they challenge the notion of academic freedom. However, when applied to compulsory public education which is viewed as working toward an altering of parental values and often using "a stacked deck," it is observed that what is actually at stake is not simply academic freedom, but parental rights. Some evangelicals are asking at what point academic freedom supersedes the right of a parent to mold the values of his children?

Paul Kienel, one of the leading proponents of evangelical private schools, has noted several reasons why many evangelicals are leaving public education. The major reasons he gave relate both to the loss of parental control and the increased emphasis on reform. According to Kienel, a major reason is the fact that "Parents are losing faith in the public schools because they are generally losing control of them."¹⁶⁵ Kienel observed that many parents are losing faith in the government schools "because some schools are embarking on a course for which they were never intended--change agents."¹⁶⁶ Kienel admitted the existence of a growing number of irresponsible parents who are harmful to their children and called this "deplorable." He suggested, however, that many social scientists and educators working out of the mindset that they have the responsibility to reform society

have gone beyond any mandate given them by the people and made it difficult for evangelical parents to carry out the commands given them by God. Kienel referred to Roger W. McIntire, professor of psychology at the University of Maryland, who called for a licensing of parenthood in the October 1973 issue of Psychology Today. McIntire's reason appeared to be more out of a concern for children's psychological development than for such traditionally accepted government concerns such as physical safety. Kienel conveyed the idea that many evangelicals fear that views similar to McIntire's represent more than just a few isolated cases and are in fact reflective of a mood that is quickly ascending in popularity. The new emphasis on child abuse is one indication. Kienel noted the wording of the recently revised educational code in Ohio, which stated,

...the natural rights of a parent to custody and control of...children are subordinate to the power of the state to provide for the education of children. Laws providing for the education of children are for the protection of the state itself. 168

Ohio's revised code was the center of a storm that erupted in Ohio in 1974-1976 when 13 parents were criminally indicted for failing to send their children to a state accredited school. All 13 of these parents had their children in a private, non-accredited Christian school. All objected to the accredited schools because such schools had to conform to a set of minimum standards that openly espoused the religion of secular humanism. They took their case to the Ohio Supreme Court, where they had their conviction overturned. The court said,

...we share the concern of appellants. (Whisner et. al.) that the philosophy espoused especially in EDb-401-03 (B) relating to the teaching of citizenship, social studies, and health, may be interpreted as promoting "secular humanism," and as such, may

unconstitutionally be applied to these appellants to
 "unduly burden the free exercise of religion....169

The significance of the Ohio v. Whisner case to this study is that the case shows the presence at a high level of the increasingly prevalent idea that the rights of parents are subservient to those of the state. While the Whisner case upheld the rights of parents in Ohio to escape the humanism of public education, it did not go to the heart of the issue and rule on the plight of those evangelicals who for one reason or another have chosen to remain in public schooling. While evangelicals have the right to leave public schooling in Ohio since this case, those who remain must do so in an atmosphere the Ohio Supreme Court admitted is permeated with the religion of secular humanism.

The National Education Association

Another factor militating against parental control in public education is the increased desire of the National Education Association to control education. A recent article in the Readers Digest by Eugene H. Methvin addressed this issue. Methvin quoted Representative John Ashbrook (R-Ohio), a veteran member of the House Education and Labor Committee, as having said, "An integral part of the NEA design is to siphon ever more control of public education from the grass roots to Washington, closer to its own powerful lobbying influence, farther from the parents and tax payers who elect the school boards and pay the bills."¹⁷⁰ To support Ashbrook's charge, Methvin quoted former NEA

president, Catharine Barrett, as saying, "and we are determined to control the direction of education."¹⁷¹ Terry Herndon, the current (1979) NEA president bluntly stated the ultimate goal of the NEA is to "reorder the priorities of the United States of America."¹⁷² Whether or not the NEA's move for increased control of education will mean a more rapid movement away from evangelicals is not as large an issue as is the fact that such a development simply means a greater loss of parental control, a factor that in the long run will insure such a movement. Recognizing that society itself is moving away from historic evangelicalism, evangelicals fear any more loss of parental control.

The staff of The Capsule, a magazine designed to present "a Christian perspective on education," noted the issue of parental rights in education and related it to "a conflict of views regarding the purpose of education in the public schools."¹⁷³ It was pointed out that one group views the attempt to change the child's values as going "too" far.¹⁷⁴ This group can generally be seen today as pushing for a return to the basics of teaching reading, writing, math, and civics. The other group believes that schools should go farther into value education and personality adjustment. If the results of the 1976 Christian Educator's survey are indicative, most evangelicals, at this time, can be found among the first group (80% of those responding--none strongly disagreeing--said they believe public schools should concentrate more on the basics). However, this same questionnaire did reveal that evangelicals would be more eager to move into the values area if they felt that such a movement were accompanied by equal treatment of their views. The Capsule article expressed a view that

central to the conflict is the fundamental question, "Who is responsible and what philosophy will undergird the teaching?"¹⁷⁵ It noted:

The crucial question being raised consistently in our society is : Who has ultimate authority over a child, the parent or the state?¹⁷⁶

This may be the central unanswered question in American public education. The ultimate answer given will more than likely determine whether evangelicals (to any extent) can in good conscience remain in public schooling. It is here that the basic issue lies for evangelicals. It is here where it ultimately will be decided whether public schooling will ever achieve the pluralism so widely acclaimed. If schooling is to be left in the hands of society-reforming professionals at the expense of parents, evangelicals will continue to withdraw their children.

Evangelical Failure

Thus far this study has concentrated on public education problems and issues which evangelicals face stemming from failures inherent within the system itself. That, however, is only a part, significant though it is, of the picture. Another aspect of the problem directly relates to failure on the part of evangelicals themselves. Chapter Two dealt with the emphasis laid upon the biblical role of parents to "raise their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; yet, the history of evangelicalism revealed laxity in this matter. Also noted was the definite movement on the part of the

educational establishment to gain a greater control over children's education than perhaps was ever known in America, even though a large segment of evangelical Christian parents are apparently doing little more than complaining about the injustices done to them by the public schools. The results of the questionnaires sent to the 31 youth and their parents indicated a great need of the evangelical parents to awaken to the biblically mandated responsibility. The findings here confirmed the assessment of 85.1% of the Christian educators who expressed a belief that most evangelical homes are negligent in preparing children for public school. Every parent responding claimed to be vitally concerned over the spiritual development of their children. Likewise, every respondent stated a belief that their belief system is not treated fairly in relationship to other value systems in either textbooks or the supplemental materials used in their child's school. They expressed a unanimous conviction that when evangelical values are presented, they are often misrepresented. Such misrepresentation "frustrated" 80% of them, while 70% further claimed that they were also frustrated over the simple omission of their beliefs in their children's class instructional materials; 82% viewed their children also as being frustrated over misrepresentation, while 67.7% saw frustration in their children over the omission of their beliefs.

Despite these statements of concern, recognition of the fact of the problem and alleged feeling of frustration, 70% admitted they do not spend at least one hour a day instructing their children in spiritual matters. In fact, the student results assert an average of only 1.7 hours spent a week in planned home religious instruction. While

60% of the parents stated they had a specific outline of study in the home, further investigation disclosed that half of these probably existed only in the desires of the parents. One child, whose parents declared they had a specific outline, wrote on her questionnaire, "We don't have family devotions; I wish we did." Disagreeing that they had "meaningful family devotions" were 54% of the young people. Perhaps even more important is the fact that given an opportunity to describe their home devotion time these 54% virtually said they had no formalized religious instruction at all; only 15% indicated a time that could in any way be construed to be meaningful. One respondent did say that once a day there were discussions of 15 minutes or more with the parents concerning spiritual matters, yet could not list one topic in any way correlated to what was happening at school.

Having seen the absence of formalized training, one would naturally seek to find out the extent of informal training that might be taking place. The student questionnaire asked how many times in the previous two weeks they had sat down with either or both parents for more than 15 minutes to discuss a spiritual matter. One-third had not done this at all. The group averaged $4\frac{1}{2}$ discussions. Two stated they did so every day; only one of these, however, correlated at all with school. The group averaged less than one discussion over the past two weeks that was correlated to what went on at school. Despite the professed interest and concern of their parents, 61% said their parents do not often start discussions with them on topics they discuss and study at school, but nearly 70% believed their parents "really understand what they should know as a Christian youth."

The lack of formalized efforts of parents to teach their children plus their apparent lack of concern to initiate discussions of that which occupies the greatest amount of their children's time, may indeed be why such a high percentage of these youth feel ill prepared to share their beliefs, when appropriate, in class discussions. Of the students 46% agreed with the statement, "Actually, I usually don't know enough about what I am supposed to believe to effectively share the 'Christian' view in class discussions." This contrasts to the fact that nearly 82% of the parents felt that their child/children have a "very good knowledge of their Christian beliefs." The teachers agreed with the students, as 59% responded that evangelical students in their classes were not as knowledgeable concerning their beliefs as most of their other students. The same percentage reported that their evangelical youth do not share their beliefs as freely as other students.

Why, then, are so few parents spending time instructing their children "in the way they should go?" Gary Collins, well-known evangelical psychologist has suggested that part of the problem lies in the decreased importance given to the home by many evangelical parents. He wrote in Eternity Magazine,

The home is becoming less and less important in the lives of many people. There are many demands on our time from outside the home, so much so that for many families the home is little more than a convenient place to sleep, grab a bite to eat, and get the laundry done.

This affects every member of the family. The father too often is absent, or when he gets home, too tired to get involved in home activities. The mother is either working to supplement the family income or involved in activities that are supposed to be more fulfilling than homemaking. The kids are either left on their own or caught up in a variety of community, school, and church-related activities.¹⁷⁷

Another leading evangelical author, Dr. James Dobson, associate clinical professor of pediatrics at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, addressed the same dilemma-- that of busy lives. Dobson has written,

I've been most concerned about the impact of busy lives on the spiritual training of boys and girls. As someone stated, "Values are not taught to children, they are caught by them." In other words, it is very difficult to teach our children what we believe in formalized training sessions. Instead, we transfer our values and our love for God in the casual moments when we are together....

Children need to spend time with their parents. They need to interact with them and ask questions and identify with the adult model. This vitally important process can't take place if mothers and fathers are exhausted when they are at home, and have nothing left to give.¹⁷⁸

Beyond the fact that many parents simply are not spending with their children the time that will enable them to "catch" their biblical values, is the fact that for many parents "what they do speaks louder than what they say." Linda M. Boice, wife of Dr. James M. Boice, who is pastor of Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, an author, and prominent evangelical leader, has noted that despite the teaching of the Scripture that we are to "seek first the kingdom of God," many evangelical parents do not often live by it themselves.¹⁷⁹ She explained that parents often by their actions have conveyed to their children that "secular activities always come first."¹⁸⁰

An increasing number of evangelicals are pointing out that many of the problems evangelical parents experience in teaching evangelical values to their children ties directly with their having accepted a life style that is really no different from the average person in society.

Marion E. Lazenby, a fundamentalist Methodist pastor, has affirmed, "The line of demarcation between the church and the world is almost invisible. Too many people in the church are doing the same thing that many on the outside of the church are doing."¹⁸¹ John M. Drescher wrote in 1975,

During the past several decades, the church experienced little criticism or conflict from the world, not because the world is more Christian but because the world and church are so much alike....

The Christian has accepted the world's standards...with little thought of a life style more fitting to "strangers and pilgrims."¹⁸²

There are many evangelical parents who do spend time with their children and who do exhibit a biblical life style, but many of them also find it difficult to have formalized sessions that deal with the issues their children must face in the public school world. Many such parents lack the necessary training to combat some of the more academic issues. For such parents much responsibility for failure here can be directed to the inability of the church to fulfill its ministry to the home. Nearly 89% of the respondents to the Christian Educators survey felt that most evangelical churches are ineffective in preparing youth for what awaits them in public school. Likewise, the results of the study of 31 evangelical youth revealed that local churches are not meeting the needs of the youth. In fact, based upon the student responses, one might conclude that there was virtually no attempt on the part of their churches to assist evangelical youth in meeting the pressures of attempting to correlate, synthesize, or evaluate what they are getting at school with what they should know about their Christian

belief or behavior. Claiming that there were no topics discussed at church in the previous three months that were also discussed at school were 77% of the youth. The parent questionnaires disclosed a similar result; while 56% of the parents responding felt some attempt was being made at their church to correlate Christianity with "secular knowledge," 70% felt that their church nonetheless had a weak program for training its youth. As developed in Chapter Two, the evangelical community has always made some attempt on the part of the larger body, the church, to assist the home in educating the children. In recent years this has most often taken the form of a Sunday School program.

Perceptive evangelicals, however, have observed that some Sunday School programs have become little more than baby sitting sessions while adults have their meetings. Other programs have made real attempts to teach biblical concepts but have often left out a conscious attempt to relate biblical content to real life situations. This latter point has been observed by Harold Westing, professor of Christian Education at Conservative Baptist Theological Seminary in Denver, Colorado. Westing is the former director of Christian Education Ministries of the Conservative Baptist Association of America. He said,

I am alarmed that the goal of these faithful workers (Sunday School teachers) has been to aid students in stock-piling religious information rather than grapple with them as they seek to conform their values with Scripture.¹⁸³

Westing went further and suggested that perhaps "the church has failed to communicate our desired values because our programs segregate children too much of the time from their parents and grandparents."¹⁸⁴

Westing noted,

Youth will learn to pray as they watch us pray, they will learn to deal with sin as they see the congregation deal with sinners. They will learn to show compassion as they see the congregation display that to a needy world.¹⁸⁵

Lawrence O. Richards, professor of Christian Education at the Wheaton Graduate School at Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, is another evangelical who has called for renewal in the church's ministry to parents. The typical Sunday school program has several drawbacks, according to Richards. Among "the most serious" is the time boundary which "tends to limit expression in class to the concept level."¹⁸⁶ Richards has seen the need to get beyond the task simply of pouring out concepts to get the youth involved in the kind of Bible study that leads to and demands response. To get teens interacting, according to Richards, they first must be stimulated to prepare outside the classroom. In order to do this, "they must become convinced of the meaning of God's Word for their lives, and as they begin to discover reality by living in obedience to Christ," they will be "motivated to learn more."¹⁸⁷ With youth coming to class prepared, "they can focus on...that process of exploring values and present experience in the light of Scripture, which is not only essential for decision, but which requires the rational context that group study can provide."¹⁸⁸ The home preparation frees time for group interaction.

Assuming evangelicals can transform a Sunday school ministry into a viable mode of assisting parents, if parents themselves are not helped to fulfill their responsibilities, the total program will be at best incomplete. As mentioned previously, many parents themselves

need training in how to teach their children. This may be the most neglected area of evangelical involvement in the teaching field. The primary emphasis in the Scriptures is upon the teaching that parents give. Evangelicals face a dangerous tendency to attempt to resolve present difficulties by creating a framework which stresses the church's role more than the parents'. The church has a helping ministry in Christian education but it is a ministry first of helping the parent to do his and her task and then of supplementing the parent role where more teaching is needed. In a later chapter this study will present guidelines for Christian education.

As schools become more pluralistic, and if they do allow evangelicals a voice as one of the options to be considered by a society ready to admit that present solutions are not meeting needs, evangelicalism will be seriously considered only if evangelical youth arrive prepared to share that which they know and of which they are convinced.

Summary

The writer has surveyed public education from an evangelical posture and seen that there exists a lack of policy safeguard to protect evangelicals from the rising religion of secular humanism. Evangelicals disagree with the attempts of humanists to fill the vacuum created by the disestablishment of the traditional moral absolutes, and they, along with others, face determined efforts by public schools to wrest control over the education of their children from them. Finally,

there exists widespread failure on the part of evangelicals themselves-- their failure to carry out their own professed convictions. The issues boil down to these:

(1) Is the educational establishment committed enough to the concept of neutrality to spend the time and effort to develop consistent policy regulating the entire area of religion in accord with standard concepts of democracy?

(2) Who has the rights in the area of a child's education?

(3) Are evangelicals ready to take seriously the biblical commands to teach children by spending the time, sacrificing the comforts, and evaluating the present activities in light of evident needs?

If the answer to the first question is "no," then it will become apparent that evangelicals can no longer afford to stay with public schooling, and they will leave with the knowledge that they have been forced out by those who only talk a case for pluralism. Regarding the second issue, unless it is affirmed that parents hold the primary rights over what their children will be taught, evangelicals will have no other option than to withdraw their children from those whom they believe might at any point be working to overturn all their efforts at home--efforts they believe that stem from God-given commands. In regard to the third basic issue, unless evangelical parents and youth workers regain their position and assume their responsibilities in the area of not only teaching concepts but effectively aiding in the transference of concepts into internalized values and behavior, they will themselves either surrender their children to other beliefs or be forced to turn to the private Christian school and ask these schools to do what God has instructed them to do. This is not to imply that private Christian schools do not have a role to play in Christian education, but rather a warning to evangelicals that the private

Christian school itself, if utilized, can only be viewed as a supplemental aide to parents and the local church, not a replacement.

The next chapter will focus on the current attempts being made both by public school educators and evangelicals to meet the problems discussed in this chapter. Central to the discussion will be an analysis of the "teaching about religion" programs in public education classes and the rise of Christian schools.

FOOTNOTES

¹ National School Public Relations Association, Religion and the Schools (Washington, D.C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970), p. 31.

² Daryl Fair, "The Church-State Policy Process," Policy Studies Journal, (Winter, 1975), p. 119.

³ Louis Rittweger, "An Analysis of Virginia's Public School Policies on Religion from Historical, Public Policy, and Evangelical Christian Perspectives" (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1978), p. 185.

⁴ Ibid., p. 187.

⁵ Ibid., p. 185.

⁶ Ibid., p. 190.

⁷ Ibid., p. 195.

⁸ School District of Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U. S. 203, 83 S. Ct. 1560 (Pa. 1963).

⁹ Margherite La Pota, "Religion: Not 'Teaching' But 'Teaching About' " (Dayton, Ohio: PERSC, n.d.), p. 1, citing Justice Brennan.

¹⁰ "Invisible" in the sense that most people are not aware of what distinguishes evangelicals from other Christians.

¹¹ In light of recent media attention to the "born again" movement, one might question whether evangelicals are "socially impotent." Nevertheless, despite the increased number of people placing themselves in the evangelical camp, the actual beliefs that characterize evangelicalism demonstrate that the current culture does not hold to as much of an evangelical consensus as it once did. The acceptance of divorce is one example.

¹² Brief Amicus Curiae of the Center for Law and Religious Freedom of the Christian Legal Society in Support of Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Bruce Johnson et al. v. Huntington Beach Union High School District, S. Ct. (1977), p. 41.

¹ Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Don Howarth and Lisa Runquist, "Religious Observances in Public Schools" (paper presented at the meeting of the Christian Legal Society, Atlanta, Ga., April, 1979), p. 7.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Paul Kurtz, "What is Humanism?", Moral Problems in Contemporary Society (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969), p. 1.

²⁰James Stahr, "The 1980's, What Lies Ahead?", Interest, (January 1980), p. 3.

²¹Kurtz, op. cit., p. 1.

²²The writer wishes to note that the study being cited, while conducted under valid research principles, did not have sufficient numbers to be considered more than suggestive.

²³Robert T. Hall, "Moral Education Today: Progress, Prospects, and Problems of a Field Come of Age," The Humanist, (November-December, 1978), p. 8.

²⁴Nicholas Piediscalzi and William E. Collie, Teaching About Religion in Public Schools (Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1977), p. 18.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Elmer L. Towns, Have the Public Schools Had It? (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1974), p. 36.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Stuart Fowler, "The Christian in a Permissive Society," Reformation for the Family, comp. Reformation Today (Worthing, Sussex, England: Henry E. Walter Ltd., 1974), p. 150.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Ibid.

³²Behind the Mask: Our Psychological World (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 124.

- 33 Ibid., p. 130.
- 34 David Tribe, 100 Years of Free Thought (London: Elek Books Ltd., 1967), p. 48.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Fowler, op. cit., p. 150.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Humanist Manifest I and II (Buffalo, N. Y.: Prometheus Books, 1973).
- 40 Ibid., p. 16.
- 41 Ibid.
- 42 Ibid., p. 17.
- 43 Morris B. Storrer, "A Committee to Investigate the Paramoral? Can We Broaden the Base of Humanistic Agreement in Ethics?", The Humanist, (January-February, 1979), p. 31.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 Hall, op. cit., p. 9.
- 46 Ibid.
- 47 Onalee McGraw, Secular Humanism and the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come (Washington, D.C.: The Heritage Foundation, 1976), p. 4.
- 48 Ibid.
- 49 Ronald E. Cordero, "Ethical Theory and the Teaching of Values," The Educational Forum, (January, 1976), p. 205.
- 50 Ibid., p. 206.
- 51 Ibid., p. 208.
- 52 Ibid., p. 209.
- 53 Ibid.
- 54 Kurtz, op. cit., p. 2.

- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Humanist Manifest I and II, op. cit., p. 13.
- 57 Richard B. Bliss, "Evolution and Humanism in Today's Public Schools," Evangelizing Today's Child, (May-June, 1978), p. 4.
- 58 Corliss Lamont, Humanism as a Philosophy (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1957), p. 188.
- 59 Julian Huxley, Religion Without Revelation (New York: New American Library, Inc., 1957), p. 188.
- 60 American Humanist Association, "We Invite You," The Humanist, (November-December, 1978), p. 25.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Elizabeth Leonie Simpson, Humanist Education: An Interpretation (Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976).
- 63 Phillip May, Which Way to Educate? (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), p. 49.
- 64 Ibid., p. 50.
- 65 Bliss, op. cit., p. 6.
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 Loren Eiseley, The Immense Journey (New York: Random House, 1957), p. 199.
- 69 David J. Volt, "Religion in the Public Schools," Educational Theory, (Winter, 1974), p. 109.
- 70 Editorial, Christianity Today, (January 5, 1973), p. 28.
- 71 Ariel A. Roths, "Creation Concepts Should Be Taught in Public Schools," Liberty, (September-October, 1978), p. 25.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Henry M. Morris, The Scientific Case for Creation (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977), p. 2.
- 74 Wendell Bird, "Evolution in Public Schools and Creation in Student's Homes: What Creationists Can Do," Impact, (April, 1979), p. IV.

- 75 Christianity Today, op. cit., pp. 28-29.
- 76 Hamilton Gravens, "Impact of Evolutionary Thought on America's Culture in the Twentieth Century," Intellect, (August, 1977), p.86.
- 77 Ibid.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Bliss, op. cit., p. 4.
- 80 Michael B. McMahon, "Religion, Scientific Naturalism, and the Myth of Neutrality," Intellect, (April, 1974), p. 431.
- 81 Ibid.
- 82 Alan L. Lockwood, "The Effects of Values Clarification and Moral Development Curricula on School-age Subjects: A Critical Review of Recent Research," Review of Educational Research, (Summer, 1975), p. 325.
- 83 For example, Sidney Simon, Leland W. Howe, and Howard Kirschenbaum, Values Clarification: A Handbook of Practical Strategies for Teachers and Students (New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1972), and Louise E. Rath, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney Simon, Values and Teaching (Columbia, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1966).
- 84 Louis Rath, Merrill Harmin, and Sidney Simon, "Teaching for Value Clarity," Moral Education, ed. Barry I. Chazin and Jonas F. Soltis (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1975), p. 172.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 Howard Kirschenbaum, "New Goals for Moral Education," The Humanist, (November-December, 1978), p. 10.
- 87 Thomas Hunt, "Public Schools and Moral Education: An American Dilemma," Religious Education, (July-August, 1979), p. 365.
- 88 Ibid.
- 89 Bonnidell Clouse, "Reading, Writing, and...Right from Wrong," Christianity Today, (December 30, 1977), p. 16.
- 90 Richard A. Baer Jr., "Values Clarification As Indoctrination," The Educational Forum, (January, 1977), p. 156.
- 91 Ibid.

⁹²Ibid., p. 157.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Ibid

⁹⁵Alan L. Lockwood, "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record, (September, 1975), p. 48.

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Howard Kirschenbaum, Merrill Harmin, Leland Howe, and Sidney Simon, "In Defense of Values Clarification," Phi Delta Kappan, (June, 1977), p. 744.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹Ibid., p. 745.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Ibid.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶McMahon, op. cit., p. 432.

¹⁰⁷James C. Hefley, Textbooks on Trial (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1976), p. 131.

¹⁰⁸Kenneth S. Cooper, Man and Change (Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett Co., 1972), p. 417.

¹⁰⁹Ibid.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 240.

¹¹¹Christianity Today, (January 5, 1973), op. cit., p. 29.

¹¹²McGraw, op. cit., p. 6.

¹¹³Lawrence Kohlberg and Rochelle Mayer, "Development As the Aim of Education," Harvard Educational Review, (November, 1972), p. 449.

- 114 Ibid., p. 468.
- 115 Ibid.
- 116 Ibid.
- 117 Lawrence Kohlberg, "The Child As Moral Philosopher," Psychology Today, (September, 1968), in Chazin and Soltis, op. cit., p. 131.
- 118 Kohlberg and Mayer, op. cit., p. 473.
- 119 Ibid., p. 467.
- 120 Ibid.
- 121 Ibid., p. 468.
- 122 Kohlberg, in Chazin and Soltis, op. cit., p. 136.
- 123 Ibid.
- 124 Ibid.
- 125 Ruth Beechick, "Lawrence Kohlberg: Why Johnny Can't Be Good Without Being Religious," Christianity Today, (December 30, 1977), p. 14.
- 126 Ibid.
- 127 Ibid.
- 128 Carl A. Elder, Values and Moral Development in Children (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1976), p. 72.
- 129 Ibid., p. 73.
- 130 Ibid., p. 75.
- 131 Ibid., p. 71.
- 132 Ibid., pp. 71-72, citing Norma K. Stone, The Development of Moral Thought in Children, Values, Feelings, and Morals: Part I, Research and Perspectives (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators, 1974), pp. 16-17.
- 133 Lawrence Kohlberg, "Moral Education Reappraised," The Humanist, (November-December, 1978), p. 14.
- 134 Ibid.

- 135 Clouse, op. cit., p. 17.
- 136 Jack R. Fraenkel, "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations," Social Education, (April, 1976), p. 217.
- 137 Ronald S. Brandt, "On Moral/Civic Education: An Interview with Edward Fenton," Educational Leadership, (April, 1977), p. 490.
- 138 Fraenkel, op. cit., p. 219.
- 139 Kohlberg, "Moral Education Reappraised," op. cit., p. 13.
- 140 Ibid.
- 141 M. Stanton Evans, Clear and Present Dangers (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Javanovich, Inc., 1975), p. 368.
- 142 Ibid., p. 369.
- 143 Ibid.
- 144 Ibid.
- 145 Ibid.
- 146 Homer Duncan, Secular Humanism: The Most Dangerous Religion in America (Lubbock, Tex.: Christian Focus on Government, 1979), p. 43.
- 147 Evans, op. cit., p. 370.
- 148 Ibid.
- 149 Ibid.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 Ibid.
- 152 Duncan, op. cit., p. 43.
- 153 John Avey, "How to Survive a Liberal Education," The Alternative, (December, 1971), p. 8.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Ibid.
- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Ibid.

158 Ibid.

159 Ibid.

160 Ibid., p. 9.

161 Ibid.

162 Ibid.

163 James J. Veltkamp, "Academic Freedom and the Christian College," Education for Eternity, (April, 1979), p. 2.

164 Ibid.

165 Paul A. Kienel, The Christian School: Why It Is Right for Your Child (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1977), p. 30.

166 Ibid., p. 31.

167 Ibid., p. 60.

168 Ibid., p. 61.

169 Ohio v. Whisner, 47 Ohio St. 2d 181 (1976), p. 211.

170 Eugene H. Methvin, "The N.E.A.: A Washington Lobby Run Rampant," The Readers Digest, (November, 1978), p. 98.

171 Ibid.

172 Ibid., p. 100.

173 "Humanistic Education," The Capsule, (April, 1979), p. 7.

174 Ibid.

175 Ibid.

176 Ibid.

177 Ibid.

178 Gary Collins, "What Threatens the Family?", Eternity, (August, 1975), p. 14.

179 Linda M. Boice, "Where's the Perseverance of Teen-Aged Saints?", Eternity, (June, 1977), p. 26.

180 Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁸¹Marion E. Lazenby, "The Sin of the Modern Church Member," Faith for the Family, (September, 1977), p. 13.

¹⁸²John M. Drescher, "The New Age Starts Here," Eternity, (January, 1975), p. 28.

¹⁸³Harold Westing, "Why Showers of Blessing Keep Rolling Off Our Kids," Eternity, (April, 1977), p. 32.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 33.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

¹⁸⁶Lawrence O. Richards, Youth Ministry: Its Renewal in the Local Church (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977), p. 205.

¹⁸⁷Ibid., p. 204.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 206-207.

Chapter 4

ATTEMPTS AT SOLVING EVANGELICAL PROBLEMS WITH EDUCATION

Once the problems and issues of evangelical involvement with public schools are enunciated, the inevitable question is, "What is being done to deal with the situation?" The present chapter is an attempt to answer this question. Attention will center on what is being done from within public education, as well as upon significant movements within evangelicalism itself. The problems are not only "legion," but fraught with complexities that indicate the task of solution-finding will not be easy. The writer freely admits that he has had to deal primarily with solution attempts he deems significant by virtue of their possible or perceived impact on the problems by educators. There may be isolated instances which he has failed to mention, the exclusion of which should not be considered indicative of a lack of merit, but rather an indication that such have not yet made a serious impact in the literature of this topic.

This chapter will deal primarily with what has become known as the "teaching about religion" movement in public education, the private school movement, the efforts of certain evangelicals to "neutralize" public schooling, and those efforts of others to restructure public education so that it truly reflects a pluralism.

Learning About Religion Courses and Units

The single most significant development concerning religion within the public schools in the past 10 years has been the introduction of courses in religion studies and units on religion within existing courses. Nicholas Piediscalzi and William Collie of the Public Education Religion Studies Center (PERSC) at Wright State University have reported that:

(1) The number of Pennsylvania public schools offering the course, "Religious Literature of the West," grew from 31 to 100 between 1967 and 1974, and the number of students enrolled in the courses grew from 700 to 4000.

(2) Another 8000 students were enrolled in other religion-studies programs in Pennsylvania public schools in 1974.

(3) At least 80 new religion-studies courses appeared within a 60-mile radius of California State University, Northridge, between 1968 and 1972, in addition to "innumerable" units on religion being added to existing courses.

(4) A 1973-74 study of secondary schools in Michigan revealed that 69 out of 96 respondents had inaugurated religion-studies courses since 1970, 19 of which had begun in 1974 alone.

(5) The same study in Michigan discovered "a substantial number of religion courses in junior high schools in addition to units in regular courses."

(6) According to a study by the National Council of Teachers of English, "the Bible as literature" ranks high among the top 25 mini-courses most requested by students.¹

Piediscalzi, in a 1978 keynote address to the National Council on Religion and Public Education, further cited a study made by Professor Harold Hosell of Grinnell College, Iowa, in which Hosell discovered that 58% of the 327 Iowa schools responding to his recent survey listed courses or units on religion studies.²

Paul J. Will, lecturer in the department of history and philosophy at Eastern Michigan University, writing of the experience of implementing the study of religion in Michigan, indicated that this development is not just a phenomenon limited to Pennsylvania, California, Michigan, and Iowa, but has been present in Florida, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota as well.³ Truly, this is a national movement.

The impetus for the above development appears to be a reaction to what is seen as an over-reaction of many public school officials to the rulings of the U. S. Supreme Court dealing with prayer and Bible reading. Failing to recognize that the court was only ruling against the "practice" of religion and not the objective "study" of it, many schools chose to deal with religion as if it were not there. Margaret D. Grote, visiting adjunct professor of religion at Temple University and teacher of a graduate course, "Religion in Education," has stated,

Because of recent court battles regarding the teaching of religion in classrooms, teachers have shied away from this area of study, administrators have avoided it like the plague, and as a result, the growing hunger for knowledge in this area on the part of the college and high school students has largely gone unappeased.⁴

Textbook publishers, tuned to the type of product that teachers and administrators will use, reflected in their books the desire to shy away from religion. As a result, Dr. R. C. McMillan, in his 1970 doctoral dissertation at Duke University, noted that religion was not adequately represented in the social studies textbooks. According to McMillan, many of the references were insignificant and provided the student with little if any value.⁵ Robert Michaelson has made a similar observation concerning textbooks, "Religion is

seldom dealt with at all. Where it is, the picture is likely to be either a bland one which stresses agreement on what matters most or one which focuses almost exclusively upon the major religious tradition."⁶

The nearly total ignoring of religion has been seen by many people to present a distorted view of human history. The American Association of School Administrators stated in 1964 that,

A curriculum which ignored religion would itself have serious religious implications. It would seem to proclaim that religion has not been as real in men's lives as health, or politics, or economics. By omission it would appear to deny that religion has been and is important in man's history--a denial of the obvious. In day-by-day practice, the topic cannot be avoided. As an integral part of man's culture, it must be included.⁷

The recent developments listed earlier, however, and others like them represent an attempt to place religion back into the curriculum in a way compatible with the Supreme Court's rulings. In so doing, it has been assumed by some that this does much to solve the problems of ignored religion. From an evangelical posture, and in view of the problems and issues identified in the previous chapter, it would appear doubtful that the majority of these programs solve any problems for evangelicals. In fact, some may actually add to the problems.

Michaelsen's comment that when religion has entered the textbook it has simply reflected "the major religious tradition," is most significant as regards the evangelical. Despite the persistent equating of "evangelicalism" with what is left of protestant dominance, such is not the case. For example, Michaelsen cited a study of 48 leading secondary history and social studies textbooks, conducted under the sponsorship of the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith, which "found that a majority of the books 'present a largely white,

Protestant, Anglo-Saxon view of history and the current social scene.' "⁸

The term "Protestant" has been used to cover too wide a range to indicate what is really being described. Since Protestantism was once almost exclusively evangelical, the mistake is often made of inferring that when the "mainstream" of Protestantism is either dominant or satisfied, such is likewise true of evangelicals. Chapter One noted the great disparity of belief between evangelicals and other "Protestants." This point is stressed because it is a primary factor in what becomes an inadequacy of many of the "teaching about religion" programs; while "Protestants" in general may be satisfied, evangelicals are not.

Evangelical Problems with "Teaching about Religion" Programs

Use of Myth

One of the first states to move in the direction of "teaching about religion" was Pennsylvania. John R. Whitney, the project director for the curriculum that was developed for that state, described what he called "the subjective experience" of one who is currently involved in writing courses in the literature of religion.⁹ The task before the project office was, as he termed it, "acutely subjective...making a course in religious literature a generally acceptable object."¹⁰

Commenting on the content of the "Student's Guide," Whitney referred to certain elements and principles which informed that production. Whitney mentioned the use of myth.

At the very beginning of our work on the course, we debated the relative threat and promise of excluding in the commentaries some treatment of the literary-theological concept of myth. We decided to include it, comparing the positive concept with related positive concepts such as those of legend and history. In contrast, we also compared it with the popular negative uses of the term.¹¹

One of the major sources of disagreement between evangelicals and other "Christians" is the fact that they view the historical statements of the Bible as "history" and "fact" while the "liberals" often treat such as "myth" or "symbol." The latter group often asserts that the mythological view sees a form of reality that while not necessarily factual is nonetheless true. It is not the intent to discuss the validity of either view in this study, but rather to point out that the Pennsylvania program, often cited as the model program, has included the modern use of "myth" at the outset of its development in such a way that it placed what evangelicals firmly hold to as God-inspired history in the category of myth.

Ann M. Hildebrand, the initiator of the Religion Studies Program at Kent State University in Ohio, has written an article, "Religion Studies in Elementary Language Arts Beginnings, Mythic, and Scientific." This article has provided an example of the use of myth in a way that basic evangelical belief is effectively undermined. Hildebrand noted that elementary-age school children are introduced very early to a "version of Darwin's theory of evolution as scientific truth."¹² According to Hildebrand, this only presents one form of truth--scientific. Children, she stated, need to be "shown how to pursue another form of truth...the truth of the imagination."¹³ The former truth she called "rational reality," the latter "metaphorical reality."¹⁴

As noted in the last chapter, evangelicals desire to see creation introduced into the curriculum on a scientific basis. Many scientists believe that the facts of science, in regard to origins, point more to a creator than to an evolutionary process. To present the biblical model along with the admittedly embellished creation accounts of non-Judeo-Christian peoples, according to evangelicals, is to make their views guilty by association of being factually untrue. To place the biblical account in the category of myth and the evolutionary theory in an entirely different category labeled "scientific" or "factual" is to impress children in formative years with a "fairytale" view of the Bible.

Hildebrand attempted to defend the use of myth in this context by quoting the "experts."

Too often "myth" has the connotation of "lie" and seems especially offensive to people who do not understand that the mythic and the religious are the same. Northrup Frye defines myth as the "union of ritual and symbol giving action to thought, and meaning to action." He illustrates effectively how the stories in the Bible are myths in this sense. Various other explanations of myth should be used as well: "Myths are... metaphors that identify aspects of human personality with the natural environment." Or, "Myth is a kind of perspective, a basic way of envisaging experience, a kind of 'first meaning' where no clear-cut ideas of true and false have yet emerged." Perhaps the most useful concept to offer those who misunderstand "myth" is found in George Every's *Christian Mythology*: "Myth is an extended sense of a story told to throw light on a mystery that cannot be explained." At the center of all myth is the mysterious, the unaccountable--not entirely accessible, but believed. Even science has its own myths, its own premises based upon uncertainties. And to children intrigued with creation myths, it soon becomes apparent that the beginning stories of all cultures were religious beliefs, stated metaphorically, but no less worthy of respect for that. Calling Genesis a "myth" is, in this context, then acknowledging its connection with the natural environment, its essential "first meaning," its mystery, and its transcendent metaphoric "truth."¹⁵

First of all, evangelical Christians reject the notion that "the mythic and the religious are the same." Secondly, evangelicals resist the statement that the stories in the Bible are myths, if by "myth" one accepts, as Hildebrand has, that these stories, including creation, contain only "metaphorical truth." Therefore, any "teaching about religion" program which places the Bible in the category of myth or metaphorical truth, in opposition to "fact" or "reality," in its commonly accepted sense, is going to be found unacceptable to evangelicals. Yet, such appears to widely be the case. Robert Spivey, a prominent individual in the model "teaching about religion" program developed at Florida State University, illustrated this point in an article first appearing in 1972 in the Journal of Church and State and reprinted in David Engel's book, Religion in Public Education; Spivey gave one of his goals for teaching religion in the schools.

As a consequence, my recommendation calls either for abandoning the biblical introductory content and substituting a complex of religious traditions, some of which are necessarily close at hand for the student, or concentrating upon helping students view the biblical material as story, as myth, as a particular way of viewing reality.¹⁶

The above quote began with the phrase "as a consequence." Spivey was referring to the previous way of dealing with teaching about the Bible -- a way which he asserted "fails to take account of the situation of most modern secular students."¹⁷ The earlier exposure to the Bible, Spivey stated, "has inculcated a scientific, literal, factual view of the biblical events."¹⁸ This view must be done away with in favor of a view that "transforms youth's understanding of the Bible from scientific, literal, factual, to story, myth, as a particular way of viewing reality."

Because many of the foremost advocates of the teaching about religion movement have drawn heavily upon the "experts" in literary and biblical criticism, from whom they have gotten much of their use of "myth," it seems appropriate to share the following quote from C. S. Lewis, renowned literary critic and evangelical scholar:

I want to explain what it is that makes me skeptical about this authority....First, whatever these men may be as biblical critics, I distrust them as critics. They seem to me to lack literary judgment, and to be imperceptive about the very quality of the texts they are reading....These men ask me to believe they can read between the lines of the old texts; the evidence is their obvious inability to read (in any sense worth discussing) the lines themselves.¹⁹

The above assessment by Dr. Lewis, according to most evangelicals, will equally apply to another feature of many teaching about religion programs, as illustrated by John Whitney's description of the Pennsylvania program. Reference is to the heavy reliance on the principles of biblical interpretation used by theological liberals and known as "higher criticism."

Use of the Documentary Theory of Higher Criticism

In listing the "elements and principles" that were influential in determining the outcome of the Student Guide in the Pennsylvania program. John Whitney also stated that tacit approval was given to the "scholarly use of documentary theory, describing and using Graf-Wellhausen as an example."²⁰ The significance of this can only be seen by an understanding of what the "documentary theory" and Graf-Wellhausen' are and how they relate to evangelical belief.

The documentary theory, or documentary hypothesis, is a term

given to a view of biblical interpretation initially advanced by a German, Eichorn (1823), modified by Hupfeld (1853), then again modified by Karl H. Graf, whose views were popularized by Julius Wellhausen (1878).²¹ The theory simply stated is as follows,

The Pentateuch [first five books of the Old Testament], although traditionally ascribed to Moses, was actually a compilation of four basic documents [J.E.P.D] written by independent authors over a period of approximately 400 years beginning ca. 850 B.C. and gradually combined by unknown redactors [sub-editors] . . . who put it in its basic form by about 400 B.C. The main criterion for this theory was a close analysis of the text itself through which it was thought the actual documents could be isolated. The classic expression of this theory came from a German scholar, Julius Wellhausen, in 1878.²²

The implications of this theory of biblical interpretation are manifold. According to evangelicals, what is at stake is not only the authorship of the Pentateuch (evangelicals believe it was written by Moses), but also the integrity of the Bible itself. R. Laird Harris, dean of the faculty at Covenant Theological Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, summarized this position as follows,

It is unmistakably clear that the Pentateuch claims to be a unit; that the other books of the Old Testament refer to it as the Law of Moses; that Christ declares it to be true and to be the work of Moses, who spoke in prophecy of Himself....It has become therefore a choice between Christ and criticism. The effect of higher criticism has been to deny Christ or to reduce Him to purely human proportions. He was, it is said, a child of His time, subject to the mistakes and limitations of the knowledge of His day.²³

Harris has further denounced the higher criticism, of which the documentary hypothesis is an integral part, in that its acceptance of documentation necessitates "re-examination of the rest of the books."²⁴ This has led to the developmental view of Israel's history based upon the manipulation of the alleged various writers of the Pentateuch. For

example, it is asserted that early writers elevated Jehovah to a position of supremacy in Israel and were followed by later writers who declared Him to be supreme in the world. As a consequence of the work of these writers, "Israel's religion evolved from the law stage of polytheism and idolatry to henotheism (one God for each nation), and finally the eighth century prophets discovered monotheism." Again, Harris has pointed out the implications of such a view:

Now it is abundantly plain that if monotheism were an invention of the eighth century B.C., then David did not write the Psalms, Solomon did not write Proverbs, Job was a later creation, and the early parts of Samuel and Chronicles are largely fiction. These all must be post dated. With this view of Israel's religion, of course, there is no room for specific supernatural prediction. Naturally, the prophets may still be called "seers" and their shrewed guesses as to what may happen on the political scene may have brought them quite a reputation, but it is unthinkable that Abraham was told by God that His children would spend four centuries in bondage (Genesis 15) or that David could predict the resurrection of Christ (Psalm 16), or that Isaiah could predict Cyrus' coming two centuries before the time (Isaiah 44 and 45) or that Daniel could predict three great world empires to follow Babylon. But the simple expedient of post dating solves all these difficulties for the critics. They therefore urge that Isaiah was not written by one man in about 700 B.C., but by two men; others say three....As to Daniel, the usual view is that...it is past history presented as a prophecy that the Jews might take courage in the fact that God rules and would surely deliver them.²⁶

Whitney further revealed the fact of documentary use in the very next guiding principle he enumerated. He stated, "We have tried, for example, to encourage the student to understand Second Isaiah primarily as a Jew of the Exile might understand it...."²⁷ We have noted already that the belief in two or more authors of Isaiah is a belief based upon the documentary theory, a belief (since the New Testament authors treat Isaiah as one) evangelicals believe casts doubt on the

validity of the New Testament.

A public school "religion" course studying the Bible on the basis of the "documentary theory," therefore, works against historical evangelical belief, and the Pennsylvania model is admittedly based to a large extent on the theory. Whitney also stated, "We have recognized a widespread adherence to the principle of God's literal inspiration of sacred writings on the part of many students of the Bible and Quar'an."²⁸ The difference between the words "use of" in reference to documentation as the approach in the Pennsylvania program and "recognized a widespread adherence" in reference to a literal interpretation many hold to demonstrate an inadequacy of the treatment afforded evangelicals in the program. Similar treatment is given creation in many science classes where evolution is taught and mention is made that "many people believe creation."

The Bible Reader--An Example of Objectionable Material

Recently, Jon T. Barton, former Coordinator for the Program on Religion and Education at Harvard Divinity School, was asked about the materials available in the teaching about religion courses. His answer began, "Perhaps the most widely used is The Bible Reader."²⁹ Throughout the literature concerning "teaching about religion," this work is nearly always cited. The Bible Reader is an "inter-faith undertaking, written by an interdenominational team, including a Jewish rabbi, a Presbyterian minister, and a Roman Catholic. A folder advertising the work stated,

What is most remarkable about The Bible Reader is its concern for the problems of the pluralistic society of today and tomorrow. The authors were deeply committed to the importance of producing a work that would be recognized and accepted as objective by believers and non-believers. Thanks to their personal integrity and enormous competence in the field of biblical scholarship, they were supremely successful in achieving this objective.³⁰

An evangelical perusing the preface of this work might wonder what definitions have been given to "pluralistic," "objective," "scholarship," and "successful." The initial conclusion in all probability would be that these terms, at best, are being defined in a way that excludes any serious consideration of the evangelical. After a brief introduction, the preface includes a short treatise, entitled, "What is the Bible?" The reader is then told that "The Bible is a book of religion and is not authoritative in any other realm."³¹ Evangelicals, as repeatedly noted, accept the Bible as God's authoritative revelation from God. The revelation given is as stated in "The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy": "...of infallible divine authority in all matters upon which it touches: it is to be believed as God's instruction, in all that it affirms; obeyed as God's command, in all that it requires; embraced as God's pledge, in all that it promises."³²

The authors of The Bible Reader proceed to enumerate passages which "prove" the inaccuracy of the Bible in "non-religious" areas. They stated,

It is not a textbook in mathematics. I Kings 7:23 describes one of the vessels in the sanctuary as "round, ten cubits from brim to brim...and a line of thirty cubits measured its circumference....A school boy can figure out that anything which is ten cubits in diameter must be 31.416 cubits in circumference. Psalm 19:6 assumes that the sun rises at one end of the heavens and makes its circuit to the other end. This is not good astronomy. Isaiah 11:12 talks about the "four corners of the earth." We should not want this kind of geography taught in schools.

Genesis 7:11 described a deluge that resulted when "the windows of the heavens were opened." The U. S. Weather Bureau has more prosaic ways of analysing the meteorological factors that lead to a flood. Mark 4:31 says that a mustard seed "is the smallest of all seeds on earth." Botanists would not agree to that.³³

The intent of this study is not to demonstrate that evangelical Christians believe that all these alleged "inaccuracies" of the Bible have been satisfactorily explained by biblical scholars, but rather to point out that students reading The Bible Reader, while being told that the work is "factual" and "objective," are nonetheless being indoctrinated in a theological framework that rejects the inerrancy of the biblical revelation in favor of a view which sees the Bible's value simply in accord with the "religious truth" one subjectively draws from it.

Consistent with their view of the Bible as just described, the authors of The Bible Reader have employed great use of the documentary theory. They have ascribed a very late date to Daniel³⁴ and said specifically that biblical history "was rewritten in the light of changed conditions."³⁵ In reference to this last point, the authors wrote,

Much...was revised in the light of the reform carried out under Josiah, reading back into an earlier time practices that represented purer worship. Still later, much of the material was reworked once more by those³⁶ concerned with the developing importance of the priesthood.

The commentary given to Genesis 2:4 in The Bible Reader openly stated that the interpretation given is the interpretation of the J.E.P.D. documentary theory and instructed the student to "See Appendix: The Documentary Theory, for a full discussion of the literary sources of the Old Testament as we have it today."³⁷ No attempt, what-

ever, is made to inform the student that there exists a host of scholarly refutations of documentation. Rather, the student is point blank told that what exists today is an interpretation that accepts, as fact, documentation. To ignore the abundance of scholarly evangelical arguments appears to this writer just cause for questioning the objectivity of such a work. Furthermore, the manifest bias of the work would certainly cause a concerned and informed evangelical parent from knowingly subjecting his children to such "faulty teaching."

Dr. Frank E. Gaebeline, an eminent senior evangelical educator, as far back as 1965 noted,

In this pluralistic society, neither evangelicals nor any other Christian group can demand that the Bible be read and studied from their particular point of view. But they can agree on a study of the Bible as literature, provided that this study is not conditioned by particular theories of the origin or composition of Scripture.³⁸

Religion Studies--A Vehicle for Attitudinal Change?

Another worry evangelicals have over the thrust to introduce religion into the curriculum on an "objective" basis is that much of the effort is designed for attitude change and development. An example of what concerns them can be seen in an article by J. Susan Austin, research associate of the religion-social studies curriculum project at Florida State University (FSU), appearing in the September-October 1976 issue of Religious Education magazine.³⁹ The article is a description of a six-week program involving second graders at the FSU Developmental Research School and using multi-media materials produced

by the Religion in Elementary Social Studies Project (RESS) at FSU. The RESS project is funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Stone Foundation, and produces elementary level curriculum about religion for a multi-religious and multi-ethnic society. Austin has shared that beyond knowledge and concepts, there are learning objectives which the RESS project strives to help each child attain.

These are:

- (1) Appreciation of diversity of world views and life-styles in human societies.
- (2) Supporting a person in his beliefs and behavior which are unique to his secular or religious tradition, as long as they do not infringe on the rights of others.
- (3) Consideration of the values of particular traditions which are involved in decisions people make.⁴⁰

Austin's paper centered not so much on the material itself, as it did on the effect of six weeks of exposure on second graders to the material being used. The overriding result of exposure was that children achieved a significantly higher degree of "tolerance" to a diversity of religious views. This was perceived by Austin as an exciting and favorable effect--one which "seems to indicate that curricula designed to affect attitudes may actually be able to do so."⁴¹ When closer attention is given to what is actually taking place in such a situation, evangelicals see reason for concern. For example, the article revealed several examples of "changed attitudes." A seven-year-old girl, Sara, began the program by being shown three pictures of a little girl: one with a scowling, disapproving face, another with a neutral "doesn't matter" face, and a third with a smiling, approving face. She was asked to point out the picture which would represent her reaction if a best friend told her there is no God. She pointed to the scowling face and answered, "You should believe in God." Six weeks

later, when confronted with the same question and same pictures, Sara pointed to the neutral face and responded, "If she doesn't believe, why should we force her to believe?"⁴² This action was cited as a positive achievement, in that Sara, after six weeks was able to "reflect a more tolerant response."⁴³ Austin stated that Sara was not an isolated case but reflected what was true among most of the other children. While 80% of Sara's group expressed a disapproving response to a friend not believing in God at the beginning of the program, only 60% disapproved (32% maintained a neutral "it doesn't matter" approach) at the conclusion.⁴⁵ The study also revealed that children who became "more aware" of religion through this program decreased in their ethnocentrism,⁴⁶ meaning that they stopped believing so strongly that their religious beliefs were superior to those of others.

Most evangelical Christians recognize the need for tolerance in a religiously pluralistic society. It is understood that no one has the right to force their belief upon others. In fact, evangelicals today are in the forefront of seeking to maintain this basic American virtue in society. They, therefore, do not object to public schools working to develop an understanding in children that they must respect the rights of those who differ with and from them. The FSU program, however, admitted that the content was doing something else. The goals of the project were to create in the child a belief that it did not matter what his religious belief was and to remove any existing belief that he (and his family) had the "right" belief. The goals demonstrate that what is involved is an overt attempt by public schools to change the religious beliefs of children. Evangelical parents work

to teach their children that God has spoken and communicated to man "the way," based on such words of Jesus as when he said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me" (John 14:6) and the words of the Apostle Jude who stated that Christians are to "earnestly contend for the faith, once (for all) delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). Evangelicals, therefore, cannot be expected to happily send their children into a program that admittedly "decreased" this conviction taught at home. Evangelical youth are taught at an early age that Jesus has instructed His followers to "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel" (Matthew 28:19); that the Apostle Paul stated in II Corinthians 5:11, 14, 18 that believers have had to them "committed the ministry of reconciliation," and they are to "persuade men" because they are "constrained by the love of Christ" and "convinced of the terror of the Lord." The goal of evangelical parents is to have their children experience what is termed "the new birth" and walk in obedience to the dictates of Scripture. They are then encouraged to "share" this "good news" to others. The sharing is not a pressuring of anyone, but rather the privilege of communicating what is intensely believed to be true. It is not unlike the practice of any other citizen who strongly believes something, be it politics, a product, or religion. To attempt to interfere and designedly work against this basic religious belief and civil right appears to be a violation of the "free exercise of religion" guaranteed by the First Amendment. Moreover, many of the evangelicals who have decided to remain in public education and "hack it out" have so decided, at least in part, out of a willingness to attempt to influence future generations

toward what they believe is truth. The attempt to condition their children away from even believing it makes a difference, to them is a serious infringement of their rights.

The RESS program at FSU is not the only teaching about religion program to have dealt with attitude changes. William E. Collie and Madeline H. Apt shared results of a 1976 study involving 239 schools in Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio.⁴⁷ The results with high school students indicated that 43.5% responded negatively to a question asking if the course worked to make them "more committed to a particular religious faith;" 35.2% responded favorably.⁴⁸ Collie and Apt felt that this response along with the fact that 51% felt that the course helped strengthen moral and spiritual values, indicated that the courses emphasized objectivity.⁴⁹ The reverse may be true. With 43.5% saying they did not feel more committed to a particular religious faith and 67.5% stating that the course helped them to look "more objectively and fairly" at different religions,⁵⁰ the more obvious deduction may be that there was movement away from the religious beliefs the student brought to the course. The 51% who stated that the course helped strengthen their moral and spiritual values, may possibly have been stating that they now, having been shown that "particular religious faiths" are all equally good (or bad), and that "tolerance" supercedes "faith," feel that they are straightened out on their moral convictions. This is supposition, but wasn't the conclusion of Collie and Apt? In either case the study left open for discussion the 29.5% who were "undecided" as to whether or not the course they took made them more committed to a particular religious belief. The study raises an

additional question concerning the 19.5% who stated that the course did not strengthen their belief in a particular religious faith: Were they in part saying that the course worked against the belief which they came to school with? If such were the case, the next question would be: Was the material truly objective, or only "objective" in the way that The Bible Reader purports to be? Further, where do public school teachers get the right to introduce purposefully religious material that has as a net effect the undermining of the beliefs of their parents? This last question must be raised even if only one child was so affected. The school, it must be remembered, may never work as a deterrent, passive or active, to anyone's religious belief.

Evangelical Support for Teaching About Religion

Not all evangelicals reject the teaching about religion movement. Some, fully aware of the problems, feel that the programs are not a total loss and can possibly have a positive effect.

In 1972, David Barr, assistant professor of religion at Wright State University (he was at Florida State at the time), wrote an article published by Christianity Today, entitled, "Religion in Schools: Four Questions Evangelicals Ask." Barr acknowledged that "the project in Pennsylvania has given some evangelicals good cause to wonder if their views will be considered."⁵¹ He acknowledged that in programs of teaching about religion, teachers will often not be evangelicals or even good teachers; and interpretations given may be less than what

evangelicals desire. Nevertheless, Barr felt that the "teaching about religion" programs were worth the attempt. He suggested that evangelicals "lower our sights" and not expect that "the public school be made the end-all of religious education." He added,

We can clarify what we expect the school to teach; not "the things of the Spirit of God" but rather the facts of history and the literary and historic aspects of the Bible. One need not be filled with the Spirit to know there are four gospels or to recognize that there was some friction between liberals and conservatives in the early decades of this century. This can be taught by anyone. Maybe his account will be incomplete, by evangelical standards, but it will certainly be better than the prevailing ignorance.⁵³

According to Barr, such a program can provide a foundation upon which the church could build a better understanding. He suggested,

At the least, every Sunday school class would not have to start from zero if we could assume that our students had some general idea of the overall chronology, say, of the Bible. In addition, a general knowledge of Christianity (and of other religions) could prove most helpful in "creating a climate for evangelism," or "pre-evangelism," as Dr. Francis Schaeffer calls it. If a person understands what the issues are, it will be much easier to help him confront those issues in personal decision.⁵⁴

In September of 1979, Jon T. Barton contributed to the discussion among evangelicals via an interview published in Christianity Today. Barton suggested that evangelicals get involved in the teaching of the Bible in accord with constitutional principles. He stated,

To abandon the field to secularists is a grave mistake. The Bible will speak for itself if we read it. Suppose we have to do this in a literary way. It's still the Bible, and God can still speak through it....If you don't teach the Bible as a source book for culture, you're cutting off students from centuries of art, music, and literature....I think we should resist the temptation to throw up our hands in despair. Instead, we should explore the opportunities God gives us.⁵⁵

While Barr and Barton reflect one view among evangelicals, the more dominant view is that the early programs have indicated already that the "teaching about religion" movement will not be content with an interpretation of the Bible that allows for the possibility of literalness, factuality, or inerrancy. Because the public school teacher presents the image of being a much more sophisticated teacher than the typical Sunday school teacher, a situation in which the child is being presented with a program alleging "scholarly support" for theories such as the "documentary hypothesis" will be difficult for most Sunday school teachers to overcome. Whether or not public school teaching about religion programs move toward an evangelically perceived objectivity will in the final analysis decide whether the bulk of evangelicals will be able to accept the programs. Objectivity currently does not appear to be the case. Paul Blanshard, a humanist who has consistently expressed a desire that the Bible, even if used objectively, should be left out of public schools, may have been right when he wrote in 1963 that given the difference between the evangelical view of the Bible and that held by liberals, "it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the cleavage between these two positions is so fundamental that it is bound to lead to bitter controversy as long as the Bible is used in public schools."⁵⁶ If he was right, educators may take the pragmatic step to avoid controversy and simply once again remove the Bible from school curriculum. In either case, whether the Bible is removed or introduced in a biased manner, evangelicals will continue to have problems with public education. In the meantime, a larger number of evangelicals are opting for what is being presented as

a positive Christian approach to education--the private Christian school. Since this movement is the most widespread current development in evangelical education, this study will now examine how it proposes to be a solution to the problems and issues of evangelical involvement in education.

The Private Christian School Movement

A Positive Approach to Christian Education

Dr. Henry Morris, President of Christian Heritage College, has taught at five major secular universities. In his book, Education for the Real World, Dr. Morris referred to a frequently espoused idea among evangelicals, that evangelical presence on the part of students and teachers, in the secular environment, can possibly stem the tide of what is perceived as "anti-Christian" teaching. Drawing upon his own involvement in secular schooling, Morris expressed a conviction that has increasingly gained adherents among evangelicals.

Although it is important to witness personally to the students on such campuses concerning their individual need of salvation....it soon became apparent that this was essentially a strategy of retreat, salvaging a few here and there in the battle but watching ungodly teaching and practices become stronger year by year, carrying greater numbers of students every year into complete unbelief.⁵⁷

In effect, Morris and many Christian school proponents believe that it is time to get off the defensive end of the education business and begin an attempt to "mount an offensive." What Morris had in mind was not necessarily an attempt to regain primary influence in public schooling, although he did not rule that out, but rather "to establish

sound Christian schools where every teacher is God-called and properly prepared, and where all courses and textbooks completely conform to the principles of Scripture."⁵⁸ The problem with public education, according to Morris, is that it is so thoroughly based upon a false foundation that there is little hope for anything more than survival. Morris and a host of others are not prepared to "lower their sights" and simply accept survival. They want an education that is based on the world as they see it presented in Scripture--not the product of an evolutionary process but as God's creation.⁵⁹ Morris stated,

Furthermore, it must be recognized that there is no dichotomy between physical truth and religious truth, as many people believe. There is one God and one universe. He is the author of all truth, and His Word is His inerrant revelation of truth.⁶⁰

David B. Cummings, editor of the book, The Purpose of a Christ-Centered Education, has voiced a similar dissatisfaction with public schooling, which he stated has followed the idea of John Dewey who said that "to set up any end outside of education, as furnishing its goal and standard, is to deprive the educational process of much of its meaning and tends to make us rely on false and external stimuli in dealing with the child."⁶¹ Calling this idea part of the "false roots" of modern education, Cummings asserted,

The glory of God is ruled out as the purpose or end of education. God's Word is ruled out as a standard of truth and righteousness. Such considerations are, for modern government-controlled education mere "false and external" stimuli which interfere with the pupil's advancement up the ladder of human progress.⁶²

According to Cummings, the Christian school movement is a movement primarily of those who are taking "a vigorous stand with biblical

Christianity against those who have cut themselves off from their roots."⁶³ He has viewed this stand as a stand "for the sake of preserving Christianity and God-centered living on the face of the earth."⁶⁴

Cornelius Van Til, the Calvinist philosopher and early proponent of Christian schooling, contended that Christian schooling is the only consistent educational option for evangelicals. He noted the "antithesis" of modern public education to biblical Christianity and stated that in contrast to "non-Christian" education, which is man-centered, Godless, and often aimless, Christians

...know the purpose of education. We also know what should be the content of education. Finally we know that a definitely Christian method is to be used in the instruction of a definitely Christian content.⁶⁵

Likewise, Dr. Roy Zuck of Dallas Theological Seminary, has stated,

Whether my children attend a secular or public school, they will learn basically the same facts, but in a Christian school they'll learn to understand, interpret, and analyze those facts from a biblical perspective. The secular vs. Christian school issue is really a question of whether a child will learn to view life from man's perspective or God's perspective.⁶⁶

In a similar manner, Dr. Roy Lowrie Jr., executive director of the National Christian School Education Association (NCSEA), has stated the case calling for evangelicals to move into Christian schooling. In a brochure distributed by the NCSEA entitled, "The Purpose, Philosophy, Objectives of the Christian School," Lowrie wrote,

There is an important difference between the Christian and the non-Christian viewpoints on a given subject. Even though knowledge is factually the same for both, no subject can be taught in the totality of its truth if the creator is ignored or denied. Knowledge is purified by the recognition of God's

place in it. No other approach to education can be entirely God-honoring for parents and children, as is such an approach through the Scriptures.⁶⁷

While the fact that the Christian schools have as an overall philosophy the need to direct all of education towards an understanding of God's truth, and this is the single most important reason for their existence, other factors are also involved. These include a desire to regain parental control over the education of children; a belief that such schools offer a superior academic program ; and a belief that the public schools have lost their ability to protect children, caused by a failure to maintain acceptable levels of discipline.

Parental Control

Previous chapters noted the historic position of evangelicals concerning the role of parents in education as well as the perception that public education has significantly worked to reduce that role. A dominant theme in the literature of the Christian school movement is that Christian schools restore that role to the parents. Lowrie, in his aforementioned pamphlet, stated, "Parents of children in the school consider the Word of God clear in making Christian parents responsible for the education of their children."⁶⁸

Calvin K. Cummings, the founder of Trinity Christian School in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and an active leader among Christian schools in Pennsylvania, has written that "The first basic purpose of the Christian school is to help Christian parents fulfill their responsibility to God for their children." The public school system, according to Cummings, works against the Christian parent by training children

"during the most impressionable years, for five hours each school day...to think, believe, and live apart from God."⁷⁰ The solution, he stated, is as follows,

They can join hands with other Christian parents to provide a truly Christian education. Most parents will find that they are not in a position to teach their children at home. Father works away from home and mother frequently lacks adequate time to teach effectively. More basically, few parents are qualified to teach all the subjects for all ages. But these Christian parents can band together to secure the services of trained and dedicated Christian teachers to teach their children.⁷¹

Unlike the modern public school, the Christian school, according to proponents, is an extension of the home and should be parent controlled. Cummings has asserted that in a Christian school the parents "determine the character of the teachings to be imparted to the children."⁷² Furthermore, according to Cummings,

...with this biblical concept of a Christian school, it becomes apparent what the relation of the teacher is to be to the parent and the child, and what the child's attitude is to toward the teacher. The teacher is to be regarded as standing in the place of the parent. This means that to the best of his ability he is to seek to provide an education in agreement with the desires of the parents as expressed in the constitution of the association. It means that the teacher is to exercise the authority in the classroom that a parent would. For the child, it means that parents are to teach their children to respect and obey their teachers as they respect and obey their parents.⁷³

A brochure describing Grace Academy in Roanoke, Virginia, reflects the view that Christian schooling exists as an extension of the home. The brochure states, "Grace Academy functions primarily to aid parents who desire their children to receive a well-rounded, quality academic education in the nurture of a Christian environment."⁷⁴

Quality Education

Another prevalent theme in the literature on the Christian school movement is the claim that Christian schools better prepare students academically than do the public schools. Dr. Paul Kienel, executive director of the Western Association of Christian Schools, has asserted that while public school norms on standardized tests have been dropping steadily since 1963, Christian school pupils have been scoring above average. In a 1978 issue of Faith Aflame, published by Thomas Road Baptist Church in Lynchburg, Virginia, Kienel wrote:

The Scholastic Aptitude Test taken every year by more than a million high school students shows a decline of 49 points in verbal skills and 31 points in math skills. Our Christian school achievement test scores (standard test) show our students to be 7 to 13 months ahead of the national norm in all subject areas and 6 to 19 months ahead of the national norm in reading. Eighth graders in Christian schools, according to our test results, are reading at the tenth grade level. First graders in all subject areas are achieving at the 86th percentile. The national norm is 50.⁷⁵

Elmer Towns, a well-known evangelical educator, in his book, Have the Public Schools Had It?, claimed that Christian schools were academically superior to public ones. He stated, "Most Christian schools administer the same proficiency tests as their neighboring public schools" and "usually the Christian schools score higher."⁷⁶ Towns noted the defensive reaction to this claim by public school proponents,

They point out that the better student is usually taken out of the public school and registered in private institutions; naturally, they would score higher on achievement tests. Second, students from affluent families who traditionally scored higher on I.Q. examinations, tend to go to the private schools. Therefore, it is only natural that pupils from private schools would

score higher on achievement tests. Third, concerned parents traditionally have supervised pupil homework and supported school activities. Therefore we could only expect higher scores from students of private schools than those of public schools.⁷⁷

These reactions, according to Dr. Towns, are a "smokescreen" and fail to address the "real issue," which, he asserted, is academic excellence.⁷⁸ The question, he suggested, is simply, "Who has the best results?" The facts, he stated, are that "the private schools have superior students who score better on achievement tests than those in the public schools."⁷⁹

While Towns' views will do little to impress public school educators who may feel a responsibility to educate a wider spectrum of society, they do impress and influence parents whose big concern is the education of their own children.

Alan N. Grover, the executive director of the Ohio Christian Schools, has suggested that "quality education" to Christian school people does not simply mean superior academic performance. In his book, Ohio's Trojan Horse, Grover cited the fact that "quality education" is a term about which people today do not always agree as to its meaning. This, in part, Grover, stated, is because people differ in their meaning of the more basic word, "education." He continued,

So then, if people hold different ideas about what is meant by "education," it is no wonder there is also a difference as to what constitutes a "quality education." That which is quality education for one man may be a horrible sham to another.⁸⁰

The point Grover stressed, in effect, is that even if private Christian schools scored lower than the public ones (which apparently is not the case), using the same measuring device, the

complete picture would not be seen. To the people in the Christian school movement, quality education includes more than academic excellence. It involves character development, respect for authority, respect for country, and self-discipline. Christian school proponents believe that these added ingredients are what really set them apart and above public schooling.

The Matter of Discipline

Secular education journals as well as more popular magazines have recently contained much information revealing the fact that the American educational public considers the matter of discipline in the schools of major importance. The National Institute of Education (NIE) issued a 247-page report, Violent Schools--Safe Schools, in which it said that "25% of American schools suffer some moderately serious to serious problems of vandalism, personal attack, or theft."⁸¹ The report indicated that "one out of every nine secondary school students will have something stolen in any one month period; one out of eighty students will be attacked on school property; and vandalism will cost the schools as much as \$600 million a year."⁸²

The Christian school literature, likewise, abounds with statements concerning this widely recognized problem in public schooling and presents the Christian school as the best means for Christians to escape the discipline problems of public schools. Dr. Roy Lowrie addressed this subject and stated,

Christian schools are disciplined schools, for they believe that God endorses discipline. The schools follow the biblical commands regarding respect for authority. Students are taught

to obey their parents, civil authorities, and those who are over them spiritually in their churches. In the classroom the teacher and principal represent the parents, and the directives of the Bible about child-parent relationships are applicable during school. The teacher is also viewed as being placed in a position of authority over the student by the will of God, so the directives to obey those who have spiritual authority are applicable.⁸³

Unlike modern trends in public school management, which have opted for less regulation, Christian school educators seem to be satisfied that proper regulation is a "must" if discipline is to be maintained. Lowrie said,

...education is best accomplished under conditions of rather strict behavioral standards. The schools know that students are actually happier when there are clear rules which are consistently and fairly enforced, for then students know what is expected of them. This gives them security.⁸⁴

Paul Kienel conducted a nationwide survey in 1973 of public school educators who send their own children to Christian schools. This was done, in part, to find out why public school educators are "the largest professional group among parents who send their children to Christian schools."⁸⁵ Of the 11 responses that he listed as reflective of the group as a whole in his book, The Christian School: Why It Is Right for Your Child, six mentioned the matter of discipline.⁸⁶

Many evangelicals, therefore, reacting to the problems and issues discussed in Chapter Three, believe that the only answer lies in coming out of public schooling and forming private Christian schools. By so doing, it is alleged that they are reasserting a control over the education of their children, avoiding the forced neutrality which is the best they can hope for in public schools, protecting their children from the increasingly unruly atmosphere of the state schools,

and getting a superior education in the process.

Evangelical Criticism of the Private Christian School

Although proponents of private Christian schooling tend to dominate in the evangelical literature concerning schooling, evangelicals are by no means united in viewing this movement as a panacea to their problems. Rather than viewing the movement as a step forward, some have even concluded that the private Christian school is a step backward.

William H. Willimon, an assistant professor at Duke Divinity School in Durham, North Carolina, might have given the most stinging reaction from within evangelicalism in recent years against the Christian school movement, when he wrote an article entitled, "Should Churches Buy into the Education Business?", which appeared in Christianity Today in May of 1978. Willimon expressed a conviction that Christian schools, educationally adequate or not, raise serious theological and ethical issues. He believed that many schools have been started to avoid racial integration. For Willimon and a number of evangelicals there appears to be a feeling, justified or not, that the race issue plays a more significant role than Christian school proponents wish to admit. Joseph Bayly, vice president of David C. Cook Publishing Company and a proponent of Christian schooling, has said, "To our shame as evangelical Christians, many 'Christian schools' have been founded and continue today for the purpose of perpetuating racial segregation."⁸⁸ Willimon does not believe that parents would be as

eager to send their children to these private schools if the racial proportions were the same as in their public schools.

Both the National Association of Christian Schools and the National Union of Christian Schools have officially discouraged racial discrimination on the part of their member schools.⁸⁹ Some Christian school leaders, including the headmaster at the Delaware County, Pennsylvania, Christian School, have noted that percentage-wise their minority enrollment exceeds the surrounding public schools'. After visiting many of these schools and talking to a host of Christian school people, this writer suggests that the race issue does exist in certain situations but more so as a cultural prejudice that has been carried over in the attempt to correct perceived injustices seen in the previous chapter. As one travels north and west, the extent to which segregation exists tends to diminish, and yet the rise of Christian schools continues.

A second issue that Willimon sought to address in the private Christian school movement was quality education. He suggested that part of the perceived improvement was due to the fact that children who come from relatively affluent, advantaged homes always tend to do better on standardized tests.⁹¹

Believing the major reason for Christian schools is racial, and discounting claims of academic superiority, Willimon turned to finances as a third factor involved in his questioning of the feasibility of evangelicals turning toward the private school. Noting the expense of education, Willimon suggested that the expenditure for Christian schooling would take away from the need for finances in other areas he

felt the church has a more readily perceived interest. Dr. Ralph Mawdsley, editor of The Central Testimony, published by Central Theological Seminary, and superintendent of the Fourth Baptist Christian Day School, is another critic who has drawn attention to the possible financial strain in a church with a Christian school.⁹²

Willimon further reasoned that Christian involvement in private education works as a drain from public schooling of Christians who have a responsibility to work for the solution of the problems he admitted were there. He asked, "What kind of society will we have if all Christians abandon the public schools?"⁹³

Finally, Willimon asserted that Christians who abandon public schooling are abandoning their responsibility to "let their light shine." He likened the Christian school to a "theological and intellectual hothouse" that simply works to "shield" Christian youth from "contemporary challenges to our faith." Since the bulk of the students in the Christian school, according to Willimon, would hold to the same basic theology, there would not be present those who needed to see the light.

Joseph Bayly has countered this argument by stating,

Let's keep our priorities straight....We don't send children to school primarily to evangelize, or to be salt in a corrupting society. We send them to be educated for life, in its fullest sense: the conventional subject matter, yes, but also for moral reasoning, discipline, and self-discipline, goals, career guidance, sex education, and social relationships and citizenship. Who is as equipped as a Bible-believing Christian for such an education task?⁹⁴

Having rejected the Christian school movement, Willimon explained what he considered to be "more creative, more courageous,

more biblical responses to the problem than by simply moving the game to our own secluded ball park where we make all the rules."⁹⁵ The first suggestion he made was for Christians to become "skeptical of the final efficacy of education in general," and not ask teachers to do what parents are called to do as Christians. Making his remarks personal, Willimon stated,

My church and I will teach my children to pray, to worship, to read the Bible, to counter secularity's false claims, to keep the state in proper Christian perspective, and to witness to the light that shines in the darkness. For me intelligence is not defined as the mere acquisition of facts and figures. Intelligence is the ability to live with all sorts of people, to confidently face challenges to one's faith, to learn from the heart as well as the head. In other words, I want more for my children's nurture than a public or private school can give them.⁹⁶

Willimon's second suggestion was that Christian parents take an active role working in the public schools for better use of tax money and a better education. He called for Christians to seek to serve on school boards, as teachers, as coaches, and as volunteer workers. He called this "proper Christian witness" and issued a stern rebuke to the Christian school people whom he perceived as working against such witness. He wrote,

The literature of Christian school organizations implies that parents who really love their children and that teachers who are really Christians will withdraw from the public schools and make the needed sacrifices to provide true Christian education. Such self-righteousness may be needed to keep Christian schools afloat, but it insults those Christians who see their commitment to public education as a Christian witness.⁹⁷

Finally, Willimon suggested that Christian teachers and students in the public schools need to be supported. He called for the development of creative ways to handle the tough situations that do

arise. He suggested that churches meet the situations head-on and act as "salt in a sometimes unsavory environment,"⁹⁸ rather than withdrawing.

Criticism of the Christian School Movement Coming
From Outside Evangelicalism

Much of the criticism expressed by Dr. Willimon is not unlike that coming from outside the ranks of evangelicalism; specifically the issues of racism, quality education, and finances. David Nevin and Robert E. Bills have written a book, The Schools That Fear Built. It is the result of a two-year study made by the Lamar Society. The preface of the book stated that it was "the first full discussion ever published on the new private schools that have sprung up across the South in the wake of integration orders."⁹⁹ Although the book deals exclusively with the southern situation, much of the criticism found in the book corresponds to criticism nationwide. Nevin stated this in the book: "The Society's project has limited itself to the thirteen southern states but in fact such schools are springing up in many parts of the country."¹⁰⁰

Nevin acknowledged that "it is too simple" to attribute the growth of private schooling "entirely to racism and fear of integration."¹⁰¹ Further, he acknowledged that the private Christian schools are of much more recent vintage than the early segregationist academies and differ from them in that the earlier schools were secular and the newer Christian schools are "heavily influenced by the fundamental theology of the more conservative evangelical churches." Nevertheless, he concluded,

But in a larger sense, the difference between them is unimportant, for despite what would seem contrary origins, the schools in practice are so similar as to be indistinguishable. They look the same, are financed in the same ways, and from the same motives, and teach essentially the same philosophy. Perhaps the single most important point about these schools is their sameness.¹⁰²

This attempt to link the private Christian school to the admittedly segregationist academies appears to this writer to be rather strained. The authors admittedly found very little evidence to prove that there was a deliberate attempt to exclude blacks. They concede that most had official policies that stated students would not be denied admission because of race. But much in the same way that many school districts in both north and south have been found to be "de facto" segregated, this has been interpreted to be a sign that behind the scenes there has been some form of covert manipulation. In isolated instances this may indeed have been the case, but the Lamar Society certainly does not prove it.

In fairness to Nevin, it must be noted that he has confessed that "it would be less than candid not to state the biases that the participants in the study acquired as they carried on their study."¹⁰⁸ The biases, according to Nevin, led the participants to conclude that these private schools are "destructive" to individuals, public schools, and society.

To the individual because despite the schools' claim to the contrary, they offer the student a weak and narrow education that appears inadequate for the modern world.

To the public schools, because the new schools draw off the students most likely to stabilize and enrich public schools and vitiate the public support that is essential to them.

To society, because of the damage done public schools and because of the tendency of the new private schools to perpetuate

the ignorance that long has been the bane of the South.
 They also damage the movement towards an integrated
 society.¹⁰⁴

These criticisms by non-evangelicals are more important than first meets the eye. Their real importance lies in the fact that it becomes evident that the criticism comes essentially, not from the Christian schools violating any laws or rights, but rather because such schools do not line up with the philosophical world view of the critics. Nevin stated that the private Christian schools offer a "weak and narrow education." Certainly this is a subjective value judgment. Many evangelicals view the modern public school as offering a "weak and broad" education. This too is a value judgment. Further, Nevin's criticism indicates that he believed that public schools can and should exist without treating fairly those whom he admitted are "most likely to stabilize and enrich" the schools, and "vitiating the public support that is essential to them." He made no attempt to explain how the public school curriculum should be accommodated to keep those leaving it for what he termed a "weak and narrow" education. To Nevin and the others, the private Christian schools are destructive simply because they represent a potential force capable of stemming the trends they approve of in society, which these evangelicals see as destructive.

The Americans United for the Separation of Church and State (AUSCS) sponsored a study dealing with the financial aspects of private and public schooling, especially the financial impact upon public schools when the private ones close. The results of that study

appeared in book form in 1972 with the title, When Parochial Schools Close, written by Martin A. Lawson, a member of the AUSCS National Advisory Council.¹⁰⁵ In this work Lawson shared certain "facts" discovered during the study that indicate why Christian schools, as well as other private schools, often receive criticism from within the public ranks over finances. Among his findings were the following:

(1) Communities with many parochial schools and other forms of exempt property in large amounts have substantially higher tax rates.

(2) Whenever the public schools have been severely undernourished, the primary cause has been the existence of a large system of parochial education; since the parents patronizing this have refused to vote bonds for the public schools, the latter have been impoverished.

(3) Whereas the public schools absorbed about 18 million pupils between 1950 and 1965, and did so without serious difficulty, they are now, on the contrary, facing a definite loss of enrollment because of the falling birthrate, which began to decline in 1962-63; and that they will be able to maintain their attendance during the Seventies only if private schools close in considerable numbers.¹⁰⁶

Evangelicals supportive of Christian schooling generally are not very moved by this form of criticism. Their absence from public schools, they feel, is due to their being forced out. Therefore, arguments based upon the survival of public education generally do not find a sympathetic ear. This writer talked to a prominent speaker whose sympathies lie with private Christian schooling, and he said, "I do not hide the fact that I would welcome the demise of our present system of public schooling." He felt that this would return education to the free market place.

Criticism of Christian Schooling from within Its Own Ranks

Dr. Mawdsley has questioned the state of the Christian school movement and the pace at which it is growing. His criticism is significant because it not only manifests that there are those at both ends of the evangelical spectrum that have expressed problems with the movement (the study has already referred to Dr. Willimon at Duke, a much more liberal place than Mawdsley's fundamental Central Seminary), but that criticism is coming from within the ranks of Christian schooling as well as outside it. Mawdsley did not accuse the Christian school movement of "retreating" (such would hardly seem consistent from one who is the superintendent of such a school), but he did claim that much of the movement is characterized by salesmanship, a financial draining of church budgets, and naivety, all of which have tended to produce a generally "mediocre or poor education."¹⁰⁷ He viewed the characteristics noted above as being linked in a chain reaction. He felt that the "astronomical rate with which Baptist churches are beginning their own schools attests to the effectiveness of the salesmanship" of those producing materials and heading organizations.¹⁰⁸ Once the salesmanship has convinced the church that Christian schooling is the only way to go, it embarks upon such a course only to find out "too late" that "it is not the initial start-up costs that is devastating, it is the maintenance and improvement expenses augmented by rampant inflation."¹⁰⁹ Mawdsley accused the movement of naiveness

in having failed to see that the market doesn't always remain constant. He cited population shifts, the decline of national enrollments, and certain adjustments, like a return to the basics movement, on the part of the public schools as factors that many churches never considered before committing themselves to a Christian school. Having overlooked these factors, many churches have had to face fewer students and hence fewer dollars to run their programs. He reduced the problem to the following,

In the business community, insufficient finances for a house or car can result in repossession; in local Baptist Church Day Schools, insufficient financing results, unfortunately, in mediocre or poor education. Unlike the individual, whose unwise financial planning is resolved by the repossession of the car, the unwise financial planning for the Christian Day School produces a heritage of educationally deprived children, ill-prepared for life by an anemic and truncated educational program.¹¹⁰

Another criticism coming from within the ranks of the Christian school movement is the charge that while these schools often espouse the virtue of parental control, in practice they often simply replace one non-parental authority with another. Calvin Cummings addressed this issue.

Christian parents need to be aware that there are some today, who in the name of Christian education, hold that the teacher is sovereign in the classroom and operates independently of the parents. In To Prod the Slumbering Giant, H. Van Reissen has written, "Parents have authority over their children within the family; they do not have authority over the school." In the same book, A. Peeton states that "the staff runs the school." This view torpedoes the whole biblical concept of the Christian parent. The teacher may stand against the Christian parent in his view of the Bible and the philosophy of education, and the parent can say or do nothing about it. This is a usurpation of the authority that scripturally belongs to the parents. Parents who have children in a Christian school will need to guard against the danger of letting the Christian school become a substitute for the Christian home.¹¹¹

Referring to Van Riessen, Peetom, and others whose views are reflected in To Prod the Slumbering Giant and speaking against such views, G. Bonekamp, a spokesman for The Reformed Fellowship of Canada, has written that such views are relatively new in Christian education. He alleged that they are not based upon "authoritative control by parents" and the "authoritative sovereignty of the Scriptures." Rather, he asserted, they are based on "a philosophically determined 'broadened' Word of God" under the control of principals, teachers, education committee members, and board members.¹¹² When such is the case, Bonekamp asserted, there has been a change "from scriptural, parental authority to authority behind the classroom door."¹¹³

Joseph Bayly also addressed the problem of schools intruding into the area of parental responsibility and took it further than Cummings and Bonekamp. Bayly felt that the widespread use of rules and regulations concerning appearance often oversteps the function of the school. He wrote,

It seems to me that parents are responsible to God for decisions about their children's appearance and recreation, and that...school administrators are wrong, in my opinion, if they treat the school as a substitute for parents and assume their authority over any decision-making for the children.¹¹⁴

Despite the internal differences, which can be expected in a movement as diverse as is evangelicalism, the fact remains that, at this point in time, evangelicals are increasingly being convinced that they have no other realistic option in education than private Christian schooling. Barring any significant changes in the public educational systems, Christian schools will continue to grow, despite an increased

resistance to them by the public school establishment, which will continue to view them as destructive.

Evangelicals Unhappy with Public Schools but Desiring
to Remain with Them

Efforts to Create Awareness

Thus far the study has noted two major efforts to solve the problems of evangelicals in public education. The first, initiated from within public schooling ("teaching about religion"), is unsatisfactory to most evangelicals. The second, the private Christian school movement, avoids the basic issue of equal rights within public schooling. It necessitates a movement outside it. Unhappy with what is perceived as "indoctrination" in anti-biblical teaching but either unable or unwilling to send their children to a private school, some evangelicals are questioning both the legality and the morality that in effect requires them to send their children into an institution undermining the values of the home. For the most part, these evangelicals have felt the same pressures as do those opting for Christian schools, but rather than leaving are determined to wage a last fight. Their efforts have not been as published as the two movements already discussed, but they do present another evangelical work to dissolve the existing dilemma. Their efforts are designed to awaken evangelical students, educators, and secular educators to the issues and to provide practical help in meeting them.

In the forefront of this movement is the National Educators Fellowship (NEF), based in Pasadena, California. Begun in the early 1950's, the NEF has served the evangelical community as the only, if not the most significant, organization of professional Christian educators. Through their magazine, Vision, Christian educators are not only kept abreast of current issues, but also provided with suggestions of how to implement their evangelical belief in the classroom while remaining within the confines of the law. Benjamin Weiss, editor of Vision, has written several books designed to help Christian educators, including The Courts and the Schools and Religious Observances in Public Schools. The Fellowship also markets Christian Teacher and the Law by Christopher Hall and God in the Classroom by Marjorie E. Adams. This last book is a compilation of actual experiences of Christian educators and how they function as evangelicals in the classroom.

While the NEF has been working primarily with evangelical educators, another organization has recently appeared on the scene with a specific goal of helping evangelical students--Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center in Ferrum, Virginia. Aletheia Springs was begun in 1974, in part by this writer, as a ministry designed to help evangelical youth face the rigors of modern secular schooling. In operation over the past six years, it has attracted 60 to 100 high school and college youth from New York to Georgia each summer. The basic program has been to operate three two-week sessions during which specific instruction has been given in those areas where evangelical biblical interpretation and secular schooling most often are in conflict.

Topics of study have included the nature and authority of the Scriptures, the proofs for the existence of God, the superiority of Creation over evolution as an explanation of origins, biblical principles of the nuclear family, the pressures of modern society upon evangelical youth, the teachings of the Bible concerning money, moral issues in biblical perspective (E.R.A., abortion, homosexuality, responsibilities to the poor, etc.). In addition, great stress has been placed on the fact that evangelical beliefs must be internalized before they can be put forth in a class allowing for a free exchange of ideas. Therefore, the youth attending the summer programs are aided in developing skills in Bible study, hermeneutics, and application of what is learned to real life situations. Further attention is given to the subject of how to deal with bias in the classroom, handle situations where conflicts might arise from being assigned lessons that can not in good faith be carried out, and how to raise a question without being disruptive.

The study of 31 evangelical youth cited in Chapter Three involved a group that attended a two-week session at Aletheia Springs. The results of that study revealed that 100% of the parents responding felt that the program definitely helped their children. The study also revealed that there was unanimous agreement among the parents that the program was "probably more effective" than the traditional "going to camp" summer supplement many evangelical parents give their children. A number of the summer participants have attended the program four consecutive years--indicating that these students felt the program was helpful. Early follow-up showed that the program had a 70% return rate; 7 of every 10 came back another year. Many letters have been received

from both students and parents testifying to the positive effect of the program.

Despite the perceived impact of groups such as the NEF and Aletheia Springs, these cannot be viewed as more than a virtual "drop in the bucket," when compared to the millions of evangelical youth attending public schooling. In addition to the limited outreach there are other limitations. Aletheia Springs, for instance, deals only with young people entering eighth grade through college. Some of the public school problems already noted begin in the early elementary years, so programs such as Aletheia Springs must refocus what may already have a five or six year history. Furthermore, the fact that such programs operate in the summer detracts from the youth who are available to come. Many must find summer jobs to help pay for the rising cost of a college education. Others, having been in school for 10 months would rather not spend two more weeks in a "study type" environment. Still others, it must be conceded, simply are apathetic to the issues.

What may be the most influential work among evangelicals interested in staying within public education is that being done by Mel and Norma Gabler out of Texas. Concerned over what they saw as anti-Christian influences coming into their own children's textbooks, the Gablers began reviewing all textbooks up for adoption in Texas public schools and reporting their findings at the public hearings established by the Texas State School Board. Over the past several years their reports have resulted in keeping a number of books objected to by evangelicals off the Approved List of Textbooks in Texas. Other

textbooks have been changed to conform to the pattern suggested by the Gablers. Since Texas is one of the largest buyers of textbooks, many publishers, rather than print several editions, have chosen to use the Texas edition nationwide. The success of the Gablers' efforts has been noted nationally; ABC news did a special segment on them in February of 1980 and they have appeared on such television shows as the Phil Donohue show.

In another effort to solve their problems in education, evangelicals have been trying to convince public school educators that there is a problem and that this problem must be dealt with. In 1975 this writer stated in an article appearing in Interest magazine and subsequently reprinted in The Christian Reader and Vision,

Most educators will recognize as immoral, a law requiring attendance at an institution whose net effect undermines a parent's attempts to influence how his child will turn out, what he will believe, and how he will act....If evangelicals can get public school authorities to see this problem, we will then be in a position to document the many ways teachers and textbooks (often unwittingly) undermine our efforts at home.... We must let educators know that while they are teaching that man is here by blind chance, we are explaining that he was created by Divine Intelligence.

While they are attempting to demonstrate that everything is subject to scientific analysis, we are teaching that there is a spiritual dimension not discernable by scientific scales. Unless enlightened by us, these educators will continue to assume that all religionists have accepted these and other doctrines of liberalism.¹¹⁵

The 1975 article went on to state that evangelicals need to challenge public school educators to put into practice what is so widely accepted in theory--namely, pluralism. It is to this end that this writer has repeatedly worked in presentations to the American Educational Studies Association, the State Board of Education in Virginia,

and numerous local school boards. While it is admitted that some educators have responded favorably to both the allegations made and the solutions proposed, the fact remains that such efforts have seemingly produced little fruit thus far and may be "too little, too late."

New Strategies for Pluralism

Stephen Arons, writing in the Harvard Educational Review in February 1976, has suggested a possible reason why attempts to implement pluralism within public schooling have so often gone undeeded--he thinks it's impossible! The following quote explained why.

Individual parents have rarely been able to feel that their particular values have prevailed in the schooling of their children. In almost all the struggles over the content, structure, and methods of public schools, the underlying agreement among the combatants has been that majoritarian political control of the school system is appropriate.¹¹⁶

The Supreme Court in 1925 made majoritarian control "tolerable to some parents" because it guaranteed their right to choose a non-public school that better reflected their values. The 1925 decision, *Pierce vs. the Society of Sisters*, noted that "the child is not the mere creature of the state" and that a 1922 Oregon law requiring attendance at a public school "unnecessarily" interfered with the liberty of parents to "direct the upbringing and education" of their children. Arons has suggested that the current practice of majoritarian control of public schools is really discriminatory to those unable to afford the choice of private schooling. What is needed, he asserted, is to reread the *Pierce* decision "as a First Amendment case" and take account of the nature of schooling reflected in the case. Arons

suggested that the Pierce principles reached the basic value choices on which school policy and practice are based. He stated further that,

The result of such a reading is that it is the family and not the political majority which the Constitution empowers to make such schooling decisions. A First Amendment reading of Pierce suggests therefore that the present state system of compulsory attendance and financing of public schools does not adequately satisfy the principle of government neutrality toward family choice in education.¹¹⁷

According to Arons, "value inculcation cannot be eliminated from schooling," therefore, "the notion of value neutral education is untenable."¹¹⁸ This Arons asserted, is a fact recognized by parents, social commentators, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, and others who have done research on schooling, but it is left out by the law. Arons therefore concluded that,

When the court's well developed doctrine of government neutrality in First Amendment issues concerning manipulation of beliefs is combined with the social scientists' and parents' understanding of schooling as a value-inculcating process, some extensive restructuring of compulsory education may be constitutionally required and publically acceptable.¹¹⁹

Dr. J. Robertson McQuilkin, president of Columbia Bible College in Columbia, South Carolina, in a version of a paper edited for Christianity Today after it was presented during a conference at Virginia Tech on "Religion, Morality, and Education," cited the work of Arons and sought to build upon it. Noting that "most children of evangelicals will continue to attend public schools" and that this will mean for them an education "in a system that officially treats God as irrelevant to life," McQuilkin suggested that "the public school itself be thoroughly pluralized."¹²⁰ He claimed that there were two ways of doing this. The first would be to recognize that every teacher

has a value system and is communicating it. Therefore, "We should reopen the doors psychologically (if legal doors are in truth open) for the Christian teacher to share his or her Christian values freely."¹²¹

McQuilkin anticipated objection that the proposal would allow indoctrination in religious convictions with which other parents may not agree. He answered the charge by stating, "That is my point; this is precisely what is happening."¹²² He was referring to the plight of evangelicals. Like Arons he claimed,

Moral neutrality is impossible. Moral values are being taught in the public schools. I am simply appealing for equal time. Free the Christian teacher to teach his religious and moral convictions as the secular humanist is free to teach his. This freedom must be established by law. If as many authorities claim, the Supreme Court has already affirmed this freedom, means must be devised to restrain the omnipresent and omnipotent Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Bureaucrats, from Washington, D.C., to local school boards must learn law or be controlled in their application of it.¹²³

The second way McQuilkin suggested that the public school system could be pluralized would be "to renew the old released-time concept but with a crucial change: it would be under the auspices of the school itself."¹²⁴ This approach, he suggested, would be a recognition that "value-neutral instruction is a fiction" and would authorize any group of parents "to provide a teacher for an elective course in religion and morals." If true freedom is a valid goal, McQuilkin suggested that a concerted effort must be extended towards providing it. In the area of religion and morals true freedom only exists "if parents and students have a choice of instructor."¹²⁵

Another evangelical group which has called for a restructuring of public education to solve the basic problems evangelicals have with

it, is the Association for Public Justice (APJ) in Washington, D.C. The group calls itself "a Christian citizens' organization working for justice in all areas of public life."¹²⁶ Going further than McQuilkin, the APJ has called for a system that allows all private religious schools to be publicly financed. This is not a new concept in education. It is essentially what prevailed in America prior to Horace Mann. More recently in 1969, Dr. George Charles Roche III, director of seminars for the Foundation for Economic Education, wrote: "The only lasting solution is to remove education from the hands of the government, restoring responsibility to the student and the parent."¹²⁷ The APJ proposal is significant to this study as it manifests that certain evangelicals are now giving support to the idea as a means of solving their problems. Dr. Rockne McCarthy, professor of education at Trinity Christian College and vice chairman of the APJ, talked about the proposal in a speech, "Historical and Legal Roots of the Public-Private School Controversy in the United States," delivered April 6, 1979, to the Christian Legal Society. He stated that a clean line of separation between public and private education is relatively modern but has increasingly become part of the modern mindset. He blamed evangelicals for the transference of schooling from pluralism to the present monolithic system. What Americans have today, McCarthy insisted, is not "public" and "non-public" schools but rather "government" and "non-government" schools. He claimed that financial aid to only the government schools is not only discriminatory but manifests a lack of social justice.

In 1978, McCarthy and Dr. James Skillen, research director of the APJ, appeared before Congressional committees concerning proposed

legislation granting a federal income tax credit or refund to persons who pay tuition for their children or themselves to attend school.¹²⁸

The substance of their testimony is found in a position paper distributed by the APJ entitled, "Justice for Education." The paper in part stated,

Public Justice affirms that the cultural freedom of every citizen, group, and institution in our country is only possible in a pluralistic society. The principles of public justice oppose all attempts of government to create a homogenous mass of citizens or a non-differentiated society. A truly just government must encourage, protect, and make room for the development and expression of the cultural freedom of individuals, groups, and institutions in our society. This task is one of the primary responsibilities of government.¹²⁹

The APJ feels that the United States is not a pluralistic state in that it has allowed a monolithic school system to be established. The APJ claimed that while citizens have impartial treatment afforded them in the areas of politics and economics (they are not forced into a monolithic political party, and the opposition to socialism is in part based upon the economic rights of citizens), this same basic right is not afforded citizens in the area of education.¹³⁰

The Association for Public Justice affirms that in a pluralistic society the principles of public justice require of government an equitable handling of the goods, services, welfare, protection, and opportunity that it controls, without penalty or specific advantage to any person, group, or institution due to religious, racial, linguistic, sexual, economic, or other social and individual differences. The present public funding policy for education by the federal, state, and local governments does not measure up to this test of a truly democratic-pluralistic governmental policy.¹³¹

Professor William Stanmeyer, associate professor of law at Indiana University Law School (on leave) and president of the Lincoln Center for Legal Studies in Arlington, Virginia, addressed the issue of dismantling public education at the 1979 Christian Legal Society

convention. In a paper entitled, "Parental Rights in Education vs. State Secularism," Stanmeyer suggested,

First, we could stop all public financing of schools and allow the free market to work. Broadly speaking, this dispensation obtained in America from 1776 to roughly 1840. Granted the modern need for universal literacy and other social changes, nonetheless there is not doubt that the private enterprise approach to education would work: both proprietary schools and not-for-profit (tax deductible) schools would spring up to augment those already extant; with their property taxes reduced 50 to 70 percent because no longer needed for public schools, the parents and taxpayers would have adequate funds to pay for these private schools. And they would have far more control, more choice, lower costs, and without a doubt a higher quality of literacy.¹³²

Stanmeyer's views are not uniquely new but essentially a position that the Foundation for Economic Education and others have held for a number of years. Roche suggested it in the work previously cited, where he responded to one of the more prevalent objections to it: the allegation that people would not send their children to school if compulsion did not exist. To this charge Roche responded,

I have yet to meet the person who will not send his child to school. It is always the other people who would supposedly be remiss in their duty. A parallel case may be discovered in the arguments of the last century concerning organized religion. The original argument for a state-supported church was that religion would fail if people were given their choice whether or not to support organized religion.¹³³

Stanmeyer, who optimistically presented the proposal, was pessimistic about seeing it achieved. He concluded, "Still, as we all realize, this radical reversal of practice will not happen."¹³⁴

Stanmeyer may be correct in his assessment of the prospects of dismantling the present system. The system represents an established institution that Americans have come to place almost on a par with the church in their expectations of leadership. Further, the National Education

Association has become a potent political force that will not give in easily. Nonetheless, if this view becomes a dominant one among evangelicals and evangelicals unite with Catholic parochial school people, a combination could conceivably be created that would be a force to be reckoned with.

Summary

Having viewed the major thrusts directly aimed at solving the problems evangelical Christians face in educating their children in America today, from within public schooling and evangelicalism itself, this writer has concluded that, given a continuation of present trends, there does not seem to be any prospect for a short range solution. Public school people appear to be characterized by a lack of genuine concern for evangelicals, at least enough concern to initiate positive changes. Evangelicals are rapidly becoming less optimistic about any forthcoming changes and are increasingly leaving or looking to see a restructuring of public education as now known. The largest single evangelical effort today appears to be an attempt to see that the right of private schooling remains an option. A primary fear is that the government, in an attempt to save public education, will close that door or so regulate private schooling so as to make it virtually indistinguishable from the public schooling evangelicals now are bailing out of.

The next chapter will present, as perhaps a last ditch effort to keep evangelicals in public schooling, the steps which will have to

be taken immediately by both public school and evangelical leaders. Discussed in practical terms will be the policy that needs to be developed and implemented, the roles which will have to be assumed by homes, churches, and teacher training institutions, state and local school boards, and textbook publishers, as each of these will have a role to play if evangelicals are to any extent remain with public schooling. Chapter Five will also discuss the direction private Christian schooling will need to go if the necessary changes are not made.

FOOTNOTES

¹Nicholas Piediscalzi and William Collie, Teaching About Religion in Public Schools (Niles, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1977), p. 13.

²Nicholas Piediscalzi, "Keynote Address: Public Education Religion Studies in the United States," Religious Education, (January-February, 1976), p. 149.

³Paul J. Will, "Implementing the Study of Religion in High Schools: One State's Experience," Religious Education, (January-February, 1976), p. 91.

⁴"Public Schools Can Study Religion," Intellect, (September, 1977), p. 105.

⁵R. C. McMillan, "Religious Content in Selected Social Studies Textbooks," doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1970, pp. 228, 231, quoted by James V. Panoch, "Religion Studies: On the Outs with the Curriculum," Newsletter, PERSC, (Autumn, 1975), p. 2.

⁶Robert Michaelsen, Piety in the Public School (London: The MacMillan Co., 1970), p. 263.

⁷"Religion in the Public Schools: A Report by the Commission on Religion" (Washington, D.C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1964), p. 55.

⁸Michaelsen, op. cit., p. 263.

⁹John R. Whitney, "Introducing Religious Literature in Pennsylvania Secondary Schools," in David E. Engel, Religion in Public Education (New York: Paulist Press, 1974), p. 107.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 108.

¹¹John R. Whitney, "The First Year with Religious Literature in Pennsylvania High Schools," in Engel, op. cit., p. 133.

¹²Ann M. Hildebrand, "Religion Studies in Elementary Language Arts: Beginnings, Mythic and Scientific," in Piediscalzi and Collie, op. cit. pp. 63-79.

¹³Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Robert Spivey, "A New Shape for Religion and Public Education," in Engel, op. cit., p. 154.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹C. S. Lewis, in Harold Lindsell, The Bible in the Balance (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1979), p. 287.

²⁰Whitney, "The First Year with Religious Literature in Pennsylvania Secondary Schools," p. 134.

²¹R. Laird Harris, Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1975), p. 23.

²²Josh McDowell, More Evidence that Demands a Verdict (San Bernadino, Cal.: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1975), p. 37.

²³Harris, op. cit., p. 26.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 27.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 27-28.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Whitney, op. cit., p. 134.

²⁹Jon T. Barton, "Teaching the Bible in Public Schools," Christianity Today, (September 7, 1979), p. 1157.

³⁰"Announcing The Bible Reader," The Bruce Publishing Co., New York.

³¹Walter M. Abbott, S. J., Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, Rolfe Lanier Hunt, J. Carter Swaim, The Bible Reader (New York: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1969), p. xi.

³²"The Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy," in Harold Lindsell, op. cit., p. 367.

³³Abbott, Gilbert, Hunt, and Swaim, op. cit., pp. xi-xii.

³⁴Ibid., p. xx.

³⁵Ibid., p. xvii.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., p. 8.

³⁸ Frank E. Gaebelein, A Varied Harvest (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967), p. 28.

³⁹ J. Susan Austin, "Religion in Elementary School Social Studies: A Vehicle for Attitudinal Change," Religious Education, (September-October, 1976) .

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 477.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 484.

⁴² Ibid., p. 475.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 480.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 483.

⁴⁷ William Collie and Madeline Apt, "Student Attitudes Toward Religion Studies Courses," Educational Leadership, (April, 1978), p. 547.

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 549.

⁴⁹ Ibid., pp. 549-550.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 549.

⁵¹ David L. Barr, "Religion in Schools: Four Questions Evangelicals Ask," Christianity Today, (January 21, 1972), p. 349.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Jon T. Barton, op. cit., p. 1156.

⁵⁶ Paul Blanshard, Religion and the Schools (Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 190.

⁵⁷ Henry M. Morris, Education for the Real World (San Diego, Calif.: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977), p. 6.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 9.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 23.

⁶⁰Ibid.

⁶¹John Dewey, in David B. Cummings, The Purpose of a Christ-Centered Education (Phillipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1979), p. v.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³Ibid., p. vi.

⁶⁴Ibid.

⁶⁵Cornelius Van Til, Essays on Christian Education (Phillipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974), p. 188.

⁶⁶Roy Zuck, in Paul A. Kienel, The Christian School: Why It Is Right for Your Child (Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1977), p. 72.

⁶⁷Roy W. Lowrie, "The Purpose, Philosophy, Objectives of the Christian School" (Newtown Square, Penn.: National Christian School Education Association, 1974).

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Calvin K. Cummings, "Parents: The Purpose of a Christian School Is...", in David B. Cummings, op. cit., p. 1.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 4.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Ibid., p. 5.

⁷⁴"Grace Academy--An Educational Alternative," brochure of Grace Academy, 2731 Edgewood St., S.W., Roanoke, Va. 24015.

⁷⁵Paul A. Kienel, "The Forces Behind the Christian School Movement," Faith Aflame, (March-April, 1978), p. 6.

⁷⁶Elmer L. Towns, Have the Public Schools Had It? (Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1974), p. 158.

⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 158-159.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 159.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Alan N. Grover, Ohio's Trojan Horse (Greenville, S.C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1977), p. 93.

⁸¹Robert Alan Hill and Olaf John, Your Children: The Victims of Public Education (Van Nuys, Calif.: Bible Voice Inc., 1978), p. 14.

⁸²Ibid., pp. 14-15.

⁸³Roy W. Lowrie, "Discipline in the Christian School," brochure of the National Christian School Education Association, 1976.

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Kienel, Church Aflame, op. cit., p. 6.

⁸⁶Kienel, The Christian School: Why It Is Right for Your Child, op. cit., pp. 43-48.

⁸⁷William H. Willimon, "Should Churches Buy Into the Educational Business?", Christianity Today, (May 5, 1978), p. 964.

⁸⁸Joseph Bayly, "Why I'm for Christian Schools," Christianity Today, (January 25, 1980), p. 93.

⁸⁹Willimon, op. cit., p. 965.

⁹⁰Russell T. Hitt, "Whose Side Are You On?", Moodly Monthly, (February, 1980), p. 26.

⁹¹Willimon, op. cit., p. 965.

⁹²Ralph D. Mawdsley, "Crisis in Christian Education," The Central Testimony, (July-August, 1978), p. 1.

⁹³Willimon, op. cit., p. 966.

⁹⁴Bayly, op. cit., p. 98.

⁹⁵Willimon, op. cit., p. 966.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 967.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸Ibid.

⁹⁹David Nevin and Robert E. Bills, The Schools That Fear Built (Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books Ltd., 1976), p. 1.

- 100 Ibid., p. 4.
- 101 Ibid., p. 1.
- 102 Ibid., p. 2.
- 103 Ibid., p. 3.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 Martin A. Lawson, When Parochial Schools Close (Washington, D.C.: Robert E. Luce Inc., 1972).
- 106 Ibid., p. 5.
- 107 Mawdsley, op. cit., p. 1.
- 108 Ibid.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 Ibid.
- 111 Calvin Cummings, op. cit., p. 5.
- 112 G. Bonekamp, "Authority: Behind the Classroom Door," Viewpoint: Five Essays on Christian Education (Rexdale, Ontario, Canada: The Reformed Fellowship of Canada, 1974), pp. 18-19.
- 113 Ibid., p. 19.
- 114 Bayly, op. cit., p. 94.
- 115 Gerald Stiles, "Evangelicals and Public Schools," Interest, (February, 1975), p. 4.
- 116 Stephen Arons, "Pierce Reconsidered," Harvard Educational Review, (February, 1976).
- 117 Ibid.
- 118 Ibid.
- 119 Ibid.
- 120 J. Robertson McQuilkin, "Public Schools: Equal Time for Evangelicals," Christianity Today, (December 30, 1977), p. 406.
- 121 Ibid., pp. 406-407.

122 Ibid.

123 Ibid.

124 Ibid.

125 Ibid.

126 Position paper, "Justice for Education," Association for Public Justice, Washington, D.C., 1978.

127 George Charles Roche III, Education in America (Irvington-On-Hudson, N. Y.: The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., 1969), p. 153.

128 "Justice for Education," op. cit.

129 Ibid.

130 Ibid.

131 Ibid.

132 William Stanmeyer, "Parental Rights in Education vs. State Secularism," paper presented to The Christian Legal Society, April 7, 1979, at Atlanta, Ga., p. 13.

133 Roche, op. cit., p. 154.

134 Stanmeyer, op. cit., p. 13.

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND PROPOSALS

In the first four chapters this study has concentrated on identifying the evangelical Christian movement, tracing the historical path of the evangelical as it related to education, describing the problems evangelicals currently face in American education, and analyzing the major attempts to solve those problems. The study has been approached from an evangelical perspective in order to give interested observers a means of understanding the widespread evangelical discontent with public education in the United States. This concluding chapter will present a synopsis of what has already been stated, the conclusions this writer has drawn from the study, and his proposals for change that he believes may aid in solving the problems.

Summary of Chapters 1-4

Chapter One noted that evangelical Christians represent a minority religious group distinguished from other groups claiming the Christian label by the doctrines they hold; in particular, evangelicals believe that God has revealed to mankind His will in the form of inerrant Scriptures (the Bible), and that these Scriptures require of man a conversion experience (the new birth) based upon the death, the

shed blood, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Because evangelicals believe the Bible is the Word of God, they believe that the information which it contains is absolute truth.

Despite the fact that evangelicals are united by the two foci of an inerrant Scripture and the new birth, there exists among them a wide range of variations. The variation most significant to this study is the distinction between the mainstream evangelical and those found on either of the two extremes. On the extreme right is the separatist fundamentalist who has tended to stress separation to the point that it would be "compromise" for him to interact within the confines of a neutral public school. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of these evangelicals have already opted for private education. On the extreme left of the evangelical movement is a group that is actually in danger of leaving the historic evangelical position altogether due to a questioning of the inerrancy of Scripture. Because of this position on inerrancy, these people are not usually found among evangelicals actively protesting recent developments in education. The focus of this study has been the evangelical in the middle of both these extremes.

Chapter Two revealed that evangelical Christians historically have been in the forefront of educational movements. This was due to the fact that evangelicals have always placed great stress on equipping every man to read the Scriptures for himself. In addition evangelicals have attempted to carry out the injunctions of Christ and the early Apostles who emphasized that the entire world should hear the Gospel and be taught to carry out the message delivered by Christ.

It was further noted in Chapter Two that evangelicals have long been plagued by two problems: (1) the difficulty of maintaining evangelical distinctiveness as a minority group in a society that does not hold to an evangelical consensus, especially when their children attend schools they do not control, and (2) the propensity of evangelical parents to neglect their biblically mandated role in the education of their children. The first of these two recurring problems was especially manifested in the American culture when out of a seemingly evangelical consensus arose a belief that education existed more as a function of the state than that of either parents or church. As America received more and varied people, the culture changed. Schools began to reflect this change and pressure was brought to bear upon those elements of public schooling which still reflected the past evangelical dominance. A climax was reached in 1962-63 when the United States Supreme Court outlawed the devotional practices of prayer and Bible reading in the schools. The second major recurring problem evangelicals historically have had in relation to education, that of parental neglect, was explained in Chapter Two to have occurred early in American history, when the Massachusetts Law of 1642 noted the general neglect of parents. The propensity towards neglect surfaced again during the late 1800's and early 1900's when many evangelicals, like other Americans, were swept away with materialism.

Today's scene was dealt with in Chapter Three. It was observed that current problems stem from the fact that society has continued to move further away from the evangelical position while the lack of adequate policy relating to religion in public schools has

allowed societal views at odds with evangelicalism to become prevalent in the schools. Specifically causing concern for evangelicals has been the religion of secular humanism, a view held to and forming the basis of the work of many leading educational theorists and reformers, among whom have been Lawrence Kohlberg and the values clarification proponents. Educators like these, having rejected the absolutism of what evangelicals accept as God's inerrant Word, have sought to lay a new basis, using the public schools, for the understanding of morals and values. This has led to serious conflict over the purpose and nature of public schooling. Compounding the issue, it was noted, has been the ambiguity of the law relating to the protection afforded individuals under the "Free Exercise" clause of the First Amendment and the continued failure of evangelicals themselves to address properly their children's needs. This latter aspect of the problem was observed to be a failure of both parents and the church to prepare adequately evangelical youth to survive as evangelicals in a society that rejects basic evangelical distinctives.

Chapter Four first revealed that little is being done from within public schooling to solve the problems described in Chapter Three. The single most visible movement dealing with religion in the schools was seen to be the "teaching about" religion programs. It was noted that these programs, designed to bring religion into the school as an objective subject of study rather than indoctrination, generally have been found to present more problems for evangelicals than they solve.

While most evangelicals would welcome the recognition that religion is a worthy object of study, they nonetheless object to the fact that many of the teaching about religion programs, when dealing with the Bible, rely heavily upon the documentary hypothesis and the modern concept of myth. Such practices, evangelicals claim, is a direct affront to their belief that the Bible is divinely inspired and the inerrant Word of God. It was further noted in Chapter Four that evangelicals observe in some of these programs a direct attempt to change the religious attitudes of children away from evangelicalism towards that which would be more in line with humanism.

Responding to the problems they observe with public schooling, some evangelicals, as noted in Chapter Four, have sought to salvage their place in the system by seeking to influence textbook selection, to create awareness of their problems, and to appeal to the principles of fair play and neutrality. Others have attempted to provide supplementary programs designed to better prepare evangelical youth to face the task of holding to a minority view in a secular society. Still others have sought to restructure public education claiming that neutrality is an impossibility and therefore the sooner the present system is abolished the sooner a reshaping can be accomplished that will effectively solve the dilemma.

Despite attempts at reforming the public schools in order to make them more palatable to evangelicals, Chapter Four revealed that the most significant movement among evangelicals has been the exodus towards private Christian schools. Those taking this step have concluded that rather than working towards what can at best be a neutral school, they

will instead put their efforts into developing an educational program which openly relates all knowledge to what is viewed as God's truth revealed in the Bible. Chapter Four further pointed out that Christian school proponents believe this form of schooling better assures parental control over the education of their children, places children in a more disciplined environment, and provides the child with a better quality education. While such is increasingly the view of many evangelicals, they are by no means united in this assessment. Some evangelicals have questioned whether such an education can properly prepare evangelical youth to eventually face the "real world." Others have expressed the belief that private Christian schooling is an expensive undertaking only questionably superior in quality and may be a veiled attempt to escape racial integration. These last two accusations are those most often voiced by critics outside evangelicalism. The most serious charge made against Christian schooling coming from those within the movement is that there is often the same lack of parental input encountered in public schooling.

Conclusions Based on Chapters 1-4

After describing and analyzing the relationship between evangelical Christians and public education, this writer has reached certain conclusions. They are as follows:

1. A definite problem exists.
2. The problem is serious not only for evangelicals but also for the public school system.

3. The problem exists due to failure on the part of both public schooling and evangelicals.

4. Little is being done to solve the problem.

5. Most of what is being done fails to reach the root of the problem.

6. Solution is possible, though not probable.

7. Time is running out.

8. Unless a solution to the problem is effected, a greater problem will emerge.

9. True neutrality in public education may insure that large numbers of evangelicals will stay.

10. Evangelicals, desiring more than neutrality, will continue to opt for private Christian schools.

11. Should massive effort to gain neutrality not proceed soon, evangelicals will have to fully commit themselves to private Christian schooling.

12. Should this commitment be made, serious re-evaluation of current Christian school practice will need to be made to insure that such schooling prepares evangelical youth to face secular society, retains parental control, and is accessible to all youth, not just the wealthy.

13. Whether evangelical parents opt for private schools or remain with public education, they will need to place renewed emphasis upon fulfilling the biblical injunctions to teach their children.

14. Parents will increasingly need the helping ministry of the church to enlighten them to the need and prepare them for the task of raising their children according to biblical standards.

The conclusions listed above, especially the first three, need little comment. The fact of a problem, its seriousness, and the revelation that little is being done about it should be evident after having read the first four chapters of this study. Likewise, it should be evident from Chapter Four that the attempts to deal with the problems do not

reach what this writer sees as the root of the problem. The major attempts at dealing with the issue fail to address the ultimate questions which must be answered and answered satisfactorily, if evangelicals can in good conscience remain in public schooling. These questions are:

1. For what purpose does compulsory public education exist?
2. Who has primary rights in the public education of youth: parents, educational "change agents," or the state?
3. Can religion be dealt with in public education in a neutral way?

It was noted in Chapter Four that evangelicals fear public schools are increasingly being used as change agents, in which conscious attempts are being made to alter the values taught at home, if those values are not in conformity to the foundational principles of humanism. This same pattern is viewed by many evangelicals to exist in many programs designed to deal objectively with religion. Evangelicals see little if any effort to alter the perception that those in the forefront of this latter movement are not interested at all in the inclusion of evangelical scholarship to make their programs acceptable to the evangelical community. Conversely, the use of the documentary hypothesis and myth, without qualification, have convinced many evangelicals (including this writer) that the goal of such programs when they deal with the Bible is not objectivity, or description, but rather the indoctrination of the belief that, among other things, the Bible is not an inerrant revelation from God.

The Christian school movement, though it may be the most consistent move for evangelicals considering the present state of public

schooling, does not address itself to the first question noted previously and avoids the second two by withdrawing to the private realm. The movement therefore is not an attempt to solve the root of the problem remaining for evangelical youth who stay in public schools and for parents concerned about the right to see that their children receive a free education.

Whether or not one can agree with the charges that evangelicals are making against public schooling has little to do with the fact that a problem exists. Justified or not in these charges, numbers of evangelicals, having concluded that public schooling is more a hindrance than a help in their children's education, have withdrawn them from public schooling whenever possible. While this presents a problem for parents who must form or find, and then finance an alternative to the system they left, it also presents a problem for the public schools, which not only receive bad publicity, but also lose students and to some extent community support. Furthermore, it is this writer's contention that, for the most part, evangelicals are justified in their charges against public schooling. This writer has concluded that public education has to a large degree become insensitive and even disdainful of the views of evangelical parents and that rather than serve these parents, have sought to supersede them in the role of value development. This charge brings one to the very root of the seriousness of what is being discussed, namely, who has what rights in public education in a free society?

If saving public education as it is now structured is a desired goal, the rate at which new private Christian schools are being

established testifies to the need for immediate attempts to effect meaningful changes that will enable evangelicals to remain within the system. It has repeatedly been shown in this study that given the perpetuation of the current situation, evangelicals will continue to leave. There are also signs that they are not alone in their dissatisfaction with the state schools. Roman Catholic parochial schools, not long ago on the way out, are now experiencing a stable enrollment. Since evangelicals and Roman Catholics together constitute nearly one half the American population, it seems inconceivable that public schools as we now know them could continue were a majority of both these groups to leave. Furthermore, one must question what effect such a withdrawal would have on the nation economically.

For evangelicals, a total commitment to private Christian schooling will not only demand financial sacrifices, but also present them with the problem of how to avoid an isolationism which could hinder their effect upon a society they believe desperately needs the message they have. Care would also have to be taken to insure that the Christian schools themselves do not usurp parental rights. It has previously been noted in this study that some are already alleging this to be the case. Whether or not evangelical parents choose the private school option, they must assume the primary role in their children's education. This responsibility has been assigned them by Scripture and cannot be avoided. The Christian school may be a help but cannot be a substitute for parental responsibility. A total commitment to the Christian school should not result in the loss of

evangelical interest in public education. Because the parent sending his child to the private school must continue to pay for public schooling via his taxes, he retains the right to continue to question the legitimacy of the state to spend that tax money to educate the youth of our nation into what is recognized as a secular religion. Should it be concluded that there is no hope for public education, it will be imperative that the evangelical community devise a way to finance the Christian education of those families with limited finances.

Let it be noted that the conclusion of this writer is that solution is possible, not probable or imminent. If a serious attempt, on the part of public school leaders, is made and made soon, there is a possibility that solution can be effected. Whether such an attempt is made remains to be seen. This writer is now less optimistic than he was when he began this study. As for evangelicals, it appears that currently more desire to remain in public education than not. The study of evangelical educators cited in Chapter Three (see Appendix B) revealed that almost one-half would not send their child to a private Christian school even if financially able to do so. Since these people are already involved with private Christian schooling, it would seem logical that they would not only be more informed concerning the problems which exist, but also be more prone towards Christian schooling than the average Christian. Yet not only would half not send their child, but 80% of those responding to the survey rejected the notion often put forth by Christian school proponents that all parents financially able to do so should send their children to the Christian school. In fact, at the time of this study, 56% of these same leading

evangelical educators were willing to support a bond referendum to help finance public schooling. On the other hand, 46% felt that evangelicals could not hope to see any significant change for the better regarding public education. These findings indicate that evangelicals have not conclusively rejected public schooling, yet the closeness of the tallies reveals a significant degree of concern. Further, the fact that four years have elapsed since that survey leaves open the question of whether evangelicals today are more or less satisfied than in 1976.

Proposals for Solving Evangelical Discontent with Public Schools

Having concluded that a serious problem exists both for evangelicals and the nation's public schools, and that a solution to this problem is possible, it remains for this writer to suggest how such a solution can be effected and what should be done by evangelicals in the event of failure to procure solutions. Because local conditions vary, rather than to propose a list of hard and fast steps promising to be a panacea, the writer has limited his proposals to suggestions which he feels will present the direction and the absolute essentials without which no solution is felt to be possible. For clarity, the proposals are listed below with elaboration following.

1. Create recognition of the problem among all parties concerned: educators, administrators, legislators, parents.
2. By law establish in each state the purpose or aim of public schooling.
3. Develop in each state meaningful policy relative to religion in the schools to implement the aim established by law.

4. Develop at the local school division level adequate policy to insure that religion in the schools is in compliance with state law and policy.

5. Re-awaken evangelicals to see the role they are to play in the world according to Scripture.

6. Mount a massive effort among evangelicals to prepare parents to teach values to their children.

The proposals just given clearly indicate that it is the writer's conviction that evangelical leaders as well as public officials have a role to play in the solution of the problem being discussed. Throughout this study the writer has been consciously noting the fact that evangelicals are as much responsible for the problem as anyone else. Therefore, it is essential that they serve a key role in attempting to work out the solution. Although only evangelicals will be able to carry out the #5 and #6 proposals, it is not being inferred that the first four proposals are exclusively the task of the officials who direct public educational policy and practice. The fact of the matter is that unless those evangelicals who desire to remain in a public education based upon neutrality take the initiative and work hard, it is unlikely that there will be a sufficient number of interested individuals to carry out the proposals enumerated. If solution is to be effected, a joint endeavor is essential.

Create Awareness of the Problem

Because public school administrators may not be aware of either the problem or the potentiality of the problem, it may be

necessary for others, particularly parents, to take the initiative. Since this invariably will mean the involvement of concerned evangelicals, it is suggested that in any given locality a friendly meeting be requested with the school superintendent to discuss the needs of the evangelical community. It should be stressed to the superintendent that the approach is being made not out of anger but rather to open up lines of communication between the school system and a significant segment of the school community. Because those approaching the superintendent will want to speak as true representatives of the evangelical community, it will be necessary to contact all of the evangelical churches in the community. Great care should be maintained to present a true picture of what is desired of the schools and specific areas of concern. If at all possible the one approaching the schools should be able to demonstrate in a tangible way that he or she speaks on the behalf of the community. This may necessitate a preliminary gathering of evangelicals and the drafting of a resolution approved by representative churches and individuals in the community. Someone in the evangelical community will need to do some homework. Textbooks will need to be viewed, students and parents consulted, and libraries scrutinized. Any approach will need to deal with the facts as they exist in that community and not on the basis of hearsay or what "some" public schools are doing. However, the fact that some places are involved in practices unacceptable to evangelicals would be a legitimate topic of discussion, even if not currently a local problem. Simple discussion of the matter may work towards the prevention of that practice latter appearing on the local scene.

In cases where a local policy on religion in the schools is non-existent, evangelicals who approach the local school division would do well to suggest that a committee be formed representing all the religious groups in the division, the teachers, the legal community, as well as any groups whose interest is primarily to keep religion out of the schools. The inclusion of this latter segment of the community is important to insure complete representation of the community. The committee would meet to discuss the concerns of each group represented and attempt to formulate a policy statement reflecting neutrality which would be presented to the school board for adoption in the system.

Educators interested in seeing large numbers of evangelicals remain in public schooling and who are committed to the principle of religious neutrality in the schools, can play an important service by encouraging the attempt to regain neutrality regarding religion in public schooling. It is unlikely that many communities will have the parental initiative alone to bring about action of the nature described. Present school administrators would do well to take the initiative themselves and approach the religious community to inquire into its perceptions of the school program. This could very well be the means to prevent a crisis from developing later. Professors in colleges of education will need to begin exposing the plight of the evangelical to those training to be teachers and administrators. Encouragement needs to come from these leaders to those in the teaching field to see that adequate policy is developed.

While effort will need to be extended to acquaint school officials with the plight of the evangelical, an equally important

effort will need to be made to acquaint evangelicals with the nature of public schooling. It must be stressed that public schools, in order to be public, cannot be centers of Christian learning. It must not be inferred that the effort being extended is aimed at anything more than the achievement of an acceptable level of neutrality.

By Law Establish the Purpose of Compulsory Public Schooling

Since it has been noted that part of the problem evangelicals have with public schooling is due to the fact that some educators have allegedly usurped the rights of parents by attempting to formulate the values, attitudes, beliefs, and desires of children, and that such a usurpation has caused parents to raise the question of who gave the teachers this right, it appears appropriate to ask that the entire purpose of public schooling be established by law. Such a step would be a return to the concept that government governs at the consent of the governed. The law should specifically state to what end public schooling exists and that end must not in any way infringe upon or abridge the basic rights of parents to raise their children as they deem best, so long as such raising is not clearly harmful to the children or society. Today there exists great disagreement over the purpose of education. In part, this disagreement has resulted in the emergence of various private schools as well as different emphases within public schooling. One major theory regarding the aim of public schooling is that the schools exist as the vehicle by which the culture may be

molded to conform to what the educator considers a more perfect social order. Many evangelicals claim it is this theory that is held by those who are in the forefront of the moral development and values clarification movements (described in Chapter Three of this study). Those acting on the basis of this theory stand in contrast to those who believe that public schooling exists to aid parents and the state in training children to be informed and productive citizens of a free society. Those subscribing to this latter view of public schooling believe that the home and church--not the school--should play the role of value clarifier and moral developer. The school should only reinforce consensus values and morals. Public schooling, unlike the home and church, is a function of the public domain. Children are born into the home, parents choose without government interference the church they will attend, but they are, in practice, compelled by law to send their children to public schooling. If parents object to the values being taught their children at a given church, they can simply change churches. This same option is not generally open to parents regarding public schooling unless they are financially able to pay for an alternative. Consensus does not exist in the area of values and morals in this nation. Therefore the practice of one group attempting to use the nation's public schools, where children of other groups are required to be educated, for the purpose of formulating values contrary to the home, becomes intolerable. Because this writer believes that such intolerable practices are currently taking place within public schooling, he believes it is necessary to establish by law exactly to what end public schooling exists. This will not be an easy task. The writer is

hesitant to specify exactly what that end will be. However, it must respect the rights of parents.

The task of setting the aim of public schooling should not be left to educators alone. Education today has grown to the point where it represents an enormous structure that tends to suffer from a propensity to serve its own interests, often at the expense of those it is supposed to serve. This is not to accuse education of anything more than would be true of any large industry or organization. Educators should play a large role in determining the aim of public schooling, but the role of those whose children are to be educated should be even greater. The legitimate interest of the state to have an enlightened electorate should be reflected in the proposed law, but should not preclude the right of each parent to determine what, if any, religious values will dominate in his or her child's educational environment. The law being proposed should provide for every parent regardless of his religious or non-religious views and be seen as a positive contribution to the education of his child.

It must be admitted that the task of finding a consensus in what public education should involve may prove to be a near impossibility and may even result in a severe limitation of programs presently well entrenched in the curriculum. It might possibly reach the point that in order to satisfy the will of our pluralistic society the best option will be to restructure schooling altogether. This writer, however, believes that most Americans can accept a form of public schooling that objectively teaches children to read and write, learn mathematics, history, government, language, science, health and physical education,

as well as art and music. Each of these subject areas can be taught without infringing upon the religious and moral beliefs lying beyond the bounds of consensus. It is conceivable that a broader curriculum could be developed providing there existed the means of limiting the use of such to function as the vehicle for any one group or groups to use for social change.

Because education has been reserved to the states under the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, any legislative action to establish the aim of education would of necessity be done at the state level. Such effort to establish the aim of public schooling by law would need to take place in each state. Although some might view this a more formidable task than simply getting one law passed at the national level, this writer believes that any given parent has a better chance of achieving action at the state level rather than going through the federal bureaucracy.

A state law establishing the aim of public schooling within its jurisdiction, would tend to ensure equality of protection throughout the state. For example, textbooks in most states are selected from state approved lists and teachers are certified according to state standards. If these two areas of public education alone could be made to conform to legislation mandating effective neutrality, evangelicals will have come a long way. Both of these areas, textbooks and teacher preparation, have either directly or indirectly added to the problem of keeping the schools from being neutral. It was seen in Chapter Three that evangelicals claim many textbooks reflect a humanist bias. It was further noted that many teachers were alleged not to be acquainted with

the extent to which religion is integrated into the world-view of the evangelical. With the aim of public education established by law, both textbooks and teacher education programs would have a standard against which their neutrality could be measured. A textbook, in order to be adopted for use in the public schools of the state, would have to conform to the standard set in the law. A teacher, in order to qualify to teach in the public schools, would have to be prepared to deal effectively with the element of religion. This latter requirement would necessitate an exposure to the multiplicity of religious beliefs held by school patrons entering the public school program. It would require that teachers become familiar with the aim of public schooling in that state as required by the people of the state and manifested in the law. Further, teachers would be required to receive instruction in how to implement effectively that aim in their classrooms.

Some persons invariably will conclude that the above means of achieving and maintaining neutrality will infringe on the rights of public school educators to establish their own guidelines for the training of teachers. However, the writer counters with the fact that educator rights in compulsory public schooling must be kept subordinate to those of parents whose children are being taught. It must be kept in mind that public school teaching is a public trust. Academic freedom must never be elevated to the point where it becomes unlimited freedom.

Establish Meaningful Policy

Establishing public education's aim by law is one thing, translating that aim into practice is another. It was noted in Chapter Three that there exists a lack of specific policy relating to religion in the schools. Such must change if any meaningful solution to the problems evangelicals have with public schooling is to be effected.

There must be specific guidelines to regulate the extent to which religion is openly brought into the school program and the manner in which it is treated. Furthermore, policy is necessary to identify and regulate the religious beliefs which are often not recognized as being religious but nonetheless affect the ultimate orientation of students. Policy must be developed at the state and local levels. At the state level, policy would be the means of insuring implementation of the aim of education in the state as identified by the law proposed above. At the local level, policy would tend to insure that state law and policy are carried out.

Policy should spell out the prohibitions consistent with the "No Establishment" clause of the First Amendment, as well as the freedom afforded under its "Free Exercise" clause. Policy must be sufficient to insure that every aspect of the school program is covered and the mechanism by which the effectiveness of the policy can be evaluated must be built into the policy itself. Simply stating the rules to govern public education will not insure compliance. There will need to

be a periodic assessment of how well those rules are in fact governing actual practice. This too is not a job to be left to educators alone. Open meetings might be held not only to determine areas of concern from all segments of the populace, but also to identify potential problem areas. The assistance of representatives from legal groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the Christian Legal Society might prove beneficial to an enlightenment of legal matters to be considered. However, this writer cautions against limited legal advice from any single source. We have viewed in an earlier chapter the fact that there is presently much ambiguity in the interpretations of the law regarding the practical outworkings of the First Amendment.

Out of an open meeting of people reflective of the community, there could come the formation of a working committee approved by the community to draft a proposed policy. It should be stressed that if the policy is at the state level, extensive publicity would of necessity be needed to inform interested citizens in adequate time to insure that they will be represented at an open meeting. The work of this committee should be widely circulated throughout the community prior to another public hearing at which time the community would express their approval or disapproval. Assuming the committee's work is approved by those attending the second public hearing, the document would then go before the school board which is empowered by the state to oversee the schools.

Whether or not the above format is followed, any policy developed, to be effective in solving the type of problems manifested in this study, at least will need to do the following: cover the actual

and potential concerns of the people, conform to law, and be able to be evaluated and enforced. From an evangelical perspective what is of most concern is that policy affirm free exercise of religious belief without constituting an establishment of religion, and limit any open or subtle attempt to establish secularism, in any form, over any or all religions.

In order to do the above, policy must be preventive as well as prohibitive. In other words, simply developing a piece of paper listing the activities which will and will not be allowed, may prove insufficient. Policy should provide for the proper training of new teachers and in-service assistance to existing ones. This might involve both course work dealing with the religious beliefs present within the school constituency, and frequent seminar type programs involving interaction with parents holding to the various religious persuasions in the school. This latter type activity, if properly handled, could prove effective in the prevention of future crises. Wise administrators would do well to solicit openly constructive criticism from the school community concerning the perceptions that patrons may have regarding the schools' religious neutrality. In some cases they may be able to correct wrong perceptions, in others they may see the need to better acquaint the public with what is actually happening, and in yet others they may find that a change is in order. This writer suggests that school divisions consider taking the initiative and approach the religious community with the offer of having a school official visit any local church, synagogue, or mosque with a program describing the relationship the schools play with

religion, and an opportunity to answer any questions they might have concerning the schools. Such an endeavor as a conscious part of school policy would not only be good public relations for the school but would also enable both the religious groups and the school system to understand better the interests, perceptions, concerns, and needs of each other.

Should policy be developed consistent with the recommendations discussed and then measured against the practices described in Chapter Three, several changes will be seen to be in order. Some of these changes will not be easy to make. For example, the pattern established over a number of years by teachers who view their role as change agents may prove difficult to break. The many textbooks which reflect a humanist bias will more than likely tend to persist for a few years and annoy evangelicals; alternatives may be difficult and expensive to obtain. Despite the difficulty of the task, however, the fact remains that some effort, attempted soon, is in order. The teacher problem must be dealt with through in-service programs; supplementary materials will need to augment existing texts until such texts can be improved upon. The use of outside guests may need to be encouraged to provide an alternative to that which certain groups allege to be unfair treatment in textbooks. The role of administrators as facilitators to aid teachers in locating resources will need to be emphasized. Teachers who may have comfortably relaxed by strictly teaching the text, will need to be encouraged to broaden their approach. These things do not change overnight. Evangelicals should not expect immediate drastic change to solve all the problems. However, unless

definite changes are made as new policy and the evangelical community perceives that things are moving in the right direction, there will not be a reversal of the evangelical flight from public schooling. It is this writer's belief that unless a movement in the right direction is openly visible, the attempt itself will prove futile.

Re-Awaken Evangelicals to See the Role They Are
To Play in the World According to Scripture

It was noted in Chapter Three that part of the problem evangelicals have with public schooling stems from the fact that many of them have failed to maintain a distinction between themselves and the world around them. It was noted in Chapter Two that this is a problem that has repeatedly surfaced in evangelical history. Because evangelicals have accommodated themselves to the culture they have greatly lost the perception that there are adverse forces in the culture competing for the values of their children. They seem to have become blind to the principle that children themselves tend to value what they see their parents valuing. From the evangelical perspective, many evangelical youth today, hampered by the unbiblical life style of their parents and other evangelical leaders, are consequently more susceptible to the pressures put upon them.

The Bible makes some definite statements concerning the fact that believers are to be a distinct people in the world. Jesus said that even though Christians are "in the world" they are not to be "of the world" (John 17:16, KJV). The Apostle Paul wrote to believers

at Ephesus and instructed them not to walk in the world "as the other Gentiles" (Ephesians 4:17, KJV). This same apostle wrote to the Christians at Rome telling them they were not to be "conformed to this world" (Romans 12:1-2, KJV). He further instructed Timothy that the Christian life is to be viewed as that of a soldier and that soldiers are not to be "entangled with the affairs of this life" (II Timothy 2:4, KJV). The Apostle Peter, likewise, informed believers that the "time past of our life may suffice us to have wrought the will of the Gentiles" (I Peter 4:3, KJV). The Apostle John said that Christians are not to "love the world, or the things that are in the world" (I John 2:15, KJV). The writer of the book of Hebrews, extolled those who instead of occupying themselves with the things of this world, "desire a better country, that is a heavenly" (Hebrews 11:8-16, KJV).

Several leading evangelical writers were cited in Chapter Three of this study to show that many evangelical parents have neglected the above teaching of the Scriptures. Consequently, despite receiving the verbalization of the biblical world view, many children of evangelical parents have apparently concluded that somehow this is only a verbalization and that what is in fact important is to pursue affluence. More importantly, parental striving for affluency has resulted in a serious lack of time to spend directly or indirectly teaching children the mandates of Scripture. Unless there is widespread re-awakening of the fact that they are only "pilgrims" on this earth, it is this writer's conviction that evangelicals will continue to see their children turning to more popular world views.

Having concluded that too many evangelical parents are not taking seriously the command to live distinct from the culture in which they live, this writer proposes that those called to preach and teach the Bible among evangelicals mount an offensive effort to exhort their listeners to this responsibility placed upon them by the Bible. Further, it should be stressed to evangelicals that they will be held accountable for the way in which they deal with the above requirements (Romans 14:10, KJV).

When evangelical parents are re-awakened to the fact that they are not to be conformed to the life styles of those viewed as unbelievers, they will be in a position to see the need not only to remain distinct, but also to explain to their children the reason for living this way. This is an area where help will be needed both to enlighten and assist parents to fulfill the task.

Prepare Evangelical Parents to Teach Their Children

It was observed in Chapter Three that many evangelical parents are neglecting the biblically-mandated role of teaching their children. Chapter Four showed that one of the chief reasons many parents are sending their children to Christian schooling is to regain parental rights in education, but that some within the Christian school movement itself are afraid that even here the parental role is not up to par. It is this writer's belief that unless parents do fulfill the role assigned them by Scripture, there can not be expected any significant hope that evangelical children will survive the intellectual and moral

onslaught that non-evangelical beliefs will present in the public school. As a general rule, there are no people more interested in a child than his parents. Likewise, parents generally spend more time with their child than any of the other potential value formers in his life. It may be that public school teachers, desirous of remaking society are the second most interested people in the values he acquires. It may also be true that these same teachers have the potential to spend as much time as parents working to mold the beliefs upon which that child's life will be built. If that is so, then it becomes obvious what the consequences will be if the evangelical parent is not fulfilling the task of being the chief teacher of values in the child's life; the child will more than likely be influenced by the one spending the most time and effort in his life. While making the schools more neutral than they are now will hopefully give the child a more balanced range of options; there is, however, no guarantee that the child will choose that which the evangelical parent desires for him.

While there can be no substitute for children spending time with parents who verbalize and live a biblical life style, it is this writer's contention that even the most dedicated evangelical parents need assistance in the teaching which will effectively prepare children to meet the intellectual counter-claims of secularism. We live in a day in which parents are expected to do almost no teaching. Further, this is an age of specialization in teaching. Parents have sometimes felt inadequate to counter teachers whom they recognize as "experts" in their fields. Moreover, little time indeed is left to the parent who truly wants to teach. The school has the child for the best part of

each day most of the week. The parent who works, like the child who has been in school all week, is usually desirous of spending Saturday in some form of rest or recreation. The evangelical parent has generally thought that Sunday is the only day in which Christian education is possible, and even the activities of this day have been removed from parental involvement.

To aid parents who do want to fulfill the biblical mandate of teaching their children, church leaders will need to be equipped to suggest strategies, prepare materials, supply their own "experts," and further prepare parents. It is this writer's belief that parent preparation is one of the most neglected ministries of the evangelical church. While emphasis has tended to be placed upon what churches can do for the children in the church, it is this writer's belief that this very emphasis itself has tended to cause an ignoring of what may be an even greater ministry--how to help parents do what Scripture calls upon them to do for their own children. This writer believes that evangelical Christians will, to a great extent, be able and willing to remain with public schooling, if the evangelical community will make a serious attempt to prepare parents to teach biblical values to their children, if evangelical parents are re-awakened to the fact that Christianity is more than a belief system tacked onto life--that it is a way of life, if meaningful policy regulating the role of religion is established, if the aim of public education is clearly established by law so that parental rights are safeguarded, and if the actual problems which do exist are recognized. However, these are all "ifs" about which there is great skepticism.

Develop Contingency Plans to Guide Evangelical Action
If Neutrality Cannot Be Attained

Because the very real possibility exists that evangelicals will not find sufficient interest within public education to conform unacceptable practice to neutrality, this writer proposes that contingency plans be developed to provide the way and means of private Christian schooling for each child whose parents so desire. Since evangelicals are not bound together in an organized body, this proposal may seem superficial and impractical. It will undoubtedly take time for divergent groups of evangelicals to agree upon a working consensus on this subject. However, it is conceivable that the same group that initiated the move toward neutrality in public schooling (discussed earlier in this chapter) would provide the framework from which contingency plans might be developed. Developing plans of this nature should not be postponed until absolutely necessary but rather begun immediately so as to speed action if the need eventually becomes obvious. Efforts to prepare for this possibility, however, should not be allowed to dilute the attempts being made to solve the problems within public education.

As evangelicals work toward solution of their problems with education, the decision to leave public schooling will loom as a distinct possibility. Contingency plans should reflect a study of tax credits for private school attendance, vouchers, and other methods which seek to provide the benefit due citizens who are taxed for

schooling and yet cannot avail themselves of state schools.

A definite factor that will need to be considered when preparing for the possibility of leaving public schooling is how to avoid three pitfalls into which many Christian schools have fallen: becoming a haven for those simply avoiding desegregation; becoming a "hot house" inadequately preparing youth to face the outside world; becoming as disdainful of parental rights as the public schools are perceived to be.

Finally, a decision to leave public schooling because of a perception that neutrality is not forthcoming, should not evoke a cry from evangelicals for the removal of evangelical teachers from public schooling to staff the Christian schools. Having evangelical teachers in the public schools provides students with an alternative option to secular humanism. Evangelical teachers should not be in public schooling seeking to indoctrinate students into evangelical Christianity; however, their very presence in the schools does tend to serve as a form of check on the influence of humanism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Single Volume Works

- Abbott, Walter M., and others. The Bible Reader. New York: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1969.
- Allen, Roland. Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Athearn, Walter Scott. Religious Education and American Democracy. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1917.
- Armerding, Hudson T., ed. Christianity and the World of Thought. Chicago: Moody Press, 1968.
- Bainton, Roland H. Here I Stand (A Life of Martin Luther). New York: New American Library, 1961.
- Baylin, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Beggs III, David W., and McQuigg, R. Bruce. America's Schools and Churches: Partners in Conflict. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965.
- Blanshard, Paul. Religion and the Schools. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Boles, Donald E. The Bible, Religion, and the Public Schools. New York: Collier Books, 1963.
- Bonekamp, G. Viewpoint: Five Essays on Christian Education. Rexdale, Ontario, Canada: The Reformed Fellowship of Canada, 1974.
- Butts, R. Freeman. A Cultural History of Western Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955.
- _____, and Cremin, Lawrence A. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1950.
- Chazin, Barry I., and Soltis, Jonas F., eds. Moral Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1975.
- Coe, George Albert. Education in Religion and Morals. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1904.
- Commanger, Henry Steele. Living Ideals in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

- Cooper, Kenneth S. Man and Change. Morristown, N. J.: Silver Burdett Co., 1972.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. The Genius of American Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.
- _____, ed. The Republic and the School: Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1968.
- Cubberly, Ellwood P. A Brief History of Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1922.
- _____. The History of Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1920.
- Cummings, David B. The Purpose of a Christ-Centered Education. Phillipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1979.
- Curoe, Phillip R. V. History of Education. New York: Globe Book Company, 1921.
- Dewey, John. A Common Faith. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934.
- Dixon, A. C. Lights and Shadows of American Life. Boston: William H. Smith, 1903.
- Dobson, J. F. Ancient Education and Its Meaning to Us. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1932.
- Dollar, George. A History of Fundamentalism in America. Greenville: Bob Jones University Press, 1973.
- Drinan, Robert F. Religion, The Courts, and Public Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1963.
- Duncan, Homer. Secular Humanism: The Most Dangerous Religion in America. Lubbock, Tex.: Christian Focus on Government, 1979.
- Eby, Frederick. The Development of Modern Education. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.
- Edersheim, Alfred. The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Grand Rapids: Associated Publishers and Authors, 1968.
- Eisley, Loren. The Immense Journey. New York: Random House, 1957.
- Elder, Carl A. Values and Moral Development in Children. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1976.

- Engel, David E. Religion in Public Education. New York: Paulist Press, 1974.
- Evans, M. Stanton. Clear and Present Dangers. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Javanovich, Inc., 1975.
- Fisher, George Park. History of the Christian Church. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.
- Fleming, W. S. God in Our Public Schools. Pittsburg: The National Reform Association, 1942.
- Fowler, Stuart. Reformation for the Family. Worthing, Sussex, England: Henry E. Walker Ltd., 1974.
- Gabelein, Frank E. A Varied Harvest. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1967.
- Grant, F. W. Help and Food. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1896.
- Grover, Alan N. Ohio's Trojan Horse. Greenville, S. C.: Bob Jones University Press, 1977.
- Harris, Pickens E. Changing Conceptions of School Discipline. New York: MacMillan Co., 1928.
- Harris, R. Laird. Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1975.
- Hefley, James C. Textbooks on Trial. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1976.
- Henry, Carl F. H., ed. Christian Faith and Modern Theology. New York: Channel Press, 1964.
- Hill, Robert Alan, and John, Olaf. Your Children: The Victims of Public Education. VanNuys, Calif.: Bible Voice Inc., 1978.
- Humanist Manifesto I and II. Buffalo, N. Y.: Prometheus Books, 1973.
- Huxley, Julian. Religion without Revelation. New York: New American Library, Inc., 1957.
- Jewett, Paul King. Man as Male and Female. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975.
- Kienel, Paul A. The Christian School: Why It Is Right for Your Child. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1977.
- Kurtz, Paul., ed. Moral Problems in Contemporary Society. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

- Lamont, Corliss. Humanism as a Philosophy. New York: New American Library Inc., 1957.
- Lawson, Martin A. When Parochial Schools Close. Washington, D. C.: Robert E. Luce Inc., 1972.
- Lazerson, Marvin. Parents, Teachers, and Children. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1977.
- Lee, Gordon C. Crusade Against Ignorance: Thomas Jefferson Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.
- Lindsell, Harold. The Bible in the Balance. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979.
- Manschreck, Clyde Leonard. Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer. Nashville: Abington Press, 1958.
- May, Phillip. Which Way to Educate? Chicago: Moody Press, 1975.
- McDowell, Josh. More Evidence that Demands a Verdict. San Bernadino, Cal.: Campus Crusade for Christ, 1975.
- McGraw, Onalee. Secular Humanism and the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come. Washington, D. C.: The Heritage Foundation, 1976.
- Michaelson, Robert. Piety in the Public Schools. New York: The MacMillen Co., 1970.
- Montgomery, John Warwick. The Shaping of America. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship Inc., 1967.
- Morgan, Joy Elmer. Horace Mann (His Ideas and Ideals). Washington, D. C.: National Home Library Foundation, 1936.
- Morris, Henry M. Education for the Real World. San Diego, Calif.: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977.
- _____. The Scientific Case for Creation. San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977.
- Mueller, A. D. Progressive Trends in Rural Education. New York: The Century Co., 1926.
- Nevin, David, and Bills, Robert E. The Schools That Fear Built. Washington, D. C.: Acropolis Books Ltd., 1976.
- Newport, John, and Cannon, William. Why Christians Fight Over the Bible. Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson Inc., 1974.

- Packer, J. I. Fundamentalism and the Word of God: Some Evangelical Principles. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974.
- Packer, Samuel Chester. A Textbook in the History of Modern Elementary Education. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1912.
- Parks, Henry Ramford. The American Experiences. New York: Vintage Books, 1959.
- Person, Peter P. An Introduction to Christian Education. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1972.
- Piediscalzi, Nicholas, and Collie, William E. Teaching About Religion in Public Schools. Males, Ill.: Argus Communications, 1977.
- Quebedeaux, Richard. The Young Evangelicals, Revolution in Orthodoxy. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Rian, Edwin H. Christianity and American Education. San Antonio: The Naylor Co., 1949.
- Rice, John R. I Am a Fundamentalist. Mufreesboro, Tenn.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1975.
- Richards, Lawrence O. Youth Ministry: It's Renewal in the Local Church. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977.
- Roche III, George Charles. Education In America. Irvington-On-Hudson, N. Y.: The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., 1969.
- Rushdoony, Rousas J. The Messianic Character of American Education. Nutley, J. J.: The Craig Press, 1976.
- Sandnel, Samuel. Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Schaeffer, Francis A. Back to Freedom and Dignity. Downers-Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1973.
- _____. No Final Conflict. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1975.
- Sherrill, Lewis Joseph. Presbyterian Parochial Schools. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969.
- Simpson, Elizabeth Leonie. Humanist Education: An Interpretation. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.
- Singer, G. Gregg. A Theological Interpretation of American History. Nutley, N. J.: The Craig Press, 1969.

- Stephens, W. Richard, and Van Till, William. Education in American Life. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1972.
- Stott, John R. Christ the Controversialist. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1974.
- Swete, William Warren. The Story of Religion in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1930.
- Thorndike, Edward Lee. Education. New York: The MacMillen Co., 1923.
- _____. Educational Psychology. New York: The Teacher's College Press, 1921.
- Towns, Elmer L. Have the Public Schools Had It? Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1974.
- Tribe, David. 100 Years of Free Thought. London: Elek Books Ltd., 1967.
- Trumbull, H. Clay. Yale Lectures on the Sunday School. Philadelphia: John D. Wattles, Publisher, 1893.
- Tucker, Louis Leonard. Puritan Protagonist: President Thomas Clap of Yale College. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1962.
- Tyack, David B. The One Best System. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- _____. Turning Points in American Educational History. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox Corp., 1967.
- Van Til, Cornelius. Essays on Christian Education. Phillipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.
- Veatch, Robert Wells. The Meaning of the War for Religious Education. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1920.
- Wells, David S., and Woodbridge, John, eds. The Evangelicals. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.
- Westerhoff III, John H. McGuffey and His Readers. Nashville: Abington, 1978.
- Whitman, Wilson, ed. Jefferson's Letters. Eau Claire: E. M. Hale Co., undated.

Periodicals

- American Humanist Association. "We Invite You," The Humanist. 38 (November-December, 1978), 25.
- Arons, Stephen. "Pierce Reconsidered," Harvard Educational Review. 46 (February, 1976), 76-104.
- Austin, J. Susan. "Religion In Elementary School Social Studies: A Vehicle for Attitudinal Change." Religious Education. 71 (September-October, 1976), 474-86.
- Avey, John. "How To Survive a Liberal Education," The Alternative. 5 (December, 1971), 8-9.
- Baer Jr., Richard A. "Values Clarification As Indoctrination," The Educational Forum. 41 (January, 1977), 154-65.
- Barr, David L. "Religion in Schools: Four Questions Evangelicals Ask," Christianity Today. 16 (January 21, 1972), 348-50.
- Barton, Jon T. "Teaching the Bible in Public Schools," Christianity Today. 23 (September 7, 1979), 1154-58.
- Bayly, Joseph. "Why I'm for Christian Schools," Christianity Today. 24 (January 25, 1980), 92-5.
- Beechick, Ruth. "Lawrence Kohlberg: Why Johnny Can't Be Good Without Being Religious," Christianity Today. 22 (December 30, 1977), 12-14.
- "Bible Battles," Time. 107 (May 10, 1976), 57.
- Bird, Wendell. "Evolution in Public Schools and Creation in Student's Homes: What Creationists Can Do," Impact. (April, 1979), 4.
- Bliss, Richard B. "Evolution and Humanism in Today's Public Schools," Evangelizing Today's Child. 5 (May-June, 1978), 4-10+.
- Boice, Linda M. "Where's the Perseverance of Teen-Aged Saints,?" Eternity. 28 (June, 1977), 25-7.
- Brandt, Ronald S. "On Moral/Civic Education: An Interview with Edward Fenton," Educational Leadership. 34 (April, 1977), 486-94.
- Clouse, Bonnidell. "Reading, Writing, and ... Right from Wrong," Christianity Today. 22 (December 30, 1977), 14-17.
- Collie, William and Apt, Madeline. "Student Attitudes Toward Religion Studies Courses," Educational Leadership. 35 (April, 1978), 547-50.

- Collins, Gary. "What Threatens the Family,?" Eternity. 26 (August 1975), 14-16.
- Cordero, Ronald E. "Ethical Theory and the Teaching of Values," The Educational Forum. 40 (January, 1976), 205-9.
- Cravens, Hamilton. "Impact of Evolutionary Thought on America's Culture in the Twentieth Century," Intellect. 106 (August, 1977) 86+.
- Drescher, John M. "The New Age Starts Here," Eternity. 26 (January 1975), 28-9.
- Editorial. Christianity Today. 17 (January 5, 1973), 28-29.
- Fair, Daryl. "The Church-State Policy Process," Policy Studies Journal. (Winter, 1975), 119.
- Fraenkel, Jack R. "The Kohlberg Bandwagon: Some Reservations," Social Education. 40 (April, 1976), 216-22.
- Hall, Robert T. "Moral Education Today: Progress, Prospects, and Problems of a Field Come of Age," The Humanist. 38 (November-December, 1978), 8-13.
- Hitt, Russell T. "Whose Side Are You On,?" Moody Monthly. 80 (February, 1980) 25-7.
- "Humanistic Education," The Capsule. 1 (April, 1979), 7-9.
- Hunt, Thomas. "Public Schools and Moral Education: An American Dilemma," Religious Education. 74 (July-August, 1979), 350-73.
- Jones, Bob. "Pseudo-Fundamentalists: The New Breed in Sheep's Clothing," Faith for the Family. 6 (January, 1978), 7+.
- Kantzer, Kenneth. "The Charismatics Among Us," Christianity Today. 24 (February, 1980), 245-49.
- Kienal, Paul A. "The Forces Behind the Christian School Movement," Faith Aflame. 3 (March-April, 1978), 6.
- Kirschenbaum, Howard. "New Goals for Moral Education," The Humanist. 38 (November-December, 1978), 17-19.
- _____, and others. "In Defense of Values Clarification," Phi Delta Kappan. 58 (June, 1977), 743-6.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence, and Mayer, Rochelle. "Development As the Aim of Education," Harvard Educational Review. 42 (November, 1972), 449-96.

- _____. "Moral Education Reappraised," The Humanist. 38 (November-December, 1978), 13-15.
- Lazenby, Marion E. "The sin of the Modern Church Member," Faith for the Family. 4 (September, 1977), 13+.
- Lockwood, Alan L. "A Critical View of Values Clarification," Teachers College Record. 77 (September, 1975), 35-50.
- _____. "The Effects of Values Clarification and Moral Development Curricula on School-age Subjects: A Critical Review of Recent Research," Review of Educational Research. 48 (Summer, 1978), 325-64.
- Mawdsley, Ralph D. "Crisis in Christian Education," The Central Testimony. 20 (July-August, 1978), 3.
- McMahon, Michael B. "Religion, Scientific Naturalism, and the Myth of Neutrality," Intellect. 102 (April, 1974), 430-2.
- McQuilkin, J. Robertson. "Public Schools: Equal Time for Evangelicals," Christianity Today. 22 (December 30, 1977), 404-7.
- Methvin, Eugene H. "The N.E.A.: A Washington Lobby Run Rampant," The Reader's Digest. 113 (November, 1978), 97-101.
- Piediscalzi, Nicholas. "Keynote Address: Public Education Religion Studies in the United States," Religious Education. 71 (January-February, 1976), 149+.
- "Progress Report: World Congress of Fundamentalists," Faith for the Family. 4 (May-June, 1976).
- "Public Schools Can Study Religion," Intellect. 106 (September, 1977), 105-6.
- Roths, Ariel A. "Creation Concepts Should Be Taught in Public Schools," Liberty. 73 (September-October, 1978), 23-7+.
- Stahr, James. "The 1980's, What Lies Ahead,?" Interest. 45 (January, 1980), 3.
- Stiles, Gerald. "Evangelicals and Public Schools," Interest. 40 (February, 1975), 4-6.
- Storrer, Morris B. "A Committee to Investigate the Paramoral? Can We Broaden the Base of Humanistic Agreement in Ethics, ?" The Humanist. 39 (January-February, 1979), 31+.

- Streeter, Lloyd. "Flap-doo-dle," Faith for the Family. 5 (February, 1977), 29+.
- Veltkamp, James J. "Academic Freedom and the Christian College," Education for Eternity. (April, 1979), 2.
- Vold, David J. "Religion in the Public Schools," Educational Theory. 24 (Winter, 1974), 99-109.
- Westing, Harold. "Why Showers of Blessing Keep Rolling Off Our Kids," Eternity. 28 (April, 1977), 32-3.
- Will, Paul J. "Implementing the Study of Religion in High Schools: One State's Experience," Religious Education. 71 (January-February, 1976), 90-5.
- Willimon, William H. "Should Churches Buy Into the Educational Business,?" Christianity Today. 24 (January 25, 1980), 92-5.
- Wood Jr., James E. "Religion and Public Education in Historical Perspective," Journal of Church and State. 1972.
- Woodward, Kenneth L. "Born Again: The Year of the Evangelicals," Newsweek. 88 (October 25, 1977), 68-78.

Other Sources

- "Announcing The Bible Reader," New York: The Bruce Publishing Company, undated (Pamphlet).
- Clark, Gordon H. "Evangelicalism." The Encyclopedia of Christianity. 1972, IV, 122.
- "Grace Academy -- An Educational Alternative," Roanoke, Va., undated (Pamphlet).
- Guatkin, Henry Melvill. Early Church History (To A.D. 313), II London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1909.
- "Justice for Education," Washington, D. C. Association for Public Justice, 1978 (Pamphlet).
- LaPota, Margherite. "Religion: Not 'Teaching' But 'Teaching About'." Dayton, Ohio: Public Education Religion Studies Center, undated (Pamphlet).

- Lowrie, Roy W. "Discipline in the Christian School." Newtown Square, Pa.: National Christian School Education Association, 1976 (Pamphlet).
- _____. "The Purpose, Philosophy, Objectives of the Christian School," Newtown Square, Pa.: National Christian School Education Association, 1974 (Pamphlet).
- Mead, Sidney. American History (Recent Interpretation). Book 2, New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1970.
- Miller, Andrew. Short Papers on Church History, Vol. I. (A.D. 32 to A.D. 1106). London: Pickering and Inglis, undated.
- National School Public Relations Association, Religion and the Schools. Washington, D. C.: National School Public Relations Association, 1970.
- Panoch, James V. "Religion Studies: On the Outs with the Curriculum," Newsletter, PERSC. (Autumn, 1975) 2.
- Religion in America: 1977-78. Princeton: The Gallop Opinion Index, Report 145, 1977.
- "Religion in the Public Schools: A Report by the Commission on Religion," Washington, D. C.: The American Association of School Administrators, 1964, 55.
- Rittweger, Louis. "An Analysis of Virginia's Public School Policies on Religion from Historical, Public Policy and Evangelical Christian Perspectives." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, 1978.
- Schaff, Phillip. Creeds of Christendom. 3 vols. New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1877.
- School District of Abington Township v. Schempp (Pa.) 374 v.s. 203, 83S. Ct. 1560 (1963).
- Stanmeyer, William. "Parental Rights in Education vs. State Secularism," Paper presented to the Christian Legal Society, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1979.
- The Bible, King James Version.

APPENDIX A

A STUDY OF 31 EVANGELICAL
YOUTH

APPENDIX A

A STUDY OF 31 EVANGELICAL YOUTH

Description of the Study

The Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center, Ferrum, Virginia, each summer conducts three sessions of two weeks each for evangelical youth. Because these youth come from a wide geographical area, it was believed that a study of the youth in one of these sessions would provide insight to the problems of evangelical youth in general. The study sought to answer five specific questions.

1. Do public school teachers provide an open atmosphere where pupils are able to freely explore evangelical values as one option among the many requisite in a public institution?
2. Are public school instructional materials/methods free from bias against the evangelical point of view?
3. To what extent are the problems of evangelical pupils attributable to the failure of home and church to carry out their roles as instructors in values?
4. To what degree is peer pressure a factor working against evangelical participation?
5. How effective has Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center been as an example of supplemental assistance to the home and church?

The means of answering the above five questions included: student attendance at a two week session of Aletheia Springs C. E. C. where each child was administered a pre-test to aid in determining where he was at that point in his evangelical faith. Both of the teachers at this session kept anecdotal records on each child and met periodically to discuss their perceptions of how well the two week observation corresponded to the information provided in the pre-test.

After the young people were back at home and had the experience of attending nearly one full year of school after going through the Aletheia Springs program, they were administered a post-test in the form of a questionnaire. In addition, a questionnaire was sent to their parents and two of their teachers (social studies and literature). Each of these latter questionnaires were designed to gain additional information, and serve as a check on the accuracy of the information supplied by the students.

The following is a chart indicating the specific information the study sought to obtain and the means used to collect it. This is followed by the questionnaires themselves. The reader will note that the numbering of each item on the questionnaires corresponds to the number on the chart. Results are integrated in the narrative of the dissertation.

B. Question #1 - Do public school teachers provide an open atmosphere where pupils are able to freely explore evangelical values as one option among the many requisite in a public institution?

INFORMATION NEEDED

HOW COLLECTED

1. Do public school teachers provide an atmosphere where pupils are able to explore values?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
2. Are the students (in general) free to express religious convictions?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
3. Does the teacher understand evangelical values?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
4. Have the teacher education institutes and inservice programs helped prepare teachers to deal with the evangelical student?	1. Teacher questionnaire
5. Is the evangelical student free to share and persue those values he comes to school with?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire

- C. Question #2 - Are public school instructional materials/methods free from bias against the evangelical point of view (or biased against).

INFORMATION NEEDED

HOW COLLECTED

1. Are religious values present in textbooks?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire 3. Parent questionnaire 4. Perusal of books
2. Are religious values present in supplementary materials?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire 3. Perusal of some supplementary materials
3. Are religious values introduced spontaneously?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
4. Are evangelicals equally represented in both the text and supplementary materials?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire 4. Perusal of some materials
5. Is evangelical representation accurate?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Perusal of some materials
6. Has the omission or misrepresentation been sufficient to present frustration to the evangelical student and or parent?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire 3. Parent questionnaire

Question #3 - To what extent are the problems of evangelical pupils attributable to the failure of home and church to carry out their roles as instructors in values?

INFORMATION NEEDED

HOW COLLECTED

1. How well do evangelical youth interact when able to?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
2. What program does the individual church have for training youth?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire
3. How much time and what materials are used in the home for religious instruction?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire
4. How sympathetic is the home to the religious (evangelical) needs of the child?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Miscellaneous sources
5. Are the home and church programs in any way correlated to the school program?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire

E. Question #4 - To what degree is peer pressure a factor working against evangelical participation?

INFORMATION NEEDED

HOW COLLECTED

1. How large an evangelical minority is present in the school?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
2. How interested are non-evangelical youth in evangelical thought?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
3. How secure is the student in his commitment and personality?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire 4. Miscellaneous
4. How well does the student respond to being disagreed with?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire
5. How well does the student know evangelical Christianity? (Relationship of commitment)	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire

F. Question #5 - How effective has Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center been as an example of supplemental assistance to the home and church?

INFORMATION NEEDED

HOW COLLECTED

1. How much more participation was there this year than last year?	1. Pre-test 2. Student questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire
2. Was there a greater desire to constructively participate?	1. Pre-test 2. Student questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire
3. How much time was spent "practicing" religious convictions in the private sector giving evidence of commitment?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Pre-test 3. Parent questionnaire
4. Has participation tended to be more positive?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire
5. How well did the student follow the plan he left Aletheia Springs with?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Teacher questionnaire 3. Parent questionnaire
6. How quickly did the effect of Aletheia Springs wear off?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire 3. Teacher questionnaire
7. How do students, and parents evaluate effect of Aletheia Springs to other supplemental helps (such as summer camp)?	1. Student questionnaire 2. Parent questionnaire

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PART 1 - INSTRUCTIONS - PLEASE READ - Answer the following questions as true and completely as you can. The numbers to the left of each item correspond to specific questions that this project is attempting to answer, therefore, you will find that they will not always be numbered in perfect order.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name _____
2. Age _____
3. School grade _____
4. Address _____
5. Name of school _____
6. Public or private _____
7. How long have you attended this school? _____
8. Approximate enrollment _____
9. ESTIMATED number of:

	<u>Pupils</u>	<u>Teachers</u>
a. Roman Catholic	_____	_____
b. Jewish	_____	_____
c. Evangelical Christian	_____	_____
d. Non-Evangelical Protestant	_____	_____
e. Agnostic (don't know if there is a God or not)	_____	_____
f. Atheist (say there is no God)	_____	_____
g. Other	_____	_____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

10. Does your school have actual courses in:
- a. Religion _____
 - b. Morals (ethics) _____
 - c. Value Clarification _____
11. List all courses checked above (item 10)
12. Place a check mark next to any of the following topics you have discussed in school this year.
- a. The origin of life
 - b. The purpose of life
 - c. The existence of God
 - d. Witchcraft or Satan Worship
 - e. Different kinds of Religions
 - f. Astronomy, horoscopes, fortune telling
 - g. Transcendental Meditation
 - h. Sexual behavior
 - i. Abortion
 - j. Euthanasia
 - k. Family roles (including Woman's Lib.)
13. Without asking the individual, what religious belief (use Item 9 as a guide) would you guess is that of your social studies teacher? _____
14. Again without asking, and using item 9 as a guide, what would you guess is the religious belief of your literature teacher?
- _____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

15. Name of social studies teacher _____
16. Name, publisher, and date of social studies textbook _____

17. List materials used in social studies class other than textbook
both by students and teacher. _____
18. Name of Literature teacher _____
19. Name, publisher, and date of literature book _____

20. List materials used in literature class other than textbooks both
by students and teacher _____

21. Name of local church _____
22. Is your church connected in any way to a denomination? _____
If yes, which? _____
23. Approximate attendance at your local church on Sunday morning

24. Approximate number of youth ages 12-16 in your church _____
25. Do you attend regularly? _____ Would you attend more regularly
if possible? _____
26. What programs does your church have for training youth ages
6-18? (list)

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

27. Name all special youth activities your church sponsored in last 3 months. Indicate purpose of each. (For example, "Pot luck supper fellowship" or "Youth Night" - Evangelism")
28. List topics that were discussed at any church activity that were also discussed at school.
29. In an average week, how much time is spent on planned religious instruction in your home? _____
30. Briefly describe your "family devotions" and or other religious instruction time.
31. List the materials used in your home for religious instruction.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

32. How often have you sat down with either or both parents for more than 15 min. to discuss spiritual matters in the past 2 weeks?

33. List any topics discussed for at least 15 min. at home of a spiritual nature that were also discussed at school.

34. In one sentence, explain how a person "gets saved".

35. In one sentence, explain what it means to walk in the Spirit.

36. Name one "external proof" that the Bible is God's Word (Do not use your notes) _____
37. Name one "experiential proof" that the Bible is God's Word (No Notes) _____
38. True or False
- a. Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Armstrongism are false cults _____
 - b. Evangelical Christians generally believe either what is called the GAP theory or a literal 6 day creation approx. 10,000 years ago _____
 - c. The Bible teaches that a wife is to "submit unto her husband" _____
 - d. We are to pray primarily to ask for something from God _____

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE continued

39. List your 3 biggest problems this year as an evangelical Christian in school

a.

b.

c.

40. Briefly explain if and how you handled these problems.

41. Looking back, list in order of help to you, that which was best about Aletheia Springs.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - INSTRUCTIONS PLEASE READ - This part of the questionnaire simply requires a check for each of the following statements. You may either agree or disagree with the statement. Again, you will note the numbering system to the left. You may ignore this. Please read the statements carefully before you check either AGREE or DISAGREE. If you are not sure of your answer, check the response most true.

B. STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

1a. Most of my teachers provide an atmosphere where most pupils can freely explore a variety of beliefs.

2a. My social studies teacher allows most students the right to share their religious beliefs.

5a. My social studies teacher allows me to share my religious beliefs.

1d. My social studies teacher encourages me (and the other evangelical Christians in the class) to share religious beliefs when appropriate.

3a. My social studies teacher shows an understanding of what we evangelicals believe.

2b. My literature teacher allows most students to share their religious beliefs.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - continued

STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

5b. My literature teacher allows me to share my religious beliefs.

1e. My literature teacher encourages me (and the other evangelicals in the class) to share religious beliefs when appropriate.

3b. My literature teacher shows an understanding of what we evangelicals believe.

1b. My social studies teacher encourages all students to share their beliefs when appropriate.

1c. My literature teacher encourages all students to share their belief when appropriate.

C. STATEMENT

1a. My textbooks seldom contain information that relates to one's religious beliefs.

2a. The above is also true of the other materials used by my teachers.

4a. My textbooks are as fair to my beliefs as they are to anyone else.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - continued

STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

- 4b. Other materials (other than textbook) used in class are as fair to my belief as they are to anyone else.
- 5a. When textbooks do include my belief system (evangelical Christianity) they usually make it look different than it is.
- 5b. The same is true concerning the other materials used in class (misrepresent evangelical Christianity).
- 6a. I have been frustrated by misrepresentation in school materials of my religious views.
- 6b. My parents have not expressed any real frustration over the religious content of school materials.

D. STATEMENT

- 1a. When I have shared my religious beliefs in class, the other students for the most part have laughed or mocked me.
- 1b. I tend to get too emotional when I have a chance to share religious beliefs in class.
- 1c. My sharing in class usually leads into what most in the class would consider to be a good discussion.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - continued

STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

- 1d. Actually, I usually don't know enough about what I'm supposed to believe to effectively share the "Christian" view in class discussions.
- 3a. Our family has very meaningful "family devotions".
- 4a. My parents are always seeking new and better ways to instruct us.
- 4b. My parents really understand what I should know as a Christian youth.
- 4d. My parents often start talks with me on topics we discuss and study at school.

290

E. STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

2. Most "non-evangelicals" in my class would just as soon know what evangelicals believe on value issues as they would any other group.
- 3a. I firmly believe in Jesus Christ as my Lord and Savior and that the Bible is God's Word.
- 3b. What other people think of me is not as important to me as what God thinks of me.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - continued

STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

3c. I'm just too scared to participate in class discussions.

3d. It's easier to talk about non-religious issues in school.

3e. If I knew I was the only one in the class who believed something, and that most people strongly believed something different, I'd probably keep quiet.

3f. I'm not very popular among my classmates.

4a. It really bothers me when I know I'm right and someone disagrees with me.

4b. It's hard to stay out of an argument when discussing religion with "non-christians".

291

F. STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

1. I have participated more in religious related discussion in school this year than ever before.

2. I have had a greater desire to participate in religious related discussions this year than ever before.

3a. I pray more than I did a year ago.

QUESTIONNAIRE - PART 2 - continued

STATEMENT

AGREE

DISAGREE

3b. I read the Bible more than I did a year ago.

3c. I spend more time with other Christians than I did a year ago.

3d. I have read more Christian literature this year than ever before.

4. This year I shared more in class discussions because I knew and believed more.

6a. My present spiritual condition is higher than when I first came to Aletheia Springs.

6b. I'm lower spiritually than I was January 1, 1976.

7. I would probably not be any different spiritually if instead of going to Aletheia Springs last summer I had gone to a Christian camp.

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS—Mark one response to each of the following statements. If you totally agree with the statement, place a check under "agree." If you are a little unsure or you agree with some reservation, mark "tend to agree." If somewhat unsure but leaning towards disagreement with the statement, mark "tend to disagree." If you totally disagree with the statement, mark your response under "disagree." Please check one response for each statement. If more room is needed for comments to the statement, please feel free to make them.

STATEMENT	AGREE	TEND TO AGREE	TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENTS
B5A. The school my children attend allows them to share and further develop the religious values we teach at home.					
C1A. My child's textbooks expose him/her to religious values.					
C1B. One value system presented in my child's <u>textbooks</u> is secular humanism.					
C1C. I am aware of what secular humanism is.					
C2A. Religious values are involved in the <u>supplementary materials</u> used in my child's classes.					
C2B. Secular humanism is found either exclusively or among many value systems in the supplementary materials used in my child's classes.					
C3. Most religious values come into class spontaneously.					
C4A. Evangelical Christianity as a value system is represented fairly (in relation to the other value systems present) in my child's <u>textbooks</u> .					

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
C4B. Evangelical Christianity as a value system is represented fairly in the <u>supplementary materials</u> used in my child's classes.					
C4C. Most public school teachers do not really know what evangelical Christians believe.					
C5. Evangelical values are (when presented) presented accurately in my child's school.					
C6A. My child has been frustrated over the <u>ommission</u> of his/her beliefs in class instructional materials.					
C6B. I and or my husband or wife have been frustrated over <u>ommission</u> of our beliefs in our child's class instructional materials.					
C6C. My child has been frustrated over <u>misrepresentation</u> of his/her beliefs in class instructional materials.					
C6D. I and or husband or wife have been frustrated over <u>misrepresentation</u> of our beliefs in class instructional materials.					
D2. Our church (assembly) has a very effective program for training youth.					
D3A. We spend at least one hour a day in our home in religious instruction.					

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
D3B. As distinct from simply reading a chapter with little or no comment from the Bible, we (as a family) are following a specific outline of study in our home.					
D4A. We are very concerned about seeing our children develop spiritually.					
D4B. We understand the religious needs of our children.					
D5A. Our local church attempts to assist our young people through programs which correlate Christianity with what is termed "secular knowledge."					
D5B. Our home religious instructional efforts <u>significantly</u> correlate with our child's school experiences.					

The following statements directly relate to those children who are a part of this study. If you had more than one child participating rather than using a check to indicate your response, use x and y (x for the older child, y for the younger. If response is same for both children, circle the x and forget the y.

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
E3A. My child conclusively demonstrates that he/she is a "committed" Christian.					
E3B. My child is a well adjusted, emotionally stable individual.					

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
E4A. My child is a very dogmatic, uncompromising individual.					
E4B. My child can be very argumentative.					
E5. My child has a very good knowledge of his/her Christian beliefs.					
F3A. My child spends time nearly every day reading the Bible.					
F3B. I believe my child prays regularly.					
F3C. My child has a real desire to "share" his/her Christian faith.					
F5. My child (for the most part) has carried out and continued the ideals and plans he/she came home from Aletheia Springs with.					
F6. The effect of Aletheia Springs seemed to have gradually worn off by New Years.					
F7A. Aletheia Springs <u>probably</u> was more help to my child than a typical Christian camp would have been.					
F7B. My child was significantly helped by being at Aletheia Springs.					

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS-The following questionnaire is designed to evaluate the nature of the relationship between evangelical Christian students and public education. The instrument that follows is one of 4 different questionnaires being used in this study. It is set up so as to make responses easy and take up less time. You are asked to place either a check or an x in the appropriate column. The questionee is encouraged to make clarifying comments if felt necessary. However, you are asked to mark one response for each question. The numbers to the left of the question are keyed to the specific questions the project is seeking to answer. They are not necessarily in sequence.

STATEMENT	AGREE	TEND TO AGREE	TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
B1A. Most public school teachers provide an atmosphere where pupils are free to explore values.					
B1B. My classes have an atmosphere where students feel free to explore values.					
B1C. I encourage value exploration.					
B2A. Student expressions of religious convictions are an intregal part of value discussions.					
B2B. My students and I often have discussions in class involving religious convictions.					
B3A. I am knowledgeable concerning basic evangelical Christian values and their relationship to the content of our class discussions.					
B3B. Evangelical Christian concepts of the marriage relationship are based upon the relationship between Christ and the Church as taught in the Bible.					

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

STATEMENT	AGREE	TEND TO AGREE	TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
B3C. Evangelical Christians still believe in demons and witches.					
B3D. Profanity, homosexuality, and the practice of T. M. are sins to a majority of evangelical Christians.					
B4A. In college I was exposed to the works of as many evangelical Christian scholars as I was scholars representing any other value base.					
B4B. The school system in which I teach has helped and encouraged me to understand the different values held by our patrons.					
B5A. My evangelical students are encouraged to interject their religious convictions in value discussions.					
B5B. My evangelical students often share their religious convictions in value discussions in class.					
C1A. There are religious values present in the textbooks we use.					
C1B. Secular humanism is one value position present in our textbooks.					
C2A. We use supplementary materials that contain religious values.					
C3. Religious values are often introduced spontaneously in class discussions.					
C4A. Evangelical Christianity is equally represented in the textbooks we use.					

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

STATEMENT	AGREE	TEND TO AGREE	TEND TO DISAGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
C4B. Evangelical Christianity is equally represented in the supplementary materials we use.					
C6. There has been frustration manifested by evangelical Christians over materials we use in our class.					
D1A. My evangelical students are as knowledgeable about their beliefs as most of my other students.					
D1B. My evangelical students share their beliefs as freely as other students.					
E1. Numerically, evangelical Christian students are a significant group. (in your school)					
E2. Most of my non-evangelical Christian students are as interested in exploring evangelical values as they are any other values outside their own.					
E3A. The student named on the cover sheet of this questionnaire to the best of my knowledge is secure in his/her commitment to evangelical Christianity.					
E3B. The named student appears to have a healthy rapport with his/her fellow students.					
E4. The student named responds as positive as most students when disagreed with.					
F1. The student named was more willing to participate in class discussions this year than last.					

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
F2. The student named participated more constructively this year than last.					
F4. The student appeared more positive this year.					
F5. The student was less positive the last half of the year than the first half.					

APPENDIX B

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY

APPENDIX B

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY

Introduction to the Survey

In order to ascertain a better understanding of evangelical Christian perceptions of public schooling, a survey was taken in the spring of 1976 of 61 leading evangelical educators. Fifty-four of the individuals to whom a survey was sent were either heads of the department of education at an evangelical college or in the absence of a department head the academic dean of the institution. The fifty-four schools receiving the questionnaire represented the total of all evangelical institutions having a major in education, as named in the annual survey of evangelical higher education by the Moody Monthly magazine.

The questionnaire was also sent to seven evangelical magazine editors. These were carefully selected so as to represent the total spectrum of evangelicalism. It was felt that the inclusion of these individuals would add to the perception sought since each of them had, as an editorial practice, established an interest in the educational arena.

The questionnaire with its cumulative responses follows, as does a list of each college and magazine that responded.

1976
EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY
with
Cumulative Total Responses

The following questionnaire is designed to assist the compiler to properly ascertain a general idea of the thinking of a representative group of evangelical Christian educators regarding evangelical youth and public schooling. The questionees are asked to answer all questions as best as they can. It is understood that with some questions you may feel a need to "qualify" your answer. We have provided a "comment" section for you to do this.

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
1. Considering decisions made by the U.S. Supreme Court, the question of religion in public schools is no longer a significant issue.	0	2	10	17	
2. It is possible to teach religious values and concepts factually and objectively.	9	12	0	8	
3. Morality, ethics, and values can be taught apart from religious belief.	6	7	9	8	
4. Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer should be continued despite the Supreme Court rulings.	1	5	8	14	
5. Public schools in general are biased in favor of a humanistic secular religion.	17	9	3	0	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
6. The non-Christian student has a right not to be exposed to Christianity in public schools.	8	9	8	6	
7. Public schools need to concentrate more on the basics of reading, writing, and arithmetic.	14	11	6	0	
8. If financially able to, I would send my child to a private Christian day school.	11	5	9	6	
9. <u>Ms. Magazine</u> and <u>Christianity Today</u> are inappropriate magazines for a public school library.	3	1	8	16	
10. Creation theories should be given equal exposure with evolutionary theories in public school science books.	25	2	2	1	
11. Under no circumstances should profanity be included in public school textbooks.	10	10	9	1	
12. I could support a panel discussion in public school on astrology with Jean Dixon and Hal Lindsey on it.	8	14	6	1	
13. No Christian parent should send his child to a public school if he can afford a Christian school.	4	2	14	10	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
14. If public schools treated evangelicals equally, exposure to other beliefs would work to confirm the truth to evangelical students.	7	11	2	3	
15. Pre-marital sex, homosexuality, the practice of Trancendental Meditation, and the use of profanity are all sins.	18	6	5	0	
16. The objective presentation of the basic tenets of the major religions in the world, provided there is also a presentation of the basic tenets of evangelical Christianity, is a valid learning experience in a public school.	23	6	1	1	
17. Most public school teachers do not understand what evangelical Christians really believe.	18	9	3	0	
18. Religion should be left entirely out of the public school curriculum because it belongs in the home and church.	1	1	20	9	
19. The schools in 1840 to 1900 were more neutral regarding equal rights in religion than are public schools today.	6	5	8	7	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
20. I would support a return to the McGuffey Readers as standard reading texts.	2	3	16	10	
21. The major reason for the establishment of so many Christian day schools in recent years has been to avoid desegregation.	5	13	9	0	
22. Each state school board should require a course which included a unit on evangelical values for every teacher education major.	3	4	7	16	
23. The study of origins, since it is not subject to scientific analysis, should be left out entirely from public school science classes.	2	1	10	15	
24. Evangelical Christians cannot hope to see any significant change for the better in public schooling.	4	9	8	10	
25. The inclusion of writers such as Tom Skinner, Eugenia Price, David Wilkerson, C. S. Lewis, Elizabeth Elliot, and Edith Schaeffer would balance out present literature series at the high school level.	7	12	3	4	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
26. Evangelicals should support a constitutional amendment to restore prayer and Bible reading to the schools.	7	3	8	10	
27. Public schools have played a large role in undermining the values taught by Christian parents in the home.	11	8	8	4	
28. There is a difference in the meaning of the terms "Fundamentalist" and "Evangelical."	12	15	2	0	
29. A survey of the writings of Frances Schaeffer, Howard Hendricks, J. W. Montgomery, Clyde Narramore, George Dollar, and Jay Adams would expose a non-evangelical to the mainstream of evangelical belief.	8	8	9	1	
30. Rather than establish private schools, evangelicals would be wiser to beef up Sunday schools, vacation Bible schools, summer camps, and related endeavors.	5	6	9	8	
31. A school program which presented all values in its locality fairly and objectively would prove beneficial to the evangelical community.	9	17	3	1	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
32. The values that filter through most public school programs are more in line with those of the National Council of Churches than evangelical Christianity.	6	16	4	1	
33. <u>Moody Monthly Magazine</u> and the <u>Good News Broadcaster</u> may be classified as mainline evangelical periodicals.	5	13	8	0	
34. Most evangelical homes are negligent in preparing children for public school.	10	13	4	0	
35. Most evangelical churches are ineffective to prepare their youth for public school.	9	15	3	0	
36. The objective study of religious values as part of a secular learning experience is currently illegal in public schools.	0	2	6	21	
37. Presented accurately evangelical Christianity is more intellectually plausible than any of its competitors for the mind of youth.	14	7	7	3	
38. Most state school boards are out of touch with the people they represent.	4	11	12	0	

EVANGELICAL EDUCATOR SURVEY - continued

<u>STATEMENT</u>	<u>AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO AGREE</u>	<u>TEND TO DISAGREE</u>	<u>DISAGREE</u>	<u>COMMENT</u>
39. I would support a bond referendum at this time to help finance public schools.	8	6	4	7	
40. Because of their strong, dogmatic convictions, evangelicals would find it almost impossible to teach religious values objectively.	2	13	6	6	
41. I would prefer to be called a "fundamentalist" as opposed to "evangelical."	2	1	4	19	

Colleges and Periodicals From Whom a Response Was Received to a Questionnaire on Religion
in Public Schools Sent From Aletheia Springs Christian Education Center--Spring 1976

<u>College or Periodical</u>	<u>State Located</u>	<u>Denominational Affiliation</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
<u>The Alliance Witness</u>	New York	Christian Missionary Alliance	-
Anderson College	Indiana	Church of God	1784
Barrington College	Rhode Island	Independent	597
Bethel College	Indiana	Miss. Christian	not listed
Bethel College	Kansas	Lutheran	763
Bryan College	Tennessee	Independent	672
California Baptist College	California	So. Baptist	1472
Calvin College	Michigan	Christian Reformed	3674
Christian Heritage College	California	Independent	231
<u>Christianity Today</u>	Washington, DC	Independent	-
Eastern College	Pennsylvania	American Baptist	658
Eastern Mennonite College	Virginia	Mennonite	945
<u>Eternity</u>	Pennsylvania	Independent	-
Geneva College	Pennsylvania	Reformed Presbyterian	1220
<u>Good News Broadcaster</u>	Nebraska	Independent	-
Gordon College	Massachusetts	Independent	1025

Response from Questionnaire - continued

<u>College or Periodical</u>	<u>State Located</u>	<u>Denominational Affiliation</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
Grace College	Indiana	Brethen	681
Grand Canyon College	Arizona	So. Baptist	not listed
Greenville College	Illinois	Free Methodist	820
Houghton College	New York	Wesleyan	1280
Huntington College	Indiana	United Brethren	604
The Kings College	New York	Independent	760
Messiah College	Pennsylvania	Brethren in Christ	1037
Nyack College	New York	Christian Missionary Alliance	758
Olivet Nazarene College	Illinois	Nazarene	1656
Pillsbury Baptist Bible College	Minnesota	Baptist	520
<u>Sword of the Lord</u>	Tennessee	Independent Baptist	-
Tabor College	Kansas	Mennonite Brethren	558
Taylor University	Indiana	Independent	1467
Trinity Christian College	Illinois	Independent	397
Wheaton College	Illinois	Independent	2485

APPENDIX C

A MODEL BILL TO INTRODUCE
CREATION SCIENCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

APPENDIX C

Bill No. :
 Introduced by:
 Date:

A BILL FOR

An Act to require balanced treatment of scientific creationism and evolution in public schools; to protect academic freedom by providing student choice; to ensure freedom of religious exercise; to guarantee freedom of speech and belief; to prevent establishment of religion; to prohibit religious instruction concerning origins; to bar discrimination on the basis of creationist or evolutionist belief; to provide definitions; to provide clarifications; to set forth an effective date; to declare the legislative purpose; to state legislative findings of fact; to provide for severability of provisions; and to provide for repeal of contrary laws.

Be it Enacted by the Legislature of the State of :

Section 1. Short Title. This Act shall be known as the "Balanced Treatment for Scientific Creationism and Evolution Act."

Section 2. Requirement for Balanced Treatment. Public schools within this State shall give balanced treatment to the theory of scientific creationism and the theory of evolution. Balanced treatment to these two theories shall be given in classroom lectures taken as a whole for each course, in textbook materials taken as a whole for each course, in library materials taken as a whole for any field of the sciences or humanities, and in other educational programs, to the extent that such lectures, textbooks, library materials, or educational programs deal in any way with the subject of the origin of man, life, the earth, or the universe.

Section 3. Prohibition against Religious Instruction. Treatment of either the theory of evolution or the theory of scientific creationism shall be limited to scientific evidences for that theory and inferences from those scientific evidences, and must not include religious instruction.

Section 4. Requirement for Nondiscrimination. Public schools within this State, or their personnel, shall not discriminate, by reducing a grade or by singling out and criticizing publicly, against any student who demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of both the theory of evolution and the theory of scientific creationism and who also accepts or rejects either theory in whole or part.

Section 5. Definitions. As used in this Act:

(a) The "theory of scientific creationism" means the scientific evidences for creation and inferences from those scientific evidences. The concept of "creation" includes belief in (1) special creation of the universe and life; (2) the insufficiency of mutation and natural selection in bringing progressive evolution; (3) fixity of originally created kinds of plants and animals; (4) distinct ancestry for man and apes; (5) explanation of the earth's geology by catastrophism including the occurrence of a world-wide flood; and (6) a relatively recent inception of the earth and living kinds. The "scientific evidences" for creation

include, but are not necessarily limited to, (1) a sudden appearance of complex living forms in the fossil record; (2) the harmful nature of most or all mutations, the tautologous nature of natural selection, the application of the entropy law to prevent development from lesser order to greater order, and the mathematical improbability of evolution of complex living forms; (3) the systematic absence of transitional forms between kinds in the evolutionary chain; (4) the reasons for identification of presumed missing links as the same as either modern men or modern apes; (5) the occurrence of geologic layers with fossils of a presumably earlier or later geologic age, and the past occurrence of catastrophic events in causing mass extinctions and ending the world-wide temperate climate; and (6) identification of the assumptions of radiometric dating methods that support an ancient age for the earth and life, and description of alternate dating methods that support a younger age.

(b) The "theory of evolution" means the scientific evidences for evolution and inferences from those scientific evidences. The concept of "evolution" includes belief in (1) evolution by naturalistic processes of the universe from disordered matter and of life from nonlife; (2) the sufficiency of mutation and natural selection to produce progressive evolution; (3) evolution by mutation and natural selection of present living kinds from simple earlier kinds; (4) evolution of man from a common ancestor with apes; (5) explanation of the earth's geology and the evolutionary sequence by uniformitarianism; and (6) an inception several billion years ago of the earth and life. The "scientific evidences" for evolution, being more widely known, are for brevity not listed.

(c) "Public schools" mean public secondary and elementary schools.

Section 6. Clarifications. This Act does not require or permit instruction in any religious doctrine or materials. This Act does not require any instruction in the subject of origins, but simply requires instruction in both scientific theories (of evolution and scientific creationism) if public schools choose to teach either. This Act does not require each individual textbook or library book to give balanced treatment to the theories of evolution and scientific creationism; it does not require any school books to be discarded. This Act does not require each individual classroom lecture in a course to give such balanced treatment, but simply requires the lectures as a whole to give balanced treatment; it permits one unit to present the theory of evolution and a separate unit to present the theory of scientific creationism. This Act does not affect university level instruction, but simply applies to public secondary and elementary schools.

Section 7. Effective Date. The requirements of the Act shall be met by and may be met before the beginning of next school year if that is more than six months from the date of enactment, or otherwise one year after the beginning of the next school year, and to all subsequent school years.

Section 8. Legislative Declaration of Purpose. This Legislature enacts this Act with the purposes of, in public schools, protecting academic freedom for students' differing values and beliefs; ensuring neutrality toward students' diverse religious convictions; ensuring freedom of religious exercise for students and their parents; guaranteeing freedom of speech and belief for students; preventing establishment of nontheistic or humanistic religion; preventing discrimination against any student on

the basis of his personal beliefs concerning creation and evolution; and assisting students in their searches for truth. This Legislature does not have the purposes of causing instruction in religious concepts or making an establishment of religion.

Section 9. Legislative Findings of Fact. This Legislature finds that:

(a) The subject of the origin of the universe, earth, life, and man is treated within many public school courses, such as biology, life science, anthropology, sociology, and often also in physics, chemistry, world history, philosophy, and social studies.

(b) Only the theory of evolution is presented to students in virtually all courses that discuss the subject of origins, and no alternative theory of origins is presented.

(c) The theory of evolution is not an unquestionable fact of science, because evolution cannot be experimentally observed or fully verified or logically falsified, and because the theory of evolution is not accepted by some scientists.

(d) The theory of evolution is contrary to the religious convictions or moral convictions of many students and parents, including individuals of many different religious faiths and with diverse philosophic beliefs.

(e) Public school presentation of only the theory of evolution without any alternative theory of origins abridges the Constitution's protection of freedom of religious exercise for students and parents, because it undermines their religious convictions, violates their separatist practices, compels their unconscionable statements, and hinders religious training by parents.

(f) Public school instruction in only the theory of evolution also abridges the Constitution's protection of freedom of speech and belief for students and parents, because it violates their moral and civic values.

(g) Public school presentation of only that theory furthermore abridges the Constitution's prohibition against establishment of religion, because it produces hostility toward many theistic religions and brings preference to religious Liberalism and Humanism.

(h) Public school instruction in only the theory of evolution also violates the principle of academic freedom, because it denies students a choice between scientific theories and instead indoctrinates them in the evolutionary theory alone.

(i) Presentation of only one theory rather than alternate theories of origins is not required by any compelling interest of the State and exemption of such students from a course or class presenting only the theory of evolution does not provide an adequate remedy because of teacher influence and student pressure.

(j) Attendance of those students who are at public schools is compelled by law, and school taxes from their parents and other citizens are mandated by law.

(k) The theory of scientific creationism is an alternative model of origins at least as satisfactory as the theory of evolution, and that theory can be presented from a strictly scientific standpoint without religious doctrine, because many scientists accept the theory of scientific creationism and scientific evidences have been presented for the theory of scientific creationism.

(l) Public school presentation of both the theory of evolution and the theory of scientific creationism would not violate the Constitution's prohibition against establishment of religion, because it would involve

presentation of the scientific evidences for each theory rather than any religious instruction.

(m) Most citizens, whether they personally believe in evolution or creation, favor balanced treatment in public schools of alternative scientific theories of origins for better guiding students in their search for truth, and favor a neutral approach toward subjects affecting the religious and moral convictions of students.

(n) School districts in at least seven states are currently teaching both theories of origins or are implementing instruction in both theories.

Section 10. Severability of Provisions. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions that can be applied without the invalidated provisions, and the provisions of this Act are declared to be severable.

Section 11. Repeal of Contrary Laws. All laws or parts of laws in conflict with this Act are hereby repealed.

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

EVANGELICALS AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

by

Gerald Johnston Stiles

(ABSTRACT)

Evangelical Christians have in recent years manifested great dissatisfaction with public schooling. Because evangelicals represent a large segment of the American populace, their dissatisfaction has had a significant effect on the functioning of the public schools. More importantly, dissatisfaction on the part of evangelicals has led them to form private Christian schools which have drawn pupils from the public ones.

This study has analyzed the problems evangelicals face in public education, the historical framework of those problems, and the attempts currently being made to solve them. This has been done from an evangelical perspective. In addition to reviewing the literature available on the subject, the author utilized information gleaned from a study of 31 evangelical youth, and a survey of evangelical educators representing all evangelical colleges offering a degree in education. The study dealt with problems stemming from failure within evangelicalism as well as problems attributable to the public schools. Conclusions and proposals for change were stated based upon the information provided in the study. Proposals included the suggestion that preparations be made for the possibility of a complete evangelical break with public education should immediate and effective efforts not begin to regain evangelical confidence.