

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

The Educational Leader, 1937-1959

University Archives

10-1-1955

The Educational Leader, Vol. 19, No. 2

Kansas State Teachers College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader>

Recommended Citation

Kansas State Teachers College, "The Educational Leader, Vol. 19, No. 2" (1955). *The Educational Leader, 1937-1959*. 55.

<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/edleader/55>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Educational Leader, 1937-1959 by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

THE
EDUCATIONAL
LEADER



CONTENTS

Foreword

An Enduring Controversy—The Place of Religion in Public Education

T. William Hall

Reflections on the Place of Religion in the Teaching of Science

Theodore M. Sperry

How General Is General Education?

J. D. Haggard

Religion in the High-school Curriculum

Hulda M. Berg

OCTOBER 1, 1955

VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 2

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

*Published in January, April, July and October by the
Office of Publications*

*Kansas State Teachers College,
Pittsburg, Kansas*

REBECCA PATTERSON • Editor

*Address all communications to The Educational Leader,
Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas.*

THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

VOLUME XIX • NUMBER 2

Foreword

THESE essays have been written by faculty members at Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, who have been actively engaged in the Teacher Education and Religion Project. No effort has been made to arrive at uniformity of ideas and conclusions concerning the role of religion in Teacher Education. We hope, however, that these articles will stimulate further discussion and research among faculty members at KSTC as well as among other teachers who share our concern enough to read these essays.

An Enduring Controversy— The Place of Religion in Public Education

BY T. WILLIAM HALL

Separation of Church and State in American History

One of the persistent problems throughout the entire history of the United States has been that of understanding the theory of separation of church and state, a doctrine which grew out of the complex problems of colonial America as the founding fathers were convinced that the United States Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."¹

Although this amendment has often been referred to as building a "wall" of separation between church and state, a wealth of evidence points to the fact that this wall was either mythical, or else traversed easily within individual states. Documented statements to the effect mentioned above were gathered in a 1946 Research Bulletin of the N. E. A.² and in a thorough study by James M. O'Neil³ several years later. Both studies indicated close ties of state governments with religion, although these same governments rejected relationships with any particular sects. A "breach" of this wall has also a long standing tradition in the 165 years that the United States Congress has been paying chaplains for both Houses, U. S. hospitals, and military academies.

A thorough understanding of the relationship of the state and church has been especially crucial for educational leaders who, like their ancestors, were convinced that organized religious groups must not control or dominate public-supported schools; yet these same educators have been well aware of the fact that nonsectarian religion has always been a part of our American heritage, and must be dealt with in some meaningful manner. The American free public school, at its best, has attempted to find ways in which the ideals common to the American way of life could be taught without indoctrination in any particular religious creed or dogma.⁴

1. Taken from Article I of the Bill of Rights of the U. S. Constitution, passed by Congress, September 25, 1789.

2. *National Education Association Research Bulletin*, Vol. XXIV, No. 1 (Feb., 1946).

3. James M. O'Neil, *Religion and Education Under the Constitution* (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1949).

4. Ellwood P. Cubberly, *Public Education in the United States* (N. Y.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1934), ch. VI.

Furthermore, it is often claimed that as the American tradition has unfolded over the decades, the term "separation of church and state" has not been interpreted to mean that public institutions and religion shall be forever incompatible, but that the United States, through its agencies of national government or the several states, shall not establish a church or foster sectarianism, and that no sect shall control governments. Likewise this doctrine has been interpreted to mean that governments may not interfere with the free exercise of religion on the part of their citizens. Thus the majority of educators have been concerned with the separation between state and institutional churches, not the state and religion.⁵

Actual practice has been strangely diverse, however, and without definite pattern. South Dakota permitted Bible reading until 1929; Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, North Dakota and Oklahoma permit the use of the Bible. Delaware, Maine and New Jersey permit use of the Lord's Prayer. A long list of further diversities is available in research documents.⁶

Although this study is primarily concerned with philosophical bases of an understanding of the problem of religion in public education and teacher education, there would be less confusion in the implementation of programs if the legal aspects were clearly defined. This is not the case. Although the McCollum decision in Champaign, Ill., in 1948, drew widespread attention, an opposite decision on the *Zorach* case concerning released time in New York, again opened the question. Thus the background of ideology and practice concerning the role of religion in American education has been a complex one without any single pattern.

Within the diverse patterns found on the American scene, recent criticisms which have been made concerning the public school have focused attention upon both education and religion, and these criticisms have encouraged a re-examination of the legitimate place of religion and of spiritual values, within public education.

Criticisms come from within the ranks of Protestants, Jews and Catholics, many of whom are deeply devoted to public education. They fear that secularism is the greatest sickness in our American culture. As the secular cult has gained power, its leaders have said firmly that religion is irrelevant to democratic life, and hence religion is not needed. "Secularism," according to George Thomas, "consists of a preoccupation with the interests and values of the

5. This theme was developed in an article by Lawrence Little in the spring issue, 1949, of the *Religious Education* magazine.

6. Summarized in *N. E. A. Research Bulletin*, Vol. XXIV, No. 1 (Feb., 1946).

world of the senses, with the here and now, to the exclusion of eternity. Though it may not be based upon a formal rejection of religious beliefs, it relegates religion to a peripheral place in life."⁷ Thus secularism, Doctor Thomas suggests, does not usually show opposition to religion, but is indifferent to it.⁸

The tragic result of secularism, one critic points out, is the weakening of concern for moral, ethical and spiritual values. J. Hillis Miller suggests that while it is the responsibility of government to protect the rights of persons, "the time will come when there will be nothing for the sovereign state to protect" if secularism continues to be the dominant philosophy in American education.⁹

Supporters of the secular school have not been silent to the criticisms.¹⁰ Yet the controversy and the answers have called attention to an issue which is far from settled in American public education.

In an effort to meet such criticisms, and with a desire to enrich public education within the framework of democracy, several movements of religious nature have been developed throughout the years, the first two of which will not be discussed in detail in this paper. The first has actually been the most controversial, "Released Time Religious Education." A scarcity of published articles since 1950 supporting "released time" may be indicative of less support than this plan enjoyed prior to World War II.

The second movement, supported by the John Dewey Society and such pragmatists as Brubacher, Kilpatrick, Chave, and Bower, is usually referred to as "The Moral and Spiritual Value Approach." This author would not attempt to minimize this significant movement, since it is implicit in the whole "progressive education" theory and practice. The emphasis, at least on moral values, seems to enjoy universal acceptance.

It is the third plan which is currently receiving major attention and which warrants careful study.

Teaching Religion in the Public School

In order to correct what has been called "the blind spot in public education" or at other times "a secular school through an exclusion of religion," this third solution has been presented to the American

7. G. F. Thomas, "Problems and Principles," *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, ed. by Hoxie Fairchild (N. Y.: Ronald Press, 1952), p. 6.

8. For a view of contributing factors toward secularism in education, especially in higher education, see Fairchild, *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, Chap. I.

9. J. Hillis Miller, "Responsibility not Immunity" in Christian Gauss (ed.), *The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education* (N. Y.: The Ronald Press, 1951), p. 141.

10. See all of Chapter V in *Public Education Under Criticism*, ed. by Scott and Hill (N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, 1954).

public. Justice Jackson's statement, following the Supreme Court's decision on the Champaign, Ill., released-time case, has been quoted often as a point of departure by advocates of religious teaching:

One can hardly respect a system of education that would leave the student wholly ignorant of the currents of religious thought that move the world society for a part in which he is being prepared.

Likewise, few would disagree with the statement made by Paul Blanshard¹¹ that the public school should be free from sectarian strife. Those persons and agencies concerned with this approach to improving the schools have been and are convinced that the American tradition, as well as sound educational theory, permits no sectarian indoctrination in the tax-supported public school. It was with this agreement that the committee on Religion and Education of the American Council of Education issued its statement in 1947.¹² This committee, composed of leading educators and religious leaders, in co-operation with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, indicated that they were well aware of the usual criticism directed toward any plan of teaching religion in the public schools.¹³ Nevertheless, they stated clearly that

failure of the schools to play a part in acquainting the young with the role of religion in the culture while at the same time accepting such responsibility with reference to other phases of culture, is to be unneutral—to weigh the scales against any concern with religion.¹⁴

The committee went on to emphasize that any school which failed to deal fairly and objectively with religious data, whenever it was relevant to that particular learning experience, would be guilty of distorted teaching. In fact, they said, those who are dogmatic against religion are equally as un-American as are those who indoctrinate religious ideas.¹⁵

A statement similar to the ACE report was subsequently prepared by the Committee on Religion and Public Education of the International Council of Religious Education in 1949.¹⁶

During the years between 1947 and 1954, numerous articles have appeared in educational and religious journals, and a number of clearly written books have been published which have furthered

11. Paul Blanshard, *Communism, Democracy and Catholic Power* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1951), p. 132.

12. American Council on Education, *The Relation of Religion to Public Education: Basic Principles* (Washington, D. C.: 1947).

13. A thorough list of such criticism is listed by Virgil Henry in his book, *The Place of Religion in Public Schools* (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1950).

14. American Council on Education, *The Relation of Religion to Public Education: The Basic Principles* (Washington, D. C.: 1947), p. 29.

15. Henry, *op. cit.*, p. 17 ff.

16. Quoted by F. Ernest Johnson, *American Education and Religion* (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1952), pp. 87-88.

the widespread interest in teaching religion in the schools. Selected portions of these will illustrate this concern. John Q. Schisler, for example, writing for *Religion in Life*,¹⁷ suggests that while the public schools must not become sectarian, yet they can be encouraged to throw off the bias against religion which characterizes a large percentage of them.

Frank H. Lindhorst similarly writes that if religion is to influence the educational development of society, religious leaders must find a working relationship for ethical and religious teachings in the public schools.¹⁸

In the years of 1950 and 1951, a series of lectures was given at the Institute for Religious and Social Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. These were then published in a significant volume which presented to the public the views of eleven educators and religious leaders.¹⁹

Another volume appeared in 1950 by Virgil Henry entitled *The Place of Religion in Public Schools*,²⁰ which may have become the most widely read book in its field in some sections of the country.²¹ This published doctoral project had as its purpose to offer guidance to communities desiring to experiment with an objective study of religion in public schools. Its uniqueness lies in a thorough statement of techniques of community co-operation. Likewise, Henry's list of curriculum proposals in chapter two makes explicit possibilities of teaching about religion in literature, social studies, music, art, and drama, as well as in counseling, in extracurricular activities, and in library materials.

In comparison with Virgil Henry's work, which was primarily normative, a thorough investigation and descriptive study was made by Dr. Clarence Linton for the Committee on Religion and Education of the American Council on Education.²² This study had as its purpose to secure data through conferences, questionnaires, and opinionnaires concerning actual practices and attitudes of educational and religious leaders. The opinions expressed by Doctor Linton and his staff help clarify their position:

17. Winter edition, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (1951-52).

18. Frank H. Lindhorst, "Religion in the Educational Development of Society," *Religious Education* (Sept.-Oct., 1950), Vol. XLV, No. 5, p. 271.

19. F. Ernest Johnson (ed.), *American Education and Religion* (N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1950).

20. N. Y.: Harper & Bros., 1950.

21. During a summer workshop on Religion in Public Education, held at Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg, Kansas, in July, 1954, when 175 teachers and administrators met for two days, it was discovered that this was the most widely read single book in this field.

22. *The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953).

The public school is limited by the constitution, statutes and interpretations of the states as well as the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. . . . On the other hand, to be silent about religion may be, in effect, to make the public school an anti-religious factor in the community. Silence creates the impression in the minds of the young that religion is unimportant and has nothing to contribute to the solution of the perennial and ultimate problems of human life. This negative consequence is all the more striking in a period when society is asking the public school to assume more and more responsibility for dealing with the cultural problems of growth and development.

Therefore it is vitally important that the public school deal with religion. There are many ways in which this may be and indeed is being done. Some are good; others, in our judgment, may be dangerous to a greater or lesser degree. All public schools, however, can provide for the factual study of religion both as an important factor in the historical and contemporary development of our culture and as a source of values and insight for great numbers of people in finding the answers to persistent personal problems of living. Religion can and in our judgment should, be studied in the same way as the economic and political institutions and principles of our country should be studied—not as something on which the American public school must settle all arguments and say the last word, but as something which is so much a part of the American heritage and so relevant to contemporary values that it cannot be ignored.²³

The result of the extensive investigation by Doctor Linton may be summed up by several statements as follows:

The illustrations of practice at all levels of public education strikingly reveal the fact that there is no clear-cut and generally observed policy with respect to the relation of religion to public education. The concerns expressed by educational administrators . . . indicate that factual study of religion in the public schools is desirable . . .²⁴

Many leaders in all sections and in most communities think that the present state of affairs with respect to religion and public education is not satisfactory and that the problem should be studied until a satisfactory solution is found. . . .²⁵

We believe we have found the most promising approach to a further study of this problem, namely factual study of religion when and where intrinsic to general education on all levels.²⁶

Finally, it was recommended that the American Council on Education sponsor experimental projects to gather more data on the desirability and feasibility of factual study of religion in the public schools.

Recent Attempts to Deal with the Problem in Teacher Education

Numerous voices have merged in the past decade, suggesting that although the mass of problems related to secularism, moral and spiritual values in education, sectarianism, teaching religion,

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 71.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 83.

and the like, must be dealt with through co-operation among community, school and church, an increasing number of educators have said that one approach has often been overlooked. This is the teachers college and teacher education departments of colleges and universities. Educators began asking themselves a number of questions. Are the teacher training institutions helping prospective teachers become aware of these religious and moral problems? Do teachers know the diverse community special interests in the area of religion? Are these teachers themselves literate in religious facts of history, literature and interpretation? Do they know about various sectarianisms and secularism? Since there appeared to be, at least, a suspicion that the answers to at least some of the questions would be in the negative, a number of significant developments are worthy of mention.

In the first place, though students of public education are aware of the general function of teachers colleges, there are few data available upon what they are doing to prepare teachers to handle the difficult tasks with which we are here concerned. Such limitation of information is pointed out in the American Council on Education report.²⁷ The author indicates that with what evidence is available, it is probable that teachers colleges are doing little to prepare teachers to deal with religion in the public schools.²⁸

With this concern for teachers who are competent in all areas (including religion), Harner points out two hazards which must be overcome, assuming that the teacher education institutions must accept the primary task of developing teacher competency:

First is the danger inherent in the fact that there are large numbers of teachers who are not adequately informed in matters of religion and who lack interest in the study of religion. Secondly, there is the danger arising from the fact that teachers with deep religious convictions are tempted to teach religion merely along sectarian lines.²⁹

Preliminary Studies

At the close of the second world war, officials of the American Association of Teachers Colleges became sufficiently interested in discovering the actual practices of teachers colleges in dealing with religion in both curricular and extracurricular ways, to sponsor a committee which made a survey, under the chairmanship of William

27. *The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion* (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953), p. 15.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

29. Nevin C. Harner, *Religion's Place in General Education* (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1949), p. 144.

Vaughan of George Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn.³⁰ Information received from questionnaires sent to every member institution indicated that the American philosophy of separation of church and state was an influential deterrent to the teaching of religion. In many cases that doctrine was interpreted as a ban on all religious instruction or even religious extracurricular activities.³¹ Over half of those colleges or seventy-five (139 replying) discouraged denominational groups. One fifth or twenty-nine (137 replying to this question) discouraged even interdenominational activity. Ninety-five offered no courses whatsoever either in Bible or religion, and only thirty-eight had any faculty committee designed to encourage or supervise extracurricular activities. One hundred and eight had no committee of the kind.

Furthermore, this study indicated that the only generally approved method of dealing with religion was in bringing clergymen or outstanding religious leaders to the campus for a day or two for special addresses.

The investigators, however, expressed their unwillingness to arrive at definite conclusions, hoping only to secure initial data which might be used for further study.

The lack of evidence in current teacher education philosophies and practices concerning religion, gave rise to the calling of a National Study Conference on Religion in State Teachers Colleges. This conference was convened by the Department of Religion in Higher Education of the Yale University Divinity School and The New Haven State Teachers College in December, 1951. Over one hundred teachers and administrators from thirty states met together for three days, hearing lectures and discussing such issues as "legal problems regarding religion in teacher education," "religious courses," "the relation of religion to other academic disciplines," "religious counseling," and other special interest areas.³²

A careful investigation of the proceedings of this conference reveals no conclusions or programs of action. However, several points of view were repeatedly expressed which indicate a direction—that more adequate training of teachers is needed to deal with religion.

The following statements summarize apparent agreements from the conference delegates:

30. William H. Vaughan, "Religious Practices in State Teachers Colleges," *Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the American Association of Teachers Colleges* (1947).

31. *Ibid.*, p. 114 ff.

32. "Religion in State Teachers Colleges," a report of the National Conference on Religion in State Teachers Colleges, Yale University Divinity School, 1951.

1. Throughout the history of American higher education, including teacher training institutions, these colleges and universities have been free to deal with religion in a far more thorough manner than have the elementary and secondary public schools. This freedom, granted by the public, has not always been utilized, but it has been available. (An earlier address by Dr. Clarence P. Shedd, at a conference on the University of Minnesota campus, documented the above thesis with thirty historical sketches of state supported institutions.³³

2. A large part of the content of many disciplines in higher education is pertinent to religion, as, for instance, history, literature, psychology, social science, music, art and philosophy. It follows that both professional competence and personal integrity demand that the teacher face and not evade the emergence of religious considerations in his own field.³⁴

3. An affirmation of the statement, made earlier by the Educational Policies Commission of the N. E. A. was reaffirmed.

The public schools can teach about religion without advocating or teaching any religious creed. That religious beliefs are controversial is not an adequate reason for excluding teaching about religion.³⁵

In order that teachers will have the knowledge to teach adequately about religion, there was a common agreement that nonsectarian courses should be offered in the curriculum of state teachers colleges.

4. Finally, emphasis was placed upon the religious activity program, often sponsored by denominational groups. It was felt that this is a vital phase of the total growth of the student. This assertion is supported by a study, made by this investigator, through a questionnaire sent to 500 graduates of Kansas State Teachers College of the years 1947 through 1949. Results of this 1951 limited study indicate that extracurricular religious activities had over twice the beneficial religious influence of any other single factor.³⁶

Although the Yale conference was the first of its kind, the thinking was not revolutionary, but was a description of what was already being attempted, in one way or another, by widely separated teacher training institutions. An indicator of this fact was seen in the results of a study, made by Dr. Seymour Smith in preparation for the Yale conference. After receiving reports from two thirds of all

33. Clarence P. Shedd, "Religion in the American State University," *Religion in the State University: An Initial Exploration* (Minneapolis: Burgess Pub. Co., 1949), pp. 12-34.

34. "Religion in State Teachers Colleges," *op. cit.*, p. 27.

35. Educational Policies Commission, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, 78.

36. T. William Hall, "An Alumni Opinion on Religious Influences at K. S. T. C.," July, 1951. (Mimeographed)

teachers colleges in the United States, he discovered that of those colleges responding, every college had some kind of voluntary student extracurricular organization. This study also revealed that forty-four institutions, or thirty-seven percent of those responding offered one or more courses in religion or Bible. An additional nine colleges offered courses in ethics.³⁷

Even though such a study cannot discover how religion is dealt with in any course with the word "religion" in its title, it is clear that in the years from 1947, when the first study was made by the American Association of Teachers Colleges (*op. cit.*), to 1951, considerable additions were made in teacher education institutions in religion courses and extracurricular religious activities.

Study by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

In 1953, under the direction of a subcommittee of the Studies and Standards Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education³⁸ the Teacher Education and Religion Project originated and was developed. In December of 1953, the committee published its statement concerning the nature and scope of the projects study as follows:

The committee recommends that the chief purpose of this study of Teacher Education and Religion be to discover and develop ways and means to teach the reciprocal relation between religion and other elements in human culture in order that the prospective teacher, whether he teaches literature, history, the arts, science, or other subjects, be prepared to understand, to appreciate, and to convey to his students the significance of religion in human affairs.³⁹

Furthermore, the committee agreed that the primary aim of the study would be to discover to what extent teacher educational institutions are dealing directly and objectively with religion whenever and wherever it is relevant to learning experiences in the various fields of study, to discover how this can more adequately be accomplished, and to provide opportunity for selected colleges to assist one another in the development of this kind of teaching. The committee took the position that the emphasis on teaching *about* religion offers the most immediate opportunity for developing programs which are both appropriate to the responsibilities of colleges preparing teachers and consonant with legal and practical limitations upon the college.

37. Seymour Smith, *An Exploratory Study of Religious Provisions in State Teachers Colleges*. Mimeographed (Yale University Divinity School, 1951).

38. The A. A. C. T. E. was founded in 1948 as the result of a merger of three national teachers education associations.

39. *Prospectus, Teacher Education and Religion Project*, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, New York, 1953.

Early in 1954, fifteen colleges and universities were selected as pilot centers to conduct the study for a period of five years. Since that time one national workshop and three regional conferences have been held for participating schools.

It is not the purpose of this paper to describe all phases of the A. A. C. T. E. project, nor to analyze its accomplishments. Yet the fact that this paper has been prepared, and the following essays are printed in this journal, is indicative of considerable interest and study in one of the pilot centers of the project.

Current practices which are now known through research, conferences, study groups, faculty discussions, and a host of articles and volumes, indicate that there is a lack of direction to be followed in the preparation of teachers to deal with religion, just as there is a similar lack of direction for the lower levels of public education. Should prospective teachers be immersed in a moral and spiritual value approach alone, being taught (though sometimes not experiencing in their own educational life) values such as a respect for personality, honesty, loyalty, and the others? Should teachers have a working knowledge of all the great religions? If so, how should they gain this? Should the relationship of religion to *every* subject be stressed? Should democracy be the religion of public education? Should teacher training educators agree with Robert Ulich?

We must stop allowing our students who may have educational responsibilities as teachers, administrators, psychologists and counselors, to go out into the world with a heap of scholarly knowledge, and with less than a minimum of insight into the great spiritual wisdom of the human race. . . .⁴⁰

In whatever way these questions are answered, and whatever approaches to the problems of religion in public education are made, some conclusions will eventually emerge from the teachers colleges and departments of education where teachers are taught and where professional education experiences are gained. Therefore it appears extremely significant that we listen to the voices of those who do the teaching in teacher education institutions if we are able to discern present trends of thought and action.

Those of us who are deeply concerned with the place of religion in education are also obliged to continue conversation and discussions with our colleagues concerning the role of religion in the various subject matter areas as well as in the professional education courses. Though the fruits of progress may be slow, such progress

40. Robert Ulich, "The Preparation of Teachers" in *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, Edited by Hoxie Fairchild (N. Y.: The Ronald Press Co., 1942), p. 431.

is inevitable if it can grow out of an inner motivation of the professor, guided by an informed mind and a critical intellect.

It would appear important, moreover, for teacher education institutions to examine the whole philosophy of education which permeates the institution in an attempt to discern the implications on religion of the philosophical point of view held by the educators. If this theoretical approach can then be blended with experimentation through projects, workshops and pilot centers, we should find a clear pattern for the best possible teacher training program.

Selected Bibliography

The Following Books Are Especially Related to the Problems of Religion in Colleges and Universities

Allen, Henry E. (ed.), *Religion in the State University*, Minneapolis; Burgess Publishing Co., 1949.

Brown, Kenneth I., *Not Minds Alone*, N. Y.; Harper & Bros., 1954.

A readable book in which the author blends a host of college situations and personal philosophical insights to develop the idea that American education in all of its major manifestations must be brought to a deeper appreciation of the place of ethical and religious values in the classroom.

Cunningham, Merrimon, *The College Seeks Religion*, New Haven; Yale University Press, 1947.

This book is a published Ph.D. dissertation, giving a thorough history of the relation of colleges and religion from the beginning of this century. The author discusses attitudes toward religion in various types of colleges (including the tax supported college), religious implications of three main educational philosophies, plus a sketch of significant programs of religion in educational institutions.

Fairchild, Hoxie N. (ed.), *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*, N. Y.; The Ronald Press, 1952.

This book is a compilation of earlier pamphlets, published by the Edward T. Hazen Foundation. Thus in one volume, one can find excellent articles on religious perspectives in the teaching of literature, history, philosophy, music, physical sciences, biology, psychology, anthropology, economics, political science and preparation of teachers. Many current references to this book in articles indicate that it is the most widely read book in the field. Reviewers indicate that each author is thoroughly competent in his academic area.

Gauss, Christian (ed.), *The Teaching of Religion in American Higher Education*, N. Y.; The Ronald Press, 1951.

This book is composed of a series of essays by the editor, Robert Ulick of Harvard, Kenneth Morgan of Colgate, and others. These essays are concerned with Liberal Education, the present religious situation in higher education, and suggestions for a future approach.

Edward T. Hazen Foundation, *College Readings and Religion*, New Haven; Yale University Press, 1948.

In an effort to discover what place is given in a wide range of college courses, to religion, the Hazen Foundation asked thirteen scholars to examine college textbooks in the various areas, in order to discover the adequate or inadequate amount of material in the area of religion. Obviously each person had to set for himself some criteria for his investigation. Then each proceeded in a thorough and interesting manner to reveal the place given to religion in textbooks. Areas studied include Philosophy, Cultural Anthropology, Literature, Biology, Psychology and others.

Johnson, F. Ernest (ed.), *American Education and Religion*, N. Y.; Harper & Bros., 1952.

This volume was based on lectures given at the Institute for Religious and Social Studies of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The first chapter is a statement of the basic problems in the area of religion in education. Three chapters follow from radically different points of view on the problem as stated and each author proposes his own solutions. The last half of the book is given to discussions of religion

in various types of colleges and schools. This volume cannot be recommended too highly for a clear statement of problems of religion in education. It is likewise valuable in that various clear-cut but opposed points of view are expressed.

Limbert, Paul M. (ed.), *College Teaching and Christian Values*, N. Y.; Association Press, 1951.

This book is similar to *Religious Perspectives in College Teaching*. Chapters include a discussion of the role of religion in teachings of the Physical Sciences, by Kirtley F. Mather; the teaching of literature, sociology and all the rest by equally competent scholars. This book can probably be comprehended later at night than the previous one; yet it is thorough and well worth one's reading effort.

Moberly, Sir Walter, *The Crisis in the University*, London; S. C. M. Press, 1949.

This is a thorough analysis and criticism of modern British Universities. It deals with such questions as: What kind of a world do we live in? Is the function of the University changing? What is liberal education? What about neutrality of the teacher? Criticisms are also given concerning fragmentariness, uncriticized assumptions, and the neglect of moral and spiritual factors. *The Crisis in the University* is scholarly and timely. If one differs with Moberly's sharp criticisms of higher education, he can assume that the jab is not applicable to U. S. universities. This book is unsurpassed in the author's sharp analysis of educational philosophy and practice from a Christian point of view.

Van Dusen, Henry P., *God in Education: A Tract for Our Times*, N. Y.; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

What the author is aiming at is a philosophy of education on all levels which rests firmly on the conception of the unity of truth and of human experience. His focus of attention is mainly on higher education, though he deplores what he believes to be extreme secularization of elementary and secondary schools.

Madden, Ward, *Religious Values in Education*, N. Y.; Harper & Brothers, 1951.

This professor of education at Brooklyn College has succeeded in writing a book which is really different from others with similar titles. He is able to weave problems of students in their education growth, through a maze of educational philosophy, theology, philosophy of religion, aesthetics and come out with the conclusion that true religion is not static creed, but a "high quality of experience." The author defies complete categorization, in that he quotes religious liberals, supernaturalists, conservatives, naturalism pragmatists, and is able to blend together much that is apparent contradictory.

Wilder, Amon N. (ed.), *Liberal Learning and Religion: A Vital Discussion of Major Issues Confronting the Universities Where There is Serious Concern for Religion*, New York; Harper & Brothers, 1951.

This book is made up of the contributions of fifteen scholars on problems of religious values, teaching religion, and academic freedom in higher education in general.

The Following Books are Concerned With the Teaching of Religion in the Public School and With Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public School

American Council on Ed., *The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing with Religion*, American Council on Education, Washington D. C., 1953.

This volume is the report on a study made by Dr. Clarence Linton, on leave from Columbia University, in which he attempted to discover attitudes of teachers, administrators, and the public concerning the function of the public schools in dealing with religion.

Bower, William Clayton, *Moral and Spiritual Values in Education*, Lexington; University of Kentucky Press, 1952.

Doctor Bower is probably the most outstanding exponent of the Moral and Spiritual Value movement in education. This basic book deals with the educational situation, the basic philosophy of values in education, and techniques of a program of emphasis.

Educational Policies Commission of the N. E. A., *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public School*.

This widely read book, and one used by many schools in workshops on moral and spiritual values, sets forth lucidly a policy for public education as a partner of home and church in developing moral and spiritual values. The authors also state unequivocally that the public schools can and should teach about religion.

Henry, Virgil, *The Place of Religion in Public Schools*, N. Y., Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Doctor Henry first develops the thesis that teaching about religion is a necessary task of the public school. His main purpose, then, was to give a guide to communities which desired to introduce objective studies of religion into the schools. He discusses content, training of teachers, and the development of community understandings.

Thayer, V. T., *Religion in Public Education*, N. Y., the Viking Press, 1947,

This book, by a thorough experimentalist, is a discussion of the origins of the secular school, and an argument that sound morality can be developed without instruction in religion.

Periodicals

Religious Education

A platform for the free discussion of issues in the field of religion and their bearing on education. Published quarterly at Oberlin, Ohio.

The Christian Scholar

A new quarterly journal published by the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of Churches. Articles are always concerned with the relation of religion to higher education in general, or to some particular academic discipline.

Reflections on the Place of Religion in the Teaching of Science

BY THEODORE M. SPERRY

Science and religion are not mutually antagonistic to each other, nor are they concerned with fields which are mutually exclusive of each other. Instead, they are different approaches to a broad, integrated concept of natural philosophy which examine the same basic perceptions, and which modify and supplement each other.

This might well express the opinion which has repeatedly been proposed by many who have given serious consideration to the relation between science and religion, both of which have so profoundly affected human experience.

Why, then, has there been the frequent concern over the so-called conflict between science and religion? Why, also, has religion been so frequently omitted in the teaching of science? Why have scientists been repeatedly accused of being atheistic or ungodly? Questions of this kind have stimulated the thinking of the science teachers involved in the "Teacher Education and Religion Project" of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. It is the reflections of the writer on some aspects of this topic which are expressed here. Although these ideas have been obtained, in part, from the thinking of the various individuals concerned with this study, they do not necessarily reflect the consensus of the committee members. The writer has not hesitated to incorporate ideas previously expressed by others from many different sources.

It might be said that both religion and science are basically concerned with the relationship between the individual and his environment. That is, the sentient individual finds himself surrounded by vast forces which at first he perceives only vaguely and understands not at all. After first meeting the fundamental needs of keeping the self alive and propagated, his subsequent efforts seem to be to perceive more in detail the nature of these apparent biological, physical, psychological and spiritual forces, and in his more conscious moments, to inquire into the reasons for, or explanations of, these forces. Such perceptions of these forces may be obtained psychically or intuitively, as by religion, or physically, as by science. The ultimate goals are believed to be the same in either case.

Contrary to a common opinion, scientists are *not* concerned with

absolute facts, and in general do not admit that any absolute facts are known in science. Their concern is rather with *relative* facts, so that much time and effort goes first into the determination of relationships, as, for example, the measurement of such entities as length, mass and time. These measurements are simply the comparisons of two or more items with each other, one of which is usually defined as some arbitrary unit, such as centimeter, gram or second. The meter stick thus has absolutely no value to the scientist except as he can use it for comparison with some item in which he is interested.

Once the relationship between two or more objects is determined, the scientist next tries to formulate a statement which will cover all such relationships. This is termed a scientific principle or law, and represents our understanding of the physical and biotic environment in which we live. The scientific statement so formulated, however, is not final, and is valid only if the measurements on which it is based are correct, and if no known scientific principles contradict it. When two scientific statements contradict each other, one or both of them must be revised, modified or discarded so that no such contradiction persists. Such contradictions indicate that at least one of the statements does not truly represent the relationship it had attempted to describe.

The fact that scientific principles are open to modification or discard as new relative facts are discovered has been called the weakness of science, since it suggests that there are no principles or laws of science which are certain. But this is not, when fully understood, a real weakness, although it is definitely a limitation which every scientist (and layman) should constantly keep in mind. It seems in reality to be the strength of science, since it is this very principle which permits science continually to push ahead along increasingly wider frontiers of the unknown without being hampered by any ties to the past except as history itself imposes its own inevitable ties with any new development or discovery. There is no principle of science which has not been repeatedly challenged and carefully investigated. As a result, many such principles have been modified since their first statement, and a few of them discarded entirely, such as the classic examples of the phlogiston theory and of the inheritance of acquired characters.

Religions, on the other hand, often have not been subjected to such painstaking investigation nor has mutability of their basic principles been admitted. On the contrary, they often have been

associated with an inflexible dogma which has been stated by a small select body or obtained by revelation. This has been one of their strengths, since it provides unvarying statements of principle for a people living in a very uncertain and constantly changing world. It is the rock of security to which they can hold.

But religions likewise have their adverse limitations, varying widely according to the narrowness and immutability of their dogmas, and to the degree of thought and social change present among their adherents. A lack of thought and change can result in an enormous faith in any dogma which will preserve the *status quo*. The more widespread and enduring religions, however, are those which have tenets and principles which will hold under widely varying conditions over long periods of time, whether or not they are subject to thought and inquiry.

If religions purport to state the truth, then none of the statements of science, if they also be true, will be contrary to the principles of these religions. Furthermore, no amount of inquiry or investigation will change or negate these expressed religious principles, nor should religionists be disturbed by any findings or statements of science. Moreover, it should be to the advantage of religionists to anticipate and to welcome scientific discoveries and statements which should supplement or corroborate that which is already expressed in other ways by the basic tenets of their religions.

It is held that no two truths of any nature can contradict each other.

In contrasting science with religion, then, we find that scientists, in their search for the truths of nature, have started with the admission that they did *not* know the principles or laws of nature, and have measured, correlated, and questioned the phenomena about them, formulating, comparing, modifying, and discarding statements as necessary until they gradually arrive at principles which seem to fit all known facts. No such unity of action has been characteristic among religionists. Some sectarian groups have stated that their divinely-revealed initial tenets were the truth, and that no further inquiry was necessary concerning them. Others have stated or clarified their principles periodically by divinely-guided heads of the church, or by agreement among the elders at periodic conclaves. These methods preserve varying degrees of solidarity among the adherents to a particular faith, but at the same time have resulted in sharp disparities of opinion, if not outright conflict, among the different faiths.

This lack of unity among faiths has led to inquiries as to whether there is a set of principles common to all religions. The frequent assertion that there are such principles has not yet officially received general acceptance by the various religious groups concerned, although there seems to be increased interest in recent years looking toward this goal, as indicated by various national religious conferences of mixed faiths.

Since the breadth of scientific concepts seems to be limited only by man's knowledge of relative facts, then any concordance between science and religion would seem to depend on the breadth of the religious concepts considered. It seems, then, that one could expect broad areas of concordance between science and any religion which has comprehensive statements of principles, but that there would be limited bases for agreement between science and any religion which had sharply restricted tenets of faith.

This concordance has been substantiated by the frequency with which scientific principles have been accepted among religious groups having comprehensive principles, as contrasted with the antagonism to science met with among groups with restrictive tenets of faith. It is also suggested by the frequency with which scientists profess broad religious principles, and the infrequency of occurrence of sharply restricted religious views held by scientists.

There is no reason to suspect that scientists would agree in the details of their religious perspectives more than persons with other backgrounds, or more than scientists agree among themselves on the details of their views of science. It is probable, however, that the mechanistic approach taken by scientists in their analysis of nature suggests an atheistic conception of life, but there is reason to believe that this atheistic concept, when accepted, occurs more commonly among the younger scientists, or among those with otherwise limited backgrounds, rather than among those who have considered carefully and recognized the limitations of science. (There seems to be a regrettable tendency among the less experienced to err in recognizing no limitations to science. This attitude can easily lead to an atheistic concept.)

By way of contrast, the broader view of religion, held perhaps by the majority of scientists, would necessarily be one that would permit the inclusion of all accepted statements of science within their religious convictions. This concept of religion as a "oneness of all nature" is neither new nor socially limited, but can be recognized among the oldest religions known and in all ages since that

time. This concept has as its strength the inclusion of all that is known in science, but it has as its weakness the difficulty of its definition, and the separation of such a religion from an atheistic acceptance of life as a mechanistic process. It raises the question as to whether Naturalism or Humanism, in their various aspects, should be accepted as religions.

In a more limited sense than Naturalism, however, the scientist may have a religious view broad enough to include the truths of science, yet still be definitely theistic. Unless science can disprove theism, which does not now seem likely, there is nothing antagonistic between science and a broad theistic religion.

It is not enough for the scientist to say that since there is nothing antagonistic between science and theism, he, therefore, has a theistic religious concept. Religion, as well as science, must have positive, dynamic bases for its existence. (The "thou shalt nots" have often had far too much emphasis in various religions.)

One such basis for a positive theistic concept (belief in a principle variously expressed as "God," "Divine Power," "Ultimate Reality," etc.) is the universal presence of order throughout the macrocosm and microcosm of the universe. The complete lack of any guidance or system might be expected in matter and energy uncontrolled and without a directive force. Such a chaos is unknown to man.

A second basis for a theistic concept is the genesis and maintenance of the intricacies of the processes of life. Only those familiar with the details of physiology and genetics can appreciate the need of an enormous power to control the unbelievable complexities involved in the creation and continuance of the life of an individual. Even as complex as the atomic details involved in a chemical reaction have proved to be, they do not in any way compare in complexity with the details involved in the production of a new amoeba, much less with those involved in the genesis of man.

Still another basis for a theistic concept (all of these bases are simply manifestations of a common principle) is that concerned with the multilinear divergence of life. Contrary to the movement toward an entropic mean which one might expect in a contained dynamic system, this divergence of development seems to be producing constantly more involved and complex life forms which are not only occupying every possible habitat niche over the earth's surface, but even now are seriously threatening to break away completely from the earth's atmospheric envelope into outer space. Mechanists may perhaps explain how this can happen, but only a comprehensive

religious philosophy can yet suggest—and this only in very general terms—why it should occur.

Perhaps the most significant basis for a theistic concept is that of conceptual thought itself. By what reasoning can neutrons, protons and electrons, which are organized into atoms, which in turn are combined to produce molecules, which in themselves are bound into neurones which form the intricate network known as the human brain, so interact with each other first to perceive the phenomena of their own environment and then so organize these perceptions into data which reveal the precise nature of the neutrons, protons and electrons themselves, and through this revelation to conjecture a divine power which has thus ordered such an intricate state of things, except by the existence of such a divine or infinite power which makes the whole process possible? How else could matter thus comprehend itself?

Even though the above arguments do not in any way *prove* theism, yet a positive theistic concept seems to be distinctly indicated as a basis of approach to the explanations of these phenomena, since a mechanistic concept apparently leads to phenomena far different from those observed.

In the science classroom, it is obvious that subject matter must come first. Any reference to a religion which encompasses the concepts of science can have little meaning until the fundamentals of measurements and the formulations of scientific concepts themselves are understood. It seems to be task enough simply to develop an understanding of specific measurements, accuracy of observation, the careful recording of data, and the organization of such data to establish a concept in science, without carrying the process further within the limited time allotted the class for comprehension of the subject matter. It is necessary altogether too often simply to state the facts and concepts thus far ascertained without being able to trace adequately the development of such ideas. It is this inability to cover well the basic features of science which is probably responsible for most of the omission of religion by the science teacher. There could be no understanding of the place of religion in scientific cosmology before scientific concepts are established in the mind of the student, and there is no time for it afterward. Rome wasn't built in a day, neither will the student be able to comprehend fully the unity of science and religion in a one-semester or one-year course devoted to a single limited facet in the field of science.

As for an antagonism between science and religion, it is evident that this will be inevitable whenever the definitions used to delimit either science or religion are too narrow or too arbitrary to include all aspects of life in the physical environment, but there is reason to believe that antagonism cannot occur when the full significance of both science and religion are comprehended. The science teacher should strive to present the depth and breadth of his science and to note its limitations, but he cannot, as a scientist, do the same for religion, even if he had the time to do so.

This, however, in no way prevents him from freely including religious references, history, and concepts, which have a bearing on science, in his presentation of any given topic, and it is his obligation to present this information insofar as class time permits. In doing this, it is probably impossible to avoid antagonisms with some students, but significant scientific concepts cannot be omitted simply because antagonisms with certain religious faiths are known to occur. Fairness and tact in presentation are the principal assets on such occasions, but one cannot always please everybody.

Since any concept of science can be displaced by evidence firmly enough established to agree more accurately with the perceptions of the human intellect, then, if the presentation of a fact or concept of science disturbs the religious faith or convictions of a student, that faith must rest on very unstable or indefensible bases which are more easily shaken than his acceptance of the scientific concept. But it must remain with the philosopher to discover the weakness of such religious faith, or with the religionist, or better yet, with the student himself. It cannot be done by the science teacher (in his capacity as a scientist), since indoctrination, or counter-indoctrination, is contrary to the freedom essential to the unrestricted development of science.

It should be emphasized here, however, that the social order which permits the development of science to the point where it seriously disrupts certain religious faiths, also has the responsibility of providing qualified counselors (whether philosophers, psychologists, or clergymen) to replace the disrupted faith with a philosophy having more substantial concepts. In this, the scientist with a soundly religious conviction can be most helpful. Some of our eminent scientists with a strong conviction of social responsibility are also fully qualified religionists.

It is in this light that we say that science and religion are different aspects of a broad, integrated concept of natural philosophy.

How General Is General Education?

BY J. D. HAGGARD

From its very beginning the philosophy and objectives of general education have been in a state of evolution. Even during the infrequent periods when educators have seemed temporarily to stabilize their definition of the concept, their means of attaining the goals differ so widely as to hamper any large scale unity in the meaning of general education and thus in its accomplishment. The movement began as an attempt to solve a complex of educational problems. First the college population was growing by leaps and bounds; with large numbers inevitably came a greater spread in abilities and interests. The curriculum was not well suited for this heterogeneous mixture of students, many of whom were not interested in the highly specialized courses in which they found themselves involved. Too, there was a feeling that the college graduate, though he was very proficient in his specialty, lacked a sense of proportion; he was not too well prepared to meet the variety of life problems that were certain to face him upon graduation. Some degree of uniformity in the program of every student was being suggested. The antithesis of a single highly specialized field was regarded as a broad survey of many areas of experience; thus was born the survey course where it was expected that the student would learn a little about a lot of things and consequently become quite versatile and well rounded in his education. General education was defined almost entirely in terms of content, a course was justified on the basis of its generality of subject matter.

However logical this idea of general education appeared as a cure-all for the current educational problems, it soon became equally obvious that it solved no real problem at all and that quite another alternative should be sought. The student was permitted only a superficial acquaintance with ideas and problems, with no time for a genuine analysis and understanding of any segment of the course experience. The student participating in one of the survey courses often found he had acquired only a smattering of disconnected facts and knowledge, with no concept of the method or principles of knowledge or their relevance to the events of life. The practice was made more difficult by the continual addition to human knowledge and the losing battle of attempting to bring the student abreast of the ever increasing store of inquiry. More and more areas of

study were clamoring for recognition in the general education program, basing their argument on the common needs of the educated man or woman. Thus being defined in terms of common knowledge, and that in a very limited sense of facts and information, the program found itself hard pressed to set a limit on what should be legitimately included in general education. For these and doubtless other reasons, most educators moved rapidly to abandon the survey idea of general education and to supplant it, at least in theory, with a plan that directs its attention more to the student, and what should happen to him, than to the subject matter.¹

What kinds of experience should the student encounter in a liberal education? What are the sorts of problems that will inevitably confront an individual in a free society, and how can he be prepared to understand and resolve such problems? On these points there is wide divergence of answer and even more so on the methods and techniques of bringing these experiences into reality for the student. The more inclusive philosophy of an institution will undoubtedly have its measure of influence on the ends of the program as well as means of implementing these objectives. Though these differences are inevitable, with uniformity unlikely and perhaps undesirable, it nonetheless remains our responsibility to continually re-examine our ideas of liberal education that we might bring into clear relief the goals we set for ourselves.

In some sense a liberal education implies the student is to be set free from certain bonds that circumscribe his very existence and hamper his efforts to live his own life. Education thus should aim at bringing the student to be his own free and unique self—free from ignorance, habit, impulse, excessive emotion, and blind devotion to rule. Today these would not likely be characteristic of the educated man in every country of the world. To be liberated from all the "ties that bind" is not universally sought. However in a modern democratic society where the burden of decision is upon each of us, where our individual personality is valued, we must constantly seek to develop in the student a capacity to choose the good from the evil, the true from the false, but above all to choose for himself—to make judgments and evaluations out of his own unique experience. Therefore our conscious and controlled purpose in education is the provision of a framework from which the student has opportunity to form solutions to real problems, to dis-

1. Warren C. Lovinger, "General Education in Teachers Colleges," American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, State Teachers College, Oneonta, N. Y., 1948. p. 39.

criminate among alternatives realizing the consequences of each possible selection and the interdependence of means and ends.

The environment about us affords a clue to the kinds of problems one is constantly facing. Tradition has us divide them into the natural and social sciences, along with the creative accomplishments of man. These are the areas then with which general education must in some fashion be concerned. But how? Should the student be brought abreast the entire gamut of each discipline; or on the other hand does general education become identified with a minimal acquaintance with each of these branches? To follow the first alternative is practically impossible, and, even if it should be realizable, what of the many new discoveries and developments going on continuously? How is the student to relate himself to these; how is he to continue his education, except that he develop the skills and attitudes prerequisite to learning? And on the other hand if general education be defined as that body of knowledge in the natural and social sciences along with humanities, which every educated man ought to know, then what of the great remainder in each field? Is it expected the student will not have need for more than the knowledge gained in his college program?

General education becomes, therefore, quite restrictive, when conceived as a body of knowledge, however large. Unless conscious effort is expended to help the student develop the competencies and skills necessary to extending his own education and what is perhaps more important, the functional use of learning, the status quo of graduation day will linger with him all too many years. Thus to reject the "basic knowledge" concept of general education teaches us something of the alternative to be sought. Since the student cannot learn all things desirable, let us be content with consideration of a limited selection, but along with it emphasize the broad technique of self education. To put it another way, perhaps a better definition of general education is in terms of methods of learning;² "General" then with respect to the various methods of knowledge. Even thus defined general education will fall back again upon the three main divisions of knowledge for its subject matter, for we purposely inquire of the methods of learning useful in considering our contemporary surroundings. Otherwise learning would be abstracted from reality to the point of being strictly ivory tower and thus useful only for conversational purposes. Rather than effect a change in the content of the curriculum, it merely shifts the point

2. Report of the Harvard Committee, "General Education in a Free Society," Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1945, p. 59.

of emphasis from specific knowledge and understandings of specific objects to the process of intellectual activity, desirable since it charts the course to becoming a free rational being.

This is not to argue that liberal education can be reduced to a simple problem of how to gain new knowledge, for even this problem is not identical in the three areas of human knowledge. It does suggest that liberal education is thus general to the extent it consciously examines the methods and principles of learning unique to each of the great areas of intellectual activity. The very meaning of "truth" in natural science is quite a different thing from its meaning in the area of mathematics; add to this the fact that the process of arriving at truth in the two areas is different, and diversity of methods of knowledge begins to appear. A natural science phenomenon is said to be true if it possesses a sort of one-to-one relation with reality—if it can be verified. A proposition is called true in mathematics if it can, by the legitimate use of logic, be constructed out of a given set of postulates, perhaps having nothing whatever to do with reality. Perforce the methods of discovering truth in these two areas would then be different. While the natural scientist uses, though not exclusively, the so called inductive procedure, in which he begins by examining individual objects of like sort to record common characteristics and to obtain generalizations, the deductive method of mathematics begins much in the reverse order: with a given object (set of postulates) it seeks to discover as many particular traits (theorems) as possible.

The natural scientist prides himself on his objectivity, his devotion to truth and falsity as against judging objects as "good" or "bad," "desirable" or "undesirable." He creates the hydrogen bomb only to leave the problem of its eventual value to those who make judgments of a different kind from his. He concerns himself with only those objects that can be measured, analyzed, and described; with situations where the variables can be easily controlled; where recurrence is expected. The scientist is not interested in an object if it is truly unique, for he must make comparisons and exhibit relationships between different occurrences of an event. The precise measurement and meticulous description of the scientist is made possible with the tools of mathematics. In a real sense mathematics is handmaiden to science, and is much less a scientific than a humanistic creation of man.

If the methods of knowledge in these two branches which have been closely associated for centuries are so different, what then of

the comparison between the sciences and humanities? Whereas "truth" has a meaning in science quite different from its use in mathematics, in the humanistic expressions of man the words "true" and "false" are hardly applicable at all, except in a trivial sense of historical documentation. The humanities are interested in making value judgments, in discriminating "good" from "bad," "comedy" from "tragedy." Through the many vicarious experiences with ideas and ideals the student comes to a very important aspect of his general education, that of selecting from among several alternatives that which for him seems best. It becomes for the student a consciousness of relationship of ideas, their importance, and the reciprocal relationship of means and ends. While the precision and exactness of the scientist is now gone, and often an object stands alone with little to compare it to, still the decisions one must make in the face of these apparent handicaps are by no means completely arbitrary. Through literature and the arts the student becomes acquainted with ideas that have prevailed, with standards of moral conduct unique to civilized man. While complete uniformity of critical judgment is never achieved the "life good to live" stands as a guidepost, lending direction and motivation to our decisions. Knowledge in science and humanities is obtained by a process unique to each, yet each is based on a rational procedure of persuasion plus a well informed and disciplined judgment. Both have standards by which data are judged, even though the standards and the type of judgments vary.

If the natural sciences are concerned with description while the humanities are involved in evaluations, then the social scientist combines the two methods not only to describe and analyze, but also to judge as good or bad in terms of certain criteria. He studies not only the facts in a labor-management dispute, what each group is seeking and how they plan to attain their objective, but how the possible outcomes will affect each group and, more important, contemporary society as a whole; thus he moves to a judgment of each question as good or bad from the standpoint of each position. Nor is it as if he were usurping the problem of the philosopher, but in selecting, in judging progressive or regressive, desirable or undesirable, he sets a pattern of values against which specific events stand or fall.

The method of the social scientist is unlike that of the natural scientist in at least three important respects. First, the variable factors involved in a given situation are much more difficult to iso-

late and control than is the case in the natural sciences. A representative sample of a population is easier to obtain in the latter. Repetition and stability are the touchstones of the natural sciences, while almost any object of the social world is soon to disappear, never to return exactly as before. Each event is unique. In the second place, while there are standards by which judgments are made in both these sciences, they are much more universal in the natural science area. Absolute agreement on social conduct is rare. The net result is that progress in the natural sciences is much more cumulative; each scientist stands on the shoulders of his predecessor and gives support to those who follow him. With objectivity held in high esteem and value judgments avoided, more nearly complete agreement is experienced in the natural sciences than is possible in the humanities and social sciences. Whereas in the natural sciences each generation adds to, or perhaps corrects, what has gone before, in the social realm it is not so much additions as it is alternatives; new insights, and ideas, yes, but not in totem-pole fashion. Finally the social scientist experiences a unique relationship to his discipline in that he not only is the expert as he attempts to perceive the problem and lay some basis for analysis and solution, but he is also the creator of that problem. He is the expert as well as the artist, and that which he supports as an expert may not have been his deliberate and conscious choice as an individual. Not so in the sciences where the individual is concerned with intellectual ideas divorced from any concrete plan of social action. He stands only as expert and enjoys a kind of objectivity unknown to his colleagues across the campus.

Lest we have been overzealous in our emphasis on the differences in method of knowledge employed in the various areas of learning, we hasten to acquiesce, asserting only that the extremes of the continuum are quite distinct and poles apart, but the points in between are fuzzy and much less exact. Justification for such distinctions as those above comes when detailed consideration of the curriculum is given. If "truth" has a different meaning in science from that used in mathematics—if the method of arriving at truth is ever plural, then surely we should look to those experiences which illustrate and exemplify each definition, each technique, and method of gaining knowledge in our efforts to establish a basis for liberal education. Method of knowledge should thus be the integrating factor of general education and not the whole of it, for every society, and ours is no exception, has certain common elements and beliefs

on which it is based. Surely these must be perpetuated for the good of all, but even so it might behoove us to understand the nature of such beliefs.

To deliberately emphasize methods of knowledge alters merely the center of gravity in the curriculum rather than effecting any material change in the subject matter itself. The supremacy of method does not minimize the importance of subject matter as a means of realizing the ends of general education; however, it negates the subject matter as end in itself. Education would thus look to information and skill as essential and basic to all knowledge, but if the methods of gaining that knowledge as well as the principles that structure it differ as between the disciplines, then surely this should be an important step in perpetuation of knowledge itself. General information is not to be identified with general education: It is a necessary component but by no means sufficient. The Harvard Report puts it thus:

Since the problem of choice can under no circumstances be avoided, the problem becomes what, rather than how much, to teach; or better, what principles and methods to illustrate by the use of information. The same conflict between the factual aspects of a subject and the need of insight into the kind of truth with which it deals arises in an acute form in that most factual of disciplines, natural science itself. While a heaping up of information is peculiarly necessary in the teaching of science, information is not enough. Facts must be so chosen as to convey not only something of the substance of science but, also and above all, of its methods, its characteristic achievements, and its limitations. To the extent that a student becomes aware of the methods he is using, and critically conscious of his presuppositions, he learns to transcend his specialty and generate a liberal outlook in himself.³

For some time psychologists have pointed out the rapid rate of human forgetting. Most of us soon lose detailed information we have learned, especially if the circumstances were not conducive to strong motivation. But liberal education is more than mere facts and information. It consists rather of the development of certain attitudes in the student; an attitude of inquiry, of critical analysis, of problem solving, and of value-judging. But we hasten to point out that while facts and information are meaningless without a context of principles into which they structure themselves, it is equally futile to consider principles and method devoid of basic background materials. Alone either is limited in its usefulness. Direct acquisition of facts and information as an end in itself is rejected because it fails to help develop the creativeness and originality of the student. He

3. Report of the Harvard Committee, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64.

remains much as a mechanical device, illustrating a number of relationships and facts, but unable to grow and accumulate ideas.

Such a program as the one envisioned here is based on at least two postulates. First, it is unnecessary for the educated individual to know all about the sciences and humanities, or even all about one science or one area of the arts. Not that the two are incompatible but rather the limitation of time has its influence on the equation of education. Selection is inevitable. Second, that transfer of training is yet a reality, but not so without conscious effort to bring such transfer to pass. In fact the concept of general education as that body of information and facts everyone ought to know seems to put more reliance on automatic transfer than the one given above. It seems to suggest that knowledge, learned in whatever context, will automatically transfer to any learning situation. It is doubtful that transfer is this automatic. On the other hand if the student really comes to understand "how" to gain new knowledge, "how" it is organized, and on what principles it is based, to this extent is he capable of using the methods thus acquired to handle a new problem of learning. To this extent has the student received a liberal education; he is free to go his own rational way, to be himself, making decisions and judgments that represent his own unique self and not that of indoctrination. If the student comes to understand the tools and techniques of analysis used in examining a scientific paper, surely these same methods will be valuable when applied to similar, but out-of-class, situations. General education has been effective much in proportion as the student is able to assimilate the skills and information with the method of continuing his own education after graduation and to apply such learning to problems of everyday life.

Attention is directed, not so much at things to be learned in terms of subject matter, as at the type of experience most suitable to the student. Just as the teacher often selects certain areas of a course for a student to learn, the general education program will seek to have certain specific qualities of experience emphasized rather than others, in the process of learning the selected materials. The most important part of a learning situation is not the thing learned but rather the experience of learning itself. Thus if liberal education is to free the student from the fetters that restrict his activity and develop the powers natural to him that otherwise would remain dormant, experiences appropriate to such aims must be provided for the student. Opportunity must be given for the student to make choices, to solve problems, and to see the basis of his solution and

the consequences of his choices. In this respect most conventional textbooks are less than adequate, with their tendency toward ready-made answers and encyclopedic information. Most textbooks, in their intense effort to present as much of the subject as possible, do very little to encourage reflective thinking or to help the student arrive at solutions for himself. We have every right to expect more from the student than the capacity to give back to the teacher a fixed pattern of thought given either by that instructor or by the author of the text. Rather he should glean something of how the professor came to know what he does and how he attempts to extend this knowledge. The objectives we have set forth would invite the student to think, to judge, and to observe relationships of solutions to principles. Therefore situations must be provided in which problems are formulated and alternative solutions are examined by the student in reference to basic principles. The teacher serves as a guide—not dictator—both with respect to the classroom method to be employed as well as the content to be considered. The classroom situation must remain, to a large extent, unstructured with respect to prescribed detail, for to do otherwise is to restrict the very type of activity so necessary to liberal education.

Now it is little indeed that the concept of general education discussed above has to do with religious education. And while it is in no sense religious in nature, it nonetheless lends assistance to that education by promoting an atmosphere in which the concepts of religion can be handled with a degree of objectivity.

In the first place, the above definition of general education places considerable emphasis upon the value of the individual, his decisions, his rationality, and expresses confidence in the value of his informed judgments. Concurrent with the dignity of the individual is his responsibility to the whole of society and herein is the heart of the Christian tradition; that man is free to choose, free to be his own self, and above all to respect these freedoms in others. Second, the type of learning that often occurs by repeating what was read from a textbook or remembered from a lecture leaves one with a literacy that too often strengthens prejudices and neither helps him analyze his position or relate his behavior to commitment. In moral and social action the student often gives verbal support to one thing and exhibits behavior which is diametrically opposed. On the other hand there is some indication that to the extent one understands the principles and presuppositions on which a pattern of action is based the more correlation will be exhibited between his

understanding of the situation and his overt action toward it. When the individual is trusted to his own rationality and is conscious of the value of his own personality as well as his responsibility to others, the greater will be his effort to make the common good his own. It is only when the student is able to perceive the total implications of a problem, to see all that is involved, that it becomes really meaningful in his life.

We have been unmindful of many relevant factors of general education; in this brief note we cannot be otherwise. Method in the broad sense is not all of that education. The thesis is here supported, however, that method is the most efficient and inclusive integrating factor available. The specific subject matter selected to study is secondary in importance, but it should be so chosen as to represent the various branches, particularly as they illustrate different approaches to learning.

Religion in the High School Curriculum

By HULDA M. BERG

Early religious training of children in America at home and at school emphasized dire punishments for the wicked, and stressed the imminence of an early death, urging children to live moral lives and threatening evil to those who would not conform. The school curriculum tended to center around the study of Bible literature and stressed character development and the formation of moral habits, indoctrinating young learners as the community dictated. Early schoolbooks—the readers, primers, and spellers—were filled with this kind of moral teaching, and the beautiful selections of literature from the Bible and from the teachings of other religions were ignored.

In presenting religion in the school curriculum today, we have perhaps gone to the opposite extreme with the purpose of keeping a narrow sectarian bias from the classroom. The customs and attitudes, and religious beliefs, of the community, have influenced the kind and amount of religion taught or included, and these have varied greatly from one community to another, even in Kansas.

In many instances Bible stories and characters, and Bible language, are unfamiliar to the students, and we are beginning to realize their lack of knowledge of their own and other people's religions. Trumbull's *The Raft* is an excellent illustration of the use of the Bible stories recalled in time of stress and hardship by three men from their early training. Even though adult knowledge of theology is confused and perhaps skeptical, young people need the Bible as a source of strength and wisdom, and wise use of its literature and of the literature of other religions, should enable them to understand and appreciate other peoples and their own relationships with them.

Many recent books are attempting to provide young people with a feeling of the similarities and the beauty contained in dissimilar religions. *One God: The Ways We Worship Him*, by Florence Fitch, is a good example of this, and excerpts from ideals found in *The Tree of Life* taken from the Indian, Norse, Hindu, Hebrew, Christian, and other religions present the "testaments of beauty and faith from many lands." Illustrations and content of these and many other books combine to present clearly and in a meaningful manner the concepts from each religion, allowing the reader to form conclusions and learn from each religion represented.

Since religion has been and is a motivating force behind the actions and behavior of world peoples, the school curriculum must provide a means either formally or informally for an understanding of religions to be developed. In the Core program at College High School, the students do not study religion apart from world peoples and countries; instead, history of each country and events that occur in the present are viewed from various aspects that include religion also. Events in South America today have a direct relationship to the religious influences and backgrounds of the past, and this understanding is developed through a study of the religion that influenced the colonization of the continent and the New World. "People of other lands" is a unit taught in the Core classes in which religion is studied as a part of the customs and way of life of each group; students have made particular use of the material in *Life* magazine that presented several illustrated articles about leading religions. Some individual reading in the books describing several religions was done voluntarily in this unit and shared in the class group; Bible selections from *This Is the Way*, and the Bible itself, as well as the retold versions, were used for this purpose also. Biographies of religious leaders were read, including Biblical leaders such as Paul in *Conqueror in Chains*, and *Moses*, and leaders such as Albert Schweitzer, Father Flanagan, Francis of Assissi, Father Serra, and many more.

The seventh grade Core class in its Kansas unit, spent some time on the history of the state; the American Indian and his religious beliefs and practices were included, followed by the Spanish explorers and missionaries with their zeal to convert the Indians and establish missions in the Western territories. Many national groups from foreign countries who settled Kansas, including the Swedes, Germans, Mennonites, Episcopalians, and others, brought their religion, and the influences of these groups and their beliefs were studied.

Other Core units in which desirable character traits and moral values were discussed and stressed were those of personal and social problems—how people live together, boy and girl relationships, home and school relationships, personal growth; in the vocations unit, individual study was done by students interested in the ministry or other religious work.

In science, religion is significant in biology in the areas of man's origin, and in the evolution of man and other species. Core classes included some beginning science, often a unit in the solar system, and pupils discovered the well-planned universe that is described

in Genesis in the Bible. In senior high courses in astronomy and geology they studied the origin of the solar system, particularly the earth, and the evolution and termination of the solar system. However, the questions and interests of the group determined the trend of the discussion and religion and its part in this study varied with each class.

Many selections used in literature classes in both junior and senior high were taken from books of religion of various groups. Often a poem or story contained allusions to Bible stories and characters, and these were explained by reference to the original; the students were often surprised to learn that a selection such as the story of the elephant and the blind man taken from the Buddhist religion, was similar to that of another religious group. Since the Bible and other books of religion are much quoted, their beauty of style and language and their value as good literature were emphasized. In Dramatics classes the development of the drama and its history was studied, since the miracle plays came directly from the attempts of the Church to bring religion to the people. Students in speech classes made use of material from the Bible and other books of religion in choral groups and other oral work. For the religious holidays of Christmas, Thanksgiving, and Easter, special programs of music and drama were arranged, which are varied from year to year; these drama groups may be a choral reading, a pageant, a play, or other type, with hymns or other appropriate music used for background or as special selections. No direct attempt is made to teach religion in the high school speech course, but a certain amount of religious and moral emphasis occurs inevitably in panel and group discussion units during the course. High school students most frequently choose such discussion topics as:

- a. Juvenile delinquency problems.
- b. Teenage dating, money, or driving problems.
- c. Parental relationships with teenagers, etc.

The discussion of these topics is done by the students and they express themselves fully and freely. They do not hesitate to point out the need for religious and moral training in relation to these problems.

Social studies classes afford ample opportunities for a more complete study of religions, which perhaps was touched upon at different times in the Core groups. The world religions and the establishment of each was studied, beginning with the primitive religions and showing how they advanced in religious thinking as the nations grew.

The study included religious leaders such as Jesus, Mohammed, Buddha, and others, and showed how their teachings contributed to civilization. The rise and spread of the Christian religion, the Crusades, Christianity's influence on the Western world, and its contributions, were a part of the units taught. The history of Europe and of the world is interwoven with religion in the conflicts between the Church and the State; the Protestant revolt and the Reformation were studied as a powerful influence upon world affairs.

In the colonial period in America, the part played by religion was a direct result of conditions overseas, and this desire for freedom of worship was embodied in our Bill of Rights. As students studied the civil rights and the Constitution of our country the influence of religion upon these and other aspects of our way of life was brought out.

Religion was not taught directly in art, but it received emphasis through the history and appreciation of paintings of the great masters, and there is a definite correlation between religion and the major art pieces. In student projects, religious subject matter was neither encouraged nor discouraged but rather left to the choice of the student; two seventh grade groups this year chose religious subjects for Easter murals—a group of boys used family and church services of Easter, and four girls completed a mural depicting four parts of the Easter story: the Betrayal, Crucifixion, Last Supper, and Resurrection.

Y-Teens and Junior Y-Teens used the Bible in opening devotional reading or in responsive reading, and often used the Lord's Prayer or another prayer selected from Maus' *Christ and the Fine Arts*, or from another collection of religious literature.

Assembly programs emphasizing the holiday theme at Christmas and Easter have proved inspirational, and music and drama groups have presented a pageant or other form at each one. At holiday seasons, literature teachers and those in other classes occasionally read appropriate selections, including the Bible story, "The Other Wise Man," and others, or the students may present favorite poems or stories they wish to share with the group.

The foregoing account of religion in the curriculum at College High has indicated the areas in which it is significant, and in which it enters informally and perhaps incidentally as a topic for discussion. As a part of the program, religion is not stressed as a formal subject, nor is it avoided, but opportunities for free discussion, for questions, and for individual study and reading are encouraged in

many ways, both in and outside the classroom. Students bring to the classroom their beliefs (or lack of belief) and their method of worship; they determine to a degree the additional information and understanding they receive, with the guidance and direction of the classroom teacher.

Since material security cannot be guaranteed the young person living in today's world, he needs to be offered the great truths and concepts that will enable him to face life with courage and move forward upright and unafraid.

Is a program such as this adequate? How does it meet the needs of the young person who has received no religious training at home or with a church group, and who perhaps needs special guidance in discovering for himself all that religion offers? Does this program provide an adequate background for a future teacher, who in turn will need a knowledge of religions—his own and others—to guide his students? How can religion best be included in the school program that will adequately provide for these needs, yet remain unbiased and unemotional, and be acceptable to the whole community of which the school is a part?

NOTE: The following pages are a bibliography of books in College High School arranged according to their content by the subjects listed.

Religion—Bibliography

Bible: Explanation

- Bouquet, A. C. *Everyday Life in New Testament Times*. N. Y.: C. Scribner's Sons, c1953.

Presents excellent information concerning the life and customs of the Jews during New Testament days; useful in understanding New Testament references. Excellent illustrations; useful index.

- Freedman, David Noel and James D. Smart. *Cod Has Spoken: An Introduction to the Old Testament for Young People*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c1949.

The Old Testament discussed and explained in divisions such as historical, prophetic, and poetic writings. A chronology follows the text.

- Goodspeed, Edgar J. *How to Read the Bible*. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Co., c1946.

Guide to the reading of the Bible, presented from the literary and historical standpoint, but keeping the religious message of selection uppermost. Excellent discussions; concludes with chapters on chronological reading and English Bibles. Has brief index.

- Sypherd, Wilbur Owen. *The Book of Books: The King James version of the English Bible, abridged and arranged with editorial comments*. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, c1944.

The purpose of the author is to make the Bible better known; with explanatory comments designed to make the selections significant as parts of a body of lasting world literature.

Bible: Stories

- Bowie, Walter Russell. *The Bible Story for Boys and Girls*. N. Y.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c1952.

Stories retold from the Old Testament, with color plates and black and white illustrations. Includes an index.

- Bowie, Walter Russell. *The Story of the Bible*. N. Y.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c1934.

The Bible retold from Genesis to Revelation. Includes a brief bibliography of suggested reading and an index.

- Dolch, Edward W. [and others] *Bible Stories for Pleasure Reading*. Champaign, Illinois: Garrard Press, c1950.

Stories from the Old Testament centered around Jewish heroes. Useful for remedial reading purposes.

- Dolch, Edward W. [and others] *Gospel Stories for Pleasure Reading*. Champaign, Illinois: Garrard Press, c1951.

Stories of Jesus' life, selected from the New Testament. Useful as remedial reading material.

- Maus, Cynthia Pearl. *Christ and The Fine Arts: An Anthology of Pictures, Poetry, Music, and Stories Centering in the Life of Christ*. N. Y.: Harper, c1938.

Discusses in the introductory chapters the values and use of pictures, poetry, stories, and music in teaching religion. Each section is based on a part of the life of Christ and has many selections from art and literature to illustrate it. Excellent for use in Y-Teen, Y. W., and other groups. Concludes with useful indexes for each kind of material used.

- St. Clair, Ray L. *We Met Jesus*. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, c1953.

Personalized accounts of various people of the New Testament whose life was changed through Jesus' ministry.

- Trent, Robbie. *What Is God Like?* N. Y.: Harper, c1953.

The story told in verse form of the boy Philip, later one of Jesus' disciples, who learned what God is like through Jesus' life and teachings.

- Yates, Elizabeth. *Joseph: The King James version of a well-loved Tale*. N. Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, c1947.

Wood engravings by Nora Unwin appropriately illustrate this presentation of the Bible story of Joseph.

Practical Christianity

Church, Virginia. *The Adventure of Finding God*. N. Y.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c1950.

The author answers real questions asked by young people about God and aspects of Christianity, with the intentions of stimulating their thinking and of presenting life as an adventure. Written in the form of letters.

Nelson, John Oliver. *We Have This Ministry: Church Vocations for Men and Women*. N. Y.: Association Press, c1946.

Presents the challenge of the many types of service in Christian work.

Peale, Norman Vincent. *The Power of Positive Thinking for Young People*. N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, c1954.

Intended to help young people find themselves and to live happy and effective lives. Discusses problems such as worry, tensions, personality, prayer, and others. Based on his book for adults.

Prayer

Marshall, Catherine, ed. *The Prayers of Peter Marshall*. N. Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., c1954.

In two parts, namely Pastoral prayers and Senate prayers, arranged under several special headings. Prefaces and an introduction by the editor are included.

Yates, Elizabeth, comp. *Your Prayers and Mine*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, c1954.

Begins with a brief explanation of prayer, and presents prayers for all occasions, including prayers for the nations, and prayers of praise; in the final section are selections from the Bible.

Religion: Study and Teaching

Ansley, Delight. *The Good Ways*. N. Y.: T. Y. Crowell Co., c1950.

A simple account of the origin and history of the important religions of the world. Presents the men responsible for each and explains their beliefs and teachings. Includes a brief bibliography and an index.

Cranston, Ruth. *World Faith: The Story of the Religions of the United Nations*. N. Y.: Harper, c1949.

Presents Hindu, Buddhist, Chinese, Jewish, Christian, and Islam religions, to help in world understanding of basic ideals and philosophy of life found in each. Includes a brief account of the life of the founder of each, the principles taught and their application to practical life, their strengths and weaknesses, and present position of the religion and its contribution to world culture.

Fitch, Florence Mary. *Allah, The God of Islam: Moslem Life and Worship*. N. Y.: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, c1950.

Presents all aspects of Moslem life and worship; with excellent full page black and white photographs and an index.

Fitch, Florence Mary. *One God: The Ways We Worship Him*. N. Y.: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, c1944.

Presents three ways of worship: Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant. Excellent description, and with full-page black and white illustrations.

Fitch, Florence Mary. *Their Search for God: Ways of Worship in the Orient*. N. Y.: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, c1947.

Presents what is most distinctive and valued in Hinduism in India, Confucianism and Taoism in China, Shintoism in Japan, and Buddhism which has spread eastward in Asia from India. Excellent photographs illustrate the text; concludes with an index and a glossary.

Gaer, Joseph. *The Adventures of Rama*. Boston: Little, Brown, c1954.

The story of the great Hindu epic Ramayana. The story of their god Vishnu in the mortal form of Prince Rama, who loved princess Sita; it is the historic record of an early Golden Age in Indian life.

Gaer, Joseph. *Young Heroes of the Living Religions*. Boston: Little, Brown, c1953.

Includes the childhood and youth of the founders of the twelve most important living religions in the world today, as preserved through history and folklore.

Jones, Jessie Orton, ed. *This Is the Way: Prayers and Precepts from World Religions*. N. Y.: Viking Press, c1951.

Excellent selections from various religions appropriately and attractively illustrated, showing similarities among the beliefs of all.

Langford, Norman F. *Fire Upon the Earth: The Story of the Christian Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c1950.

Begins with the spreading of the Gospei after Jesus' death and resurrection, and traces its spread over the world and its influences in history.

Smith, Ruth, ed. *The Tree of Life: Selections From the Literature of the World's Religions*. N. Y.: Viking Press, c1942.

Introduction by Robert O. Ballou in which he refers to men as "Askers of questions," and shows how each of the different religions teaches men how to live and how to think about life and death. Selections show similarities of the religions and present the literature describing the history, beginnings, and beliefs of each. Excellent in presentation. Concludes with sources of the texts and with a glossary and an index.

Soper, Edmund Davison. *The Religions of Mankind*. 3d ed., rev. N. Y.: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, c1951.

A study of religion, including Christian and non-Christian, with chapters devoted to each and suggestions for further study given. Good index.

Year, Inc. *Bible and Christianity*. Los Angeles, California: c1952.

10,000 pictures depicting the story of all the world's great religions. Introduction is by Albert Schweitzer, and forewords are by leaders of each of the religious faiths.