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Min Chu I Youth Corps and the C. C. local party machines have maneuvered to get their members admitted into schools and colleges. During the recent autumn entrance examinations, for example, party officials who had been planted some time ago in four Peiping universities stole the examination questions and passed them on to their comrades so that a block of them could get into the student bodies and control them. The theft, however, was discovered by other little functionaries, who proceeded to sell the questions for money. The scandal raged in Peking for some weeks and was only quieted by pressure from high quarters. This systematic eradication of the liberal democratic movement is driving China into the fold of the Communists.

Chiang's regime is the culmination of all bad governments in China. No amount of foreign money can save it from downfall. The United States should stop all aid to Chiang, and exert its power for peace by giving support to the middle groups—both the Democratic League and the opposition within the Kuomintang. I know definitely that such aid would be effective now, but it will be unavailing later. The United States should realize that a corrupt minority, dependent on foreign support to maintain itself in power, is a poor ally.

The Catholic Church and Education

BY PAUL BLANSHARD

BIGOTRY once again is eating its way into the vital organs of the greatest nation on the face of the earth, our own beloved America," said Francis Cardinal Spellman at the last Fordham commencement. "Once again a crusade is being preached against the Catholic church in the United States . . . now it is the growth and expansion of Catholic education which is claimed to be a constant threat to the supremacy of public education in the United States."

It is true that there has been a tremendous revival of anti-Catholic feeling in the United States in recent months, and its focal point is unquestionably the educational policy of the church. But as Protestant leaders have been quick to point out in reply to Cardinal Spellman, the new anti-Catholic sentiment is not an offensive against the church as such but a broad defensive movement against a growing educational aggressiveness on the part of the hierarchy. The new opposition is not based upon the kind of bigotry which disgraced the country during the Al Smith campaign for the Presidency. It is strongest among the liberals who have always stood most courageously for personal tolerance.

What has caused this new opposition to Roman Catholic educational policy? The immediate occasion has been the extension of bus transportation at public expense to pupils of parochial schools in nineteen states and the fight of various Catholic lobbies in Washington against any federal aid to education in which parochial schools do not share. The federal-aid fight, particularly, has raised certain basic questions about Catholic education which most Americans had never faced before. Are the Roman Catholic schools worthy of national support? Are they democratic? Do they teach responsible freedom? Do they teach tolerance and national solidarity? Non-Catholics have a right to ask these questions not only because the Catholic schools are training some 3,000,000 future citizens in more than 8,000 tax-exempt institutions but because the people have accepted the Catholic schools as substitutes for public education under state compulsory-education laws.

Public schools in the United States are controlled democratically by local school boards whose members are either elected or appointed by elected officials. Public school buildings belong to the people of each district, and the people as voters have the final say as to their use. This democratic control of education is so well established in our tradition that it is taken for granted.

The Roman Catholic parochial school, however, is owned by a priest or bishop or by a corporation or board controlled by a priest or bishop. The Catholic people of a parish do not own a single brick in their churches or schools; they do not determine whether a school shall be built, and they have nothing to say about its continuation or its policies. All control of education is in the hands of the parish priest and his bishop, subject only to the veto of the Pope.

Nuns as Teachers

THE parish priest and the bishop may hire or fire any teacher in the Catholic school system with or without reason, throw out any textbook or course of study, and shut any building. "The pastor," says the Right Reverend...
John R. Hagan in "Vital Problems of Catholic Education" (Catholic University of America, p. 70), "is responsible by ecclesiastical law for the existence, maintenance, and conduct of the parish school. The religious superior [of the nuns and brothers] appoints the teaching staff and principal, and exercises over them a supervision which is at once religious and educational. The school board or the superintendent represents a third authority, namely, the bishop."

Below these priests and bishops in the Roman Catholic school system come the 77,000 teaching nuns who form more than 90 per cent of the teaching force in Catholic elementary schools in America. They are recruited as girls in their teens, largely by priests in the classrooms of the Catholic high schools, and are pledged to poverty, celibacy, and obedience for life. They live in the convents of their orders while they teach in the church's schools.

In the public schools teachers are reasonably free to marry and to live a life of intellectual freedom. The nuns of the Catholic schools never know the meaning of this type of freedom. Their thoughts, activities, and amusements are controlled by superiors who in turn are cut off from the cultural life of the non-Catholic community by the rules of their orders. Ordinarily the nuns are not free to read books, newspapers, or magazines of their own choice, to attend theaters or motion pictures, or to participate in any public amusements. Their carefully guided courses of training are pursued so far as possible within the Catholic educational system.

No matter how competent and devoted these nuns may be—and no one questions their industry—they do not acquire occupational tenure. They can be instantly removed as teachers or expelled from their religious orders for reasons which have no bearing on their competence as classroom teachers. Their superiors, in fact, in the convent and in the school are almost always the same persons, empowered to exercise discipline in any case of personal or intellectual insubordination. Nominal "teacher-training" courses are given in the convents, but even the shorter courses consist largely of theological indoctrination, and prospective teachers are never allowed to forget that their primary purpose in the classroom is the inculcation of the Roman Catholic faith.

This whole system of segregated schools under costumed religious teachers who are subject to the priests is almost ignored by the educational authorities of the various states. Because of the compulsory-education laws, "approving" agencies exist on the statute books in each state, but supervision of Roman Catholic schools scarcely goes beyond a perfunctory check on attendance. The most bizarre inequalities in teaching requirements exist within the closed Catholic system. Only fifteen states have any requirement whatever for certification of Catholic teachers, and only four enforce the same teaching requirements for parochial-school as for public-school teachers.

Parochial-school education is the cheapest in America, much cheaper even than Negro education in Mississippi. In 1944 Mississippi spent $42.25 per pupil; in 1937 the diocese of Indianapolis spent an average of $15.53 per pupil in five of its typical parochial schools, at a time when the corresponding expenditure in the public schools was $76.51. Roman Catholic parents who send their children to parochial schools frequently contribute only $1 a month per child to the school fund. The schools are able to operate on this financial level because the average teaching nun gets only $300 to $500 a year, paid in a lump sum to her religious order for her "keep," as against the $1,900 a year received by the average American teacher. Even the few male lay teachers in the Catholic school system are paid far below the average wage of the public schools for corresponding work.

**No Intellectual Freedom**

IN THESE Roman Catholic schools there is no academic freedom as non-Catholics understand the term, and no teaching of genuine religious freedom. The word "freedom" is constantly used, of course, but examination discloses it to be a semantic artifice meaning readiness to receive divine, that is, Catholic, revelation. Redden and Ryan in their standard Catholic work for teachers, "Freedom Through Education" (imprimatur Cardinal Spellman, p. 23), define the Catholic conception of freedom in unmistakable terms:

Freedom to worship God implies in its correct meaning and application that every man should acknowledge God as his creator, submit to His divine rule and will, and through the proper use of faith and reason embrace the eternal truths which alone assure salvation. This is true freedom. It is opposed to that so-called "liberty of conscience" which a "seditious and rebellious mind," dominated by man's lower nature and blinded to truth and goodness, employs to undermine, overthrow, or destroy the infallible authority of religion to guide and direct all the individual's conduct in terms of the moral law.

Under this interpretation of "freedom" no teacher in a Roman Catholic school is free to disagree with the hierarchy on any social or religious policy which the hierarchy cares to include in its modicum of "eternal truths." As Father Wilfred M. Mallon, S. J., put it in his attack on the American Association of University Professors before the National Catholic Education Association in 1942 (Bulletin, p. 193):

Freedom to teach what is true is without practical applicability unless we have a norm. . . . the Catholic college norm must be not only natural knowledge but the deposit of divinely revealed truths immeasurably more certain than any truth arrived at by mere human
deduction or experiment, because we have for them the guaranty of the infinite knowledge and veracity of God.

In view of the very nature and fundamental purpose of Catholic education, violations of Catholic doctrine, or of Catholic moral principles, or of the essential proprieties of Catholic life, on the campus or off the campus, render a man unfit for service in a Catholic college.

What does this priestly control of education mean in terms of intellectual freedom? The best answer is to list sample doctrines of the hierarchy which no teacher in the Catholic school system is free to challenge publicly without incurring penalties. I do not have the space to quote chapter and verse for each statement, but if a Catholic authority cares to challenge any one of them, I shall be glad to give my sources.

1. Franco is an eminent Christian statesman.
2. The Pope is the infallible leader of mankind, and when he speaks for the church in matters of faith and morals, he cannot make a mistake.
3. The Virgin Mary returned to the earth six times in one year and told three peasant children of Fatima, Portugal, how the Western world should handle Soviet Russia.
4. It is a grave sin for an American Catholic deliberately to join the Masons or Odd Fellows.
5. No good Catholic may positively and unconditionally approve of the policy of separation of church and state.
6. With a bow to Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas is the greatest philosopher of all time.
7. It is a sin to teach the evolution of man as a whole from animal life.
8. No Catholic has a moral right to secure a divorce even from a spouse who is syphilitic, insane, or an adulterous murderer; and any Catholic who separates from such a spouse and remarries is guilty of adultery.
9. The Reformation was a backward step in human history, and many of the worst evils of fascism and communism flow from it.
10. It is a grave sin for a Catholic to own or use a Protestant Bible.
11. The Pope is the head of a sovereign temporal power which has co-equal rights with that of the government of the United States.
12. The rights of the church as educator are prior to and superior to the rights of the state as educator, and no government has the legal right to infringe upon this divine pretative.

**Campaign Against the Public Schools**

In fairness to the Roman Catholic people of the United States it should be pointed out that they have never approved of the doctrinal narrowness of Catholic education or of the idea of a segregated school system. The parochial-school system has been imposed upon them by the hierarchy at the point of a theological gun. When about a hundred years ago public schools replaced denominational schools for most American children, many Catholic parents wished to join the American community as equals in the public-school system. But Rome sharply rebuked them and laid down the flat rule that American Catholics must boycott American public schools wherever possible. This rule is now part of the canon law of the church. Although the hierarchy makes a great show of its official doctrine that the family has a primary right in educating the child, in practice no Catholic parent has a right to disagree with his priest on the subject of his child's education, on pain of the denial of absolution. The statutes of the diocese of Indianapolis on this subject are typical:

Where a Catholic parochial school exists, parents ordinarily violate the general canon law of the church (Canon 1374) if they send their children to public or non-Catholic schools. If they persist in this violation, they sin gravely and cannot be absolved until they make proper adjustment with the ordinary through the pastor (Statute 117).

In spite of these drastic penalties the majority of Catholic parents in the United States have never sent their children to Catholic schools, and since 1930 the proportion in attendance has not kept pace with the Catholic population. Catholic authorities are disturbed by this fact, and they are even more alarmed at the sharp decline of recruits for the teaching orders of sisters. The whole economic structure of Roman Catholic education would collapse if young Catholic girls could no longer be persuaded to take the veil. (Lay teachers, of course, would demand a decent living wage.) Recently a leading Catholic layman of Chicago declared that the Catholic schools can be saved from extinction only by a subsidy.

Naturally, there has been much grumbling among Roman Catholics about the separatism of a dual school system and its extra financial burden. In order to hold the people in line the hierarchy has felt obliged to conduct a continuous and bitter campaign against the public school. "Godless" is the mildest of the epithets which the anxious priests have used. Here are some quotations from a pamphlet issued by the America Press under the imprimatur of the late Cardinal Hayes—"May an American Oppose the Public School?" by Father Paul L. Blakely, S. J.

Our first duty to the public school is not to pay taxes for its maintenance. We pay that tax under protest; not because we admit an obligation in justice. Justice cannot oblige the support of a system which we are forbidden in conscience to use or a system which we conscientiously hold to be bad in its ultimate consequences.

- The first duty of every Catholic father to the public school is to keep his children out of it. For the man
who sends his children to the public school when he could obtain for them the blessings of a Catholic education is not a practicing Catholic, even though he goes to Mass every morning.

Is a Catholic free to attend a non-Catholic college or university? The answer is that he is not free, since the only school, whether it be a kindergarten or a university, which is fit for a Catholic is the school that is Catholic in its principles, its aims, its programs, its teachers, and in its submission to the direction and supervision of the church.

**Efforts to Censor All Education**

The Roman Catholic hierarchy, in addition to controlling its own schools and colleges completely, also claims the right to censor all general education, and to effect this object encourages Catholics to control local boards of education where possible and to place Catholics in key positions as teachers and officials in the public-school system. For these Catholics in the public-school system the hierarchy lays down rules in the moral manuals almost as detailed as the rules for parochial teachers. They are directed to stand for the superiority of the church school even while they are teaching in the public school, and in discussing civic affairs with pupils they are “expected to make a statement on such matters as divorce, euthanasia, birth control,” and kindred subjects.

“She [the Catholic teacher in the public school] must not speak in such wise as to give the impression that all forms of religious belief possess a natural right to exist and to propagate. Only the true religion possesses such a natural right” (Father Francis J. Connell, “Morals in Politics and Professions,” imprimatur Archbishop of Baltimore-Washington, p. 156). Father Connell, who is associate professor of moral theology at the Catholic University of America, adds that a Catholic teacher in a public school may start the Lord’s Prayer for the little Protestant children when it is customary, but she must stop with the phrase “Deliver us from evil” and not say “For thine is the kingdom” etc. If she adds this latter phrase, it is a sin, for “in practice these words have taken on a Protestant connotation” (ibid, p. 158).

The hierarchy has not been successful in capturing many parts of the American public-school system. It is true that three states—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin—have Catholic directors of state education, and in many cities, such as Boston, Providence, Buffalo, and San Francisco, the city superintendents are Catholics. But the majority of Catholic public-school teachers in the National Education Association refuse to follow the dictates of the hierarchy in educational matters, and when Catholics attempt to make taxpayers support parochial schools as part of the public-school system, as they did in the famous North College Hill battle near Cincinnati last spring, they usually meet prompt defeat.

When the Supreme Court by a five-to-four vote last February allowed the state of New Jersey to charge the costs of parochial-school transportation to the taxpayers, the battle lines were drawn for a much larger conflict, of which the bus fight was only a preliminary skirmish. In the hierarchy’s briefs and the public discussions of this New Jersey bus situation, and of federal aid, it became evident that the Catholic plan for educational expansion in this country consists of three steps: (1) immediate appropriations for auxiliary services for parochial schools, (2) complete support of all parochial schools by public funds, as in Ontario, England, and the Netherlands, (3) eventual establishment of Catholicism in all public classrooms, as in Spain and Italy.

But the New Jersey bus decision was actually a major defeat for this plan in spite of its temporary financial gain. Both the majority and the minority of the court made ringing declarations in favor of the doctrine of the separation of church and state. It was clear that in the eyes of the court this particular exception of-bus service was a very special exception to a general principle, and that there was no hope of direct support for parochial schools under the First Amendment to the Constitution, which prohibits any “establishment of religion.”

Accordingly, the church’s only hope for securing desperately needed federal funds for its schools is the development of some device for indirect appropriations which would by-pass the provisions in most state constitutions and statutes prohibiting public expenditures for parochial schools. The precedent for such a device is the Louisiana textbook (Cochran) case, in which the Supreme Court permitted textbooks to be given by the state to parochial students not as contributions to the Catholic school system but as personal awards of service to students.

Meanwhile the conflict in the coming session of Congress will center about the Aiken bill for federal aid, which would open the door for direct federal appropriations to parochial schools in states where such aid is now refused, and the Taft bill, which would permit parochial schools to get federal funds only in the proportion in which they now receive public money from the states. For once liberal educators of the country are solidly backing Mr. Taft. Their reasons have never been summarized more pointedly than by John Dewey:

It is essential that this basic issue be seen for what it is —namely, as the encouragement of a powerful reactionary world organization in the most vital realm of democratic life with the resulting promulgation of principles inimical to democracy. We cannot deny that public education needs federal aid in order to equalize opportunity between state and state and between individual and individual. But it would be a poor bargain indeed to gain material aid at the expense of losing our greatest intellectual and moral heritage.
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