

placently resumes the newspaper under the impression that all is as it should be: most unfortunate mistake!

If the thing wanted had been the mere repression of noise, or the mechanical transfer of a plaything, perhaps no better course could have been pursued. Had it been of no consequence under what impulse the child acted, so long as it fulfilled a given mandate, nothing would remain to be said. But something else was needed. Character was the thing to be changed rather than conduct. It was not the deeds, but the feeling from which the deeds sprung that required dealing with. Here were palpable manifestations of selfishness—an indifference to the wishes of others, a marked desire to tyrannize, an endeavor to engross benefits intended for all—in short, here were exhibitions on a small scale of that unsympathetic nature to which our social evils are manifestly attributable. What, then, was the thing wanted? Evidently an alteration in the child's disposition. What was the problem to be solved? Clearly to generate a state of mind which had it previously existed would have prevented the offending actions. What was the final end to be achieved? Unquestionably the formation of character which should spontaneously produce great generosity of conduct. Or, speaking definitely, it was necessary to strengthen that sympathy to the weakness of which this ill behaviour was traceable.

But sympathy can be strengthened only by exercise. No faculty whatever will grow, save by the performance of its special function—a muscle by contraction; the intellect by perceiving and thinking; moral sentiment by feeling. Sympathy, therefore, can be increased only by exciting sympathetic emotions. A selfish child is to be rendered less selfish, only by arousing in it a fellow-feeling with the desires of others. If this is not done, nothing is done.

Thus we have but to reduce the subjection theory to a definite form to render its absurdity self-evident. Contrasting the means to be employed with the work to be done, we are at once struck with their utter unfitness. Instead of creating a new internal state which shall exhibit itself in better deeds, coercion can manifestly do nothing but forcibly mould externals into a coarse semblance of such a state. In the family, as in society, it can simply restrain; it cannot educate. Just as the recollection of Bridwell, and the dread of a policeman, whilst they serve to check the thief's depredations, effect no change in his morals, so, although a father's threats may produce in a child a certain outside conformity with rectitude, they cannot generate any real attachment to it. As some

one has well said, the utmost that severity can do is to make hypocrites; it can never make converts. —[Social Statics.

#### The Bible and the Public School.

The opinion rendered by Attorney-General Blackburn, in which he upholds the reading of the Bible as part of the religious exercises of a public school, in which all the pupils are obliged to participate, includes a good deal that is not to the point. Nobody supposes that the reading of the Bible as part of the religious exercises of our public schools is objected to by Roman Catholics, by Jews or by Agnostics, on the ground that the passages read inculcate immorality, or on the ground that the passages read may not be part of a fine body of literature. The plea of the Roman Catholic dissenters is that the Bible, known as the Protestant Bible, "King James' version," is held and believed by the Catholic church to be incorrect and incomplete, and it is further taught by the Roman Catholic church and believed by its members that the scriptures ought not to be read indiscriminately, since the church has divine authority as the only infallible teacher and interpreter of the same; that the reading of the same without being expounded by the only authorized teachers and interpreters is likely to lead to the adoption of dangerous errors, irreligious faith, practice and worship. This is the position of the Roman Catholic church, and in the light of this exposition the Protestant Bible is clearly a sectarian book to a Roman Catholic pupil.

So to the orthodox Jew, the Protestant Bible is clearly a sectarian book, because while he recognizes the Old Testament, he rejects the New Testament, denies that Jesus was the Messiah, and holds that he was nothing more than a gifted social agitator put to death by Pilate as a disturber of the public peace. To an Agnostic the Bible would be attractive as fine literature, but offensive as a part of religious exercises in which he has no faith, and which he ought not to be obliged to endure in a public school which is legally no place for sectarian religious exercises.

The question of Bible reading as a religious exercise in the public schools was exhaustively argued before the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in 1890 on appeal from the Circuit Court of Rock County. Mr. Justice Lyon held that the reading of any version of the Bible in the public schools as a religious text-book is sectarian instruction. He quoted from the reports of the American Bible Society the statement that through the reading of the scriptures alone several persons were converted from Romanism. In this case, Bible reading was sec-

tarian instruction, and Bible reading in the schools is sectarian instruction. The learned Judge said that these views do not banish from the public schools such text-books as are founded upon the fundamental teachings of the Bible, or which contain extracts therefrom. Such extracts pervade secular literature, are rightly included in text-books for secular instruction as standing for noble literature and the code of good morals, concerning whose fundamental principles the religious sects do not disagree. Mr. Justice Lyon held that the truths of the Bible are best taught to our youth in the church, in the Sunday schools, the social religious meetings, and, above all, by parents in the home circle, where the truths may be explained and enforced, and the spiritual nature directed and cultivated in accordance with the dictates of the parental conscience. The constitution of Wisconsin does not interfere with such teaching and culture. It only banishes theologic polemics from the district schools. The court held that reading of the Bible in the public schools is religious worship; that it constitutes the schoolhouse for the time being a place of worship, and that such reading in school houses as a school exercise against the consent of the tax-payer compels him to support a place of worship.

The court also said that no child should be compelled to retire from school because of the reading of a version of the Bible in schools offensive to the parents. The fact that the reading of the Bible in the schools was a source of religious and sectarian strife was held sufficient reason for its banishment. The court was unanimous in holding the Bible to be a sectarian book. Protestants are a sect to the Catholic church, and so is their version of the Bible sectarian as against the Catholic version of it, which includes as part of the inspired canon books omitted from the Protestant version. The constitution of Wisconsin provides that "no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in the public schools," and the court was unanimous in the opinion that the reading of the Bible therein is contrary to the rights of conscience, and that the taxpayers of any district had a right to object to the reading of the Bible therein, since the constitution declares that "no man shall be compelled to support any place of worship."

The contention of Attorney-General Blackburn that the reading of the Bible as a school exercise is not sectarian is clearly not well taken. To a Jew or a Catholic our Protestant Bible is clearly a sectarian book. The same question came before Attorney-General Jones, of Washington State, about eight years ago, and his opinion was in

accordance with that of the highest court of Wisconsin—that the Bible is a sectarian book, and its reading in schools is sectarian religious instruction. —[Oregonian.

#### Too Many By Half.

Ivan Chen, secretary to the Chinese Minister in London, sent a capital letter to the London Daily Mail in reply to Mr. Julian Ralph's article on "All the Trouble in China." The Mail did not "like either the tone nor the matter" of the Celestial's reply, which contained "many unnecessary sneers at Christianity." Poor dear Christians! How sensitive they are! How they writhe when a little—ever so little—of the sauce which they dish the "heathen" is poured over themselves! Mr. Ralph described the way in which the ignorant Chinese scare away devils, partly by means of empty beer-bottles. Well, said the bland Celestial, supposing this is all true, are there not ignorant, superstitious people everywhere, and is not an empty beer-bottle "as good for keeping off devils as the largest bells ever erected in any tower?" A hit, a hit, a palpable hit! No wonder the Mail is wild.

The bland Celestial goes on to say that China contains nine times as many people as the United States, but they don't spend nine times 200,000,000 dollars a year in "propitiating their gods and devils." They do it just as effectively for less than half that sum. Good, thou bland Celestial, very good! You are too many for these Christians. They could do with half your cleverness.

Then the bland Celestial goes on to explain that the educated, intelligent people of China follow the teaching of the great Secular philosopher, Confucius. "Confucius", he says, "has taught us to respect our ancestors and leave the gods alone. Confucius teaches us to have nothing whatsoever to do with anyone who pretends to have any intercourse with the supernatural." We have amongst us, however, he says, a silly lot of people called Buddhists, who have "a religion almost identical with the Christian religion", and the trouble in China is just what would happen in England if Buddhist missionaries tried to supplant the Catholics and Protestants. "Suppose", he says, "a Chinese priest should come to England, and it should be known that every burglar, pickpocket and thief, by becoming a Buddhist, would become exempt from arrest by the police. Suppose that the introduction of a new faith into England should give the criminal classes license to ply their trade in London with complete immunity from the action of the laws. Would the English people submit to such a state of affairs?" Certainly not. Then why should the Chinese? Finally, the