



## Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and  
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

### **MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.**

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

---

Reel  
45

Box  
14

Folder  
733

Religion and Our Schools, 1960.



## RELIGION AND OUR SCHOOLS

### Are the Churches and Classrooms Truly Separate?

The Temple  
November 27, 1960

Rabbi Daniel Jeremy Silver

There are today thirty-six million boys and girls in our American public school system. How they are taught and what they are taught are manifestly objects of national interest.

The school system, like so many other institutions in our society, is a social organism in transition. There is the transition from separate, individual school units to large, consolidated systems, a change brought about because of financial necessity, because of the necessity of specialization, and because schools are recognizing more and more that they must present a multilevel program, one level designed to enrich the studies of the academically gifted, one designed to ground faithfully the academically average, and one designed to give basic training and vocational guidance to the dextrous, but academically awkward. There is a change going on in the curriculum of our public schools. The space age and our shrunken globe have made it manifest that we must give to the young people a greater dose of foreign language, science training, and mathematics, and we are introducing these studies to a greater degree and at an earlier age. There has been a revolution in teaching techniques; television in the classroom, the language laboratory, all manner of audio-visual aids have brought motion and dimension to what was previously a static classroom, largely dependent upon the spoken word. And, finally, there has been a clarification of the function of the public school. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 insisted that the public



school must not only be a classroom for teaching but a classroom of democracy, that the schools must follow an open door policy, and that the high barriers of segregation established in the South and the conventional gerrymandered barriers of segregation established in the North must disappear, that the American public school become again a place where people of all races, economic classes, creeds, and the like can rub shoulders and forget and forgive the prejudices of their parents and of their ancestral groups.

The growing sophistication of our society is then reflected in the growing sophistication of our public schools, and this is as it should be, for none of us would wish our young people to be taught just what we know. Our world is already the world of the proximate past; the children must be equipped with the skills and the disciplines necessary to meet the challenges of the world of tomorrow.

Now, as our society prepares to meet these challenges and debates the function of the public school, all areas of public school activity come into the discussion. Inevitably the area of the religion and the relation of the church to the classroom comes into debate. And with equal inevitability, this debate concentrates on one of two areas: the first, financial, the second, curricular. The financial discussion has to do with the division of tax funds raised for school purposes. In America education is mandatory. Each of our several states has a law which requires attendance up to a given age in the public school system. However, each of our several states permits the parent to send his child to some private school, licensed by the state, which meets all educational requirements. There are today in America many private schools, military schools, preparatory schools, and parochial schools. The largest single bloc of these is the Roman Catholic



parochial school system. There are today in the Catholic school system five million, one hundred thousand boys and girls, one out of every two Roman Catholic youths of public school age. This school is extensive, and expensive; it has been built up with remarkable rapidity; it has been built because the Roman Catholic community does not feel that the moral and character education of the public schools is of a quality or of a philosophy which meets with their approval. Recently, the Jesuit Associate Editor of the magazine "America", Father Neil McClusky, set forth the Roman Catholic position in clear, unmistakable terms:

"A Catholic educator," he writes, "starts with an assumption that God and religion are the central concern of human existence. Religion for a Catholic answers the questions: What is Man? What is man's chief end? Whence did he come? Whither is he going? How did he get here? Quite patently the character of education will depend to a large extent on the answer to these questions. A Catholic believes that his first purpose in life is to learn to live in such a way as to prepare himself for an immortal supernatural destiny. This precise purpose -- not some vague humanitarianism, no matter how eloquently noble -- will accordingly be the foundation of moral education and character training in the school and will equip the Catholic child with a 'sense of values which will lend dignity and direction to whatever else he may learn'.

"A Catholic parent can hardly be censured if he remains dissatisfied with a school in which character education and its sanctions must be limited to the secular order. This means that the ethical side of education may not be related to religious values but must remain circumscribed by the purely secular. By default civic or political virtue must be the primary goal of such a school. In other words, it exists primarily to produce the 'good citizen'.



"Those who believe the perfection of the temporal social order to be the supreme and ultimate aim of life will have no quarrel with this interpretation of the public school's responsibility for character education. Those who, while believing in a supernatural dimension to education and life, see here no irresolvable conflict of value systems can continue to give full allegiance to the public school value program. Those believers in a supernatural who do see an irresolvable conflict cannot. The conclusion is inescapable: for millions of American families the public school system as it presently exists is simply incapable of caring for the moral side of education."

Now, we need not agree with either the pedagogic or the theologic propositions implicit in this statement, and I certainly do not. But we cannot dispute the right of the Catholic community to establish its own schools. In a democracy the public school must not be a coercive instrument of statism. The right of dissent is precious. We have always allowed individuals who dissented from a particular school program the opportunity to establish as best they can instruments to express their own point of view. This is an established law which has been established in the Pierce case and elsewhere. It is constitutional and it is fundamental.

What then is at issue? Simply this: the Catholic community has been arguing for a long time now and with increasing vehemence that it deserves a proportional share of the tax funds raised for public education. It claims, and rightly, that it is educating a significant proportion of our American boys and girls and that it is educating them for American citizenship. It claims that Catholic parents are paying taxes, as must all other citizens, and that they are therefore undergoing a double imposition, what they call 'double taxation'. In the first place Catholics pay state, federal, and



local taxes, secondly, they must pay the tuition, the capital costs of maintaining this system of parochial education. This double cost obviously puts a difficult financial burden on many parents of moderate income.

This is their claim. It can be answered, of course, on many levels. The very term 'double taxation' is misleading. It may appear so to the Catholic parent, but the only taxation which is compulsory is that imposed by local or state governments. Tuition, contribution to building programs of parish schools are voluntary. These contributions are undertaken because Catholics believe they cannot avail themselves of the services of the national schools. Yet public school doors are open. The public schools are prepared to educate each and every young gentleman or gentlelady, and the public schools have seen to it, by and large, that all religious practices and religious teachings which might be offensive to any denomination are excluded from the daily routine. The undertaking, then, of parochial education is a luxury, part of the luxury of dissent; it does not follow that the cost of maintaining this second school system must be in part met from public funds. Indeed, constitutionally it cannot be met from public funds. The First Amendment to our Constitution precludes the Congress from passing any law which deals with the establishment of any religion. A parochial school has two functions, one educative and one a function of indoctrination. These two functions cannot be separated out. Obviously, any massive aid to the parochial schools system would be aid in the dissemination, the teaching, and the indoctrination of a particular faith and contrary to the spirit of separation which was the spirit in which our founding fathers established our basic law.

There is a second issue at point here, and it is this: the public school is an agency of national policy. It has been democratically determined



upon, determined to be necessary to the unfolding of the democratic system. The public school system teaches open-mindedness. It permits class fluidity. It permits a mixing and mingling of peoples of a variety of backgrounds and gives us the opportunity for communication, for shared experience, for tearing down the ancient walls of separation which were brought over from Europe or Africa or elsewhere and which, if allowed to rise high, would segregate and separate our society into little millet groups religiously centered, ethnically centered, racially centered, each existing in the American polity but each a separate atom of the polity and none feeling a sense of partnership and fellowship with all other groups.

No one can dissent from a national policy by refusing to pay the upkeep of that agency. A conscientious objector may not refuse to pay taxes even though he knows that a significant proportion of his tax money goes to the military. The Catholic parent, the private school parent, all those who would enjoy the privilege of providing a private education for their children, one different from that which the community determines upon, must pay the freight of that education and as an added cost must be willing to pay the freight of the education which is available to their child but which they have voluntarily rejected.

Now, what brings this issue into focus at this moment? Simply this: for a long time now the need for federal monies for local educational needs has been manifest. Both parties included in their national planks in the last campaign provisions for bills of federal aid to education. The bills differed in wording but not in purpose. The need for such monies is apparent to all. Now, in the past parochial school interests, largely Catholic, have met with segregationists interest of the South who were determined that no federal monies shall be given to public schools which have anti-segregation strings attached to them, and have defeated any and



every attempt to pass sending federal monies into our public schools. You may recall some ten years ago, when Cardinal Spellman led quite vehemently and openly the attack on the Barden Bill, the last major federal aid bill which had an opportunity of passage. Such a bill will be presented in the next Congress, of that we can be certain. If the Catholic community practices a religious self restraint, if it allows, because of the urgency of the public need, this federal aid bill to education to pass even though it makes no provision (as it cannot make any provision) for federal monies to parochial schools, it will be permitting the passage of a bill of prime national interest and great urgency, and it will be performing a great service. It is to be hoped that this will be the position of the church. For if the church is obdurate and if it continues to oppose with every political tool at its disposal the passage of such bills it will not only prevent necessary aid to our public school systems but it will meet defeat ultimately in its selfish purpose, the purpose of gaining federal monies for the parochial school system, and it will split our community apart in a great national debate over the First Amendment of the Constitution and over the responsibility and the future of the public school system.

Indeed, if the bill were to pass enabling federal monies to go to the parochial schools and if by some impossibility the courts were to rule such a bill constitutional, there is danger implicit here that the whole public school system as we know it might disappear. Throughout the Southland there are many, many small groups ready to seize upon local church schools and federal monies, to build up white supremacy schools to undermine and destroy the intent of the Supreme Court decision. In great portions of our land the public school system as we know it would disappear to be replaced



by a system of denominational schools, religious schools, segregationist schools, and one wonders what is the ultimate result for the health and the wellbeing and the vitality of our American community.

If the Catholic church can in this instance practice a commendable self restraint there are ways, there are ways in which aid can be tendered to it, ways which would not do violation to the spirit or the letter of our Constitution. Democracy thrives on accomodation, on cooperation, on compromise. There was no great opposition to the government monies flowing into denominational schools through G. I. scholarships. There has been little opposition to the granting of science textbook aid, science equipment, developed by federal agencies, to private and public schools alike. There has been little local opposition to the extension of medical care and even of free lunches into the parochial school systems. There are ways in which cooperatively, through compromise, some financial aid can be given to the parochial schools in those areas which are purely of benefit to the individual child, in those areas in which they are obviously undertaking a responsibility of the public. It is to be hoped that this will be the result. If it is not, the year or two ahead will see a heightening of inter-religious tensions, one which will do good neither for the wellbeing or the integrity of our community nor for the posture of our nation vis a vis the world.

I spoke of two issues, two areas of conflict; the first, financial, the second, curriculum. There has been a definite, mounting interest in bringing religion into the classrooms of America. This interest has been largely developed by thoughtful Protestant groups -- the National Council of Churches, the American Council of Churches -- it was reflected in the White House Conference on Children and Youth, in debates before the N.E.A. and the



P.T.A., locally and nationally. The spirit of this debate is largely signalled by Justice Douglas in a famous 1952 decision on released time, in which he said "that the institutions of our society presuppose a Supreme Being". One may question his historical acumen and accuracy, but one cannot question the fact that Justice Douglas here reflected the mood of America in mid-century, the mood which saw to it that we amended the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag to include the phrase "One nation under God", the mood which saw to it that we overprinted our money with the motto "In God We Trust", the mood which is reflected in the rather thoughtless way in which occasional Protestant ministers in public invocations and benedictions refer to "our Christian democracy". Religion in mid-century has become a matter of loyalty. The cold war, bringing us face to face with an atheistic enemy, has made religion both a test of and a tool of good citizenship.

Now this interest in bringing religion into the public school systems is evidenced in many different ways. Thirteen of our states make a daily Bible reading mandatory at the beginning of each school day. In perhaps one out of every four of our school communities the day is begun with prayer, usually with the Lord's Prayer from the New Testament. There has been considerable effort to develop what is called "a common core curriculum". By this we educators mean a distillation of the best and noblest ethic of all religions. This has developed largely into a pabulum ethic, one which cannot cause indigestion or develop an allergic reaction in any group. Perhaps one in three of our communities have developed a released time program which permits the school to curtail its teaching hours to release the children for attendance at Sunday School, church school, synagogue school and the like, holding in the school dissident children, children of disbelieving parents, keeping them busy at study hall or some



other types of inane and unnecessary activity. Some schools, especially in rural communities, teach religion as part of the everyday classroom program. Either a representative of the ministerial association enters the classroom to teach or the teacher herself undertakes this process. And we Jewish parents are, of course, cognizant of the annual December migraine which forces upon our children a decision between participation in some Christmas celebration and being left out. This annual migraine has become more severe of late because under ministerial prodding the schools are busy putting Christ back into Christmas and hitherto innocuous chorales and plays have become Nativity scenes overlaid with significant Christological and theological teachings. There is, in other words, a great concern by many groups in America that the religious teaching must somehow be introduced into and become part of the daily routine of the classroom.

Now, it is hard to pinpoint the reasons and the causes for this renewed interest. I suspect that in part it derives from the cancer of juvenile delinquency and the belief that more religious training would somehow curb the spread of this breakdown in the character and the emotional development of our young people. I suspect also that it is in part a result of the failure of the Sunday School system as it is practiced in many Protestant communities. I suspect, equally, that part of this impetus derives from the fear psychology which has been definitely a dimension of American life in the last decade.

But whatever be the reasons, the fact remains that we are confronted by thoughtful, large, powerful bodies determined to introduce some form of religious indoctrination into the school system.

Now, as a religionist, as one who believes deeply in the importance of a spiritual commitment, of the integrity of one's faith, I cannot, however, but feel that these attempts to introduce religion into the public schools



are educationally naive, politically unsound, constitutionally questionable, and religiously self-defeating. Take Bible reading as an example. How will Bible reading affect the character of our young? Will it teach them ethics? Haven't we long since become sophisticated enough to know that the reading of noble sentiments does not enoble character? You learn by living, by experience, by taking for yourself fine examples, by fighting through in your own self temptation, compromise, challenge. You do not learn by reading the maxims of ancient teachers. Sometimes these can verbalize for you thoughts, sentiments which you have felt and not been able to put into terms. But your own commitments precede this verbalization if the verbalization is to have any meaning. And think of the problems which such an issue as Bible reading entails. What Bible shall be read? The Old Testament? How can a Christian, who believes in a new dispensation, be satisfied only with the Old Testament? The New Testament? What of the integrity of Jewish faith, which denies the Christological teachings of the New Testament? And what version of the Bible shall be read? The King James, the Douay, the Revised Standard Version, the Jewish Publication Society? Some take prophecy as poetry, others take prophecy as fact. Some interpret a Hebrew phrase to indicate the coming of the Christ Messiah, the other, our own, fails to see any indication in this phrase of this teaching. Who shall interpret this teaching? Shall it be read as literature? Will that satisfy those who believe the Bible to be fundamental truth? Shall it be read fundamentalistically? Will this satisfy us who see in the Bible moral teachings primarily and great moral poetry?

No, I am afraid that the reading of the Bible, the performing of the sancta of religion within a public school setting can neither enoble nor teach the children the depth, the beauty, the holiness which is the essence of religion.



I question the politics of all of this. We in America have been fortunate. We have had cooperative and cooperating religious communities, communities which have come together for common purpose, which have exchanged pulpits, points of view, which have been willing to participate equally as pluralistic entities in our democratic society. I can see only where the introduction of religion into the public schools will pull these religious denominations apart. It cannot be otherwise. Each of us is committed to the integrity, the sanctity, and the truth of his own point of view, and especially where religion is dogmatic, doctrinal, and salvationistic do the ministers and priests of such faiths find it impossible -- not only difficult, but impossible -- to compromise on some commonly accepted position. And more than this. Have we the right to read out of the American fold those young people and those parents who are unwilling to make a religious commitment, or have made a commitment for disbelief, or who wish their children to be raised without being indoctrinated in any faith, that later they may make some commitment of their own? Is this kind of coercive religion the American way? I seriously question it. And I question whether religion in the long run will be the gainer. I would put before you this simple fact: travel the length and breadth of our globe and search for the religious revival and you will find it in only one nation of the world -- our own. Throughout Europe, throughout South America, throughout Asia religious interest is on the decline. These are societies which are largely secular and interested in secular things. Only in America, where religion has been non-coercive, where religion has not allied itself with the power of the State, where no young person has felt himself obligated to mumble the sanctities of some faith in which he did not believe, only here has religion shown itself in its purity and, because it was pure, only here has been able to command the respect of thinking individuals.



If religion is to thrive in America it must thrive in freedom, it must thrive in the way it has flourished till now. This is the American way, and for religion it has been a successful way. I question the political sagacity of those religionists who seek to coerce the captive audience of thirty-six million school children and who believe that, by indoctrinating them at an age before they have critical minds of their own, they are adding to the strength, adding to the substance, or making sure the future of their own faith.

I do not presume an absolute zone of silence between the classroom and the church. Religion is an integral part of our civilization. You cannot teach history without teaching religion. Moses, Jesus, Mohammed -- these are important historical figures as well as religious figures. You cannot teach literature in the upper grades without teaching of religion. How can you understand English literature without understanding the Bible? These ought to be taught as part and parcel of the normal curriculum of the school. These are sensitive areas, delicate areas, but they can be taught. And I find no argument with ministers and priests and rabbis who enter the school upon invitation on national holidays to verbalize the meaning of these holidays to the young people. I find nothing unfitting in the taking of school children to visit individual churches in the community to see how the community worships.

But I do oppose -- oppose with every fiber in my body -- the imposition of religious practices upon the minds of the very young, minds which are not yet discriminating, which have yet no critical apparatus which allows them to separate fact from fancy, dogma from truth. Of this danger our schools, in my estimation, must beware, and despite community pressure avoid.



Ultimately, our public schools rest upon the interest and the involvement of each and every one of us. The philosophy of a public school curriculum is determined locally. If we are determined to maintain the benevolent neutrality between church and classroom, then each of us has the obligation to interest himself in his local school, to participate in its discussions, to make known his views, to communicate those views to his neighbors. The battle to preserve the benevolent neutrality at present existing will be a long one and a difficult one, one which often will engender much heat and much debate. But it is a battle which can be won. It is a struggle which must be won. Ultimately the American society which we know and prize rests squarely on the success of our public school system. Ultimately its integrity, the spirit of democracy which it engenders into the young, ultimately its unwillingness to segregate along adult lines any child, ultimately its determination to create within the classroom a homogeneous democratic situation, ultimately that philosophy makes the wheels of our democracy to turn and the machinery of our democracy to work.

Our public schools are in many areas embattled schools. In this area at least we should lend them our complete support.

## Kaddish

Friday Nov. 25  
Sunday " 27

Those who passed away this week

DAVID C. ROTHSTEIN  
EDNA DUNHAM WILLARD

## Yahrzeits

JOSEPH FRIEDMAN	FEBUS FELBER
SALLIE GREENFIELD	ALEX BAUMOEL
SOPHIE MITNICK MIRMAN	CARRIE S. WISE
HARRY M. MYERS	
EMIL REISZ	
ANNETTE C. KOBLITZ	
MARK S. BERK	
JAY MILTON THURMAN	
FRANCES A. HARTZ	
DOROTHY GIMP JACOBSON	
MORRIS ELSNER	
ARTHUR FELBER	
ROSE A. HARTZ	
LIZZIE LEDERER	



36 million boys & girls attend public schools in America, what they are taught and how they are taught are obviously questions of national & government interest. Like so much else in our society, the public schools are at the moment a social organism in transition. The small separate units are being merged into large consolidated systems - a change necessitated by rising costs, increasing specialization, & a growing awareness that each school must offer distinct & separate programs for the academically talented, the academically average, & the mentally deficient but intellectually awakened.

The schools are changing in size & changing in curriculum. The open age & the steadily growing multicultural grade enrollment occurs and multicultural foreign languages & skills and the introduction of new concepts of the world today.

There is a transition in thought - language & education, democratic education, and a new method of all types have standard & national & democratic into the curriculum.

Finally there is a transition in values - clarification of function. The supreme value has shifted that the school should have neither main purpose nor in its own right - neither in its own right - The school must be subordinate to democracy - neither day to human segregation if it should have the public school disturb any day of the Nord will be ruined - The school must teach and to conserve of democracy in action.

The growing specialization of our school system reflects the growing specialization of our society. We live at a complex, complex world & it is impossible that any young man be prepared not for our present world - for the old world of already known of the past - but for the new world - the industrial democracy of tomorrow.

The function of our schools is no longer properly the subject of mere discussion - it is always in real discussion as complex & thorough question of religion & the school comes up for debate - and with a similar predominantly in the discussion of the future and of two separate problems - the past, present - the social conscience.



The fiscal issue concerns the apportionment of school tax money. I found attendance records in early on several states - but this requirement is met by attendance at some accredited private or parochial school. <sup>2.000</sup> ~~1.000~~ to military & preparatory schools of all types - <sup>Episcopal</sup> ~~Episcopal~~ - and parochial schools - some build & maintain parochial schools by & as well as public schools. By far the larger bulk of these are public schools in the R.C. parochial school system reached numbers to only 5,000,000 children or 1 of every 2 Catholic children in America.

Retention for the most expensive - school attendance in the modeling of Catholic eyes of the public schools - United States - The magazine Religious Education - Fuller Mail & M. Clerkly the front editor of the magazine American has successfully advised the Catholic position









Parliament has not the financial burden undertaken by the guests -  
this is the price of their commitment - but the constitutional burden placed  
on all of us in the First Amendment to our Constitution which established  
the separation of church & state by forbidding Congress to make any law  
affecting an establishment of religion.

Culture is a social ball admission + induction - One must be separated from the other - induction is the process of re-education of the individual - local + state - federal work to re-educate individual re-education be an evolution of the constitution supporter, as it does a particular kind of work.

Permanent also in the sense of public responsibility. The student  
 as a carrier of material policy is committed to the development of the  
 nationally determined goals of national education, class flexibility, & open  
 curriculum - One may dissent from a principle in the policy - but one  
 may not refuse to pay one's share of its cost. A conservative objector  
 must pay his taxes and cannot refuse to contribute. A radically progressive  
 will the necessity of bearing, but I can not refuse to pay my share for such  
 use. A curriculum may be a product of free public education - but a  
 an - American citizen he cannot be exempt from its cost. Paying his  
 share of the upkeep

show of an upland  
The Cullen - land have no claim against land or mineral - land  
none. One can but deplore the strong handed political techniques which  
have been used in the past, to prevent passage of any federal bill to  
education bill unless they contained clauses & conditions which  
would ~~have~~ <sup>make</sup> it possible for particular schools to share in the  
grant.

It has been 10 years now since indirect opposition level by Central  
Spencer Defended the Broken Ball - it was then no federal will  
has been reported out of committee in the House - a committee of  
pure child's play interest has been appointed. It is apparent that  
another federal will to education measure will be introduced in



This session - the need to insert, Ball parties included and means  
in this platform. It is to be hoped that procedure and interest will  
in this instance at least not be pushed ahead above the democratic  
order

of the <sup>existing</sup> public the self restraint - I would also suggest that a measure  
must be included by an agreed - accommodation, There is no doubt that  
the public & procedural schools do perform a meritorious community  
service and there are considerable evidence ways of helping them in that  
sense. No Constitutional question is open to me as a school which  
guilt, allowed to. I. Ball & Schuler's to be applied to teacher &  
democratic college - the major complaint has been raised about  
procedural schools, that is that local school & universities  
seems to be fixed to the center in a similar manner & the  
multiple task & apparatus available under many congressional  
programs for educational improvement

I am confident that constitutionally responsible and  
arrangements can be effected - but I am equally confident that  
procedural matters on the whole can't nullify any progress  
a better national better school could not of find a defect for  
the aid programs by itself; but in defect federal aid program  
to any & all similar schools.

There is now at stake has been the budget of the procedural school -  
There is a desired constitutional safeguard & the integrity of the public  
school itself - the <sup>long</sup> ~~aim~~ is to build upon a structure which  
democratic school - working to <sup>local</sup> school building & public funds  
to build high the wall of segregation - by major build in the  
no direct existence policies of body could destroy in my path  
your country all public education - with no need to an answer  
which I should be contemplating.



2 aspects earlier of the ~~double~~ <sup>complex</sup> between church, government and on  
two levels - one fiscal - one constitutional.

One could assemble an impressive list of thoughtful Americans who  
have of late moved around for the sake of religious orientation in the  
public schools - Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court legal mind of the  
discussion under is an opinion of an question of Religious Tests Schools  
he wrote "We are a religious people unless institutions presuppose  
a Supreme Being".

Whatever are my time of Mr. Douglas's Constitutional theory here - there  
is no doubt that he reflect the American mood of our country - The  
same spirit which avoided the Pledge of Allegiance to include a reference  
to our nation "under God" - which our printed our dollar bills  
made the motto "in God we trust" and which has seen a growing  
acceptance of the principle that religious affiliation is not a  
proof of character loyalty neither the qualifying reference - that  
disbelief and absolute truth conclude not the means of not in the  
camp of the strong.

The past decade has seen a sharp increase in the intensity  
of religious practice and the study into the public school, 24 hours  
period study books reading - in 13 of the states it is mandatory, 2 over  
a third of an, and districts for teaching by law has been extended so  
that children can be released only for religious instruction at the  
local schools - the burden of teaching a dividing parents has kept  
over at least half or at very much. Among small towns and very  
small communities course or what is usually labelled  
non-denominational religion - read rules of the Presb- Methodist  
as taught teaching in the school - church - church houses - after  
by a representative of the local ministerial association. There has  
been an annual Parents meeting where are present parents  
know only as well - the majority which is getting progressively  
more over - as the school and ministerial providing and







As a religious - interest in preserving & strengthening Jewish in America  
- all fields - all fields - A can of dynamite (and attempts) <sup>as</sup>  
educationally sound, constitutionally questionable, and politically  
soundly rejected.

A Community Center can be used as a Bible study in the school -  
would ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> the New Testament - What members?  
Denny, K.S., R.S.W., P.S. - What a unilateral commitment - of united  
commitment - What - of united - to united people. What are  
not long and short as my last word study conclusively settled  
has not unilateral rules. You are not good others to needs  
Biblical teaching - the will argue in some sensibilities to the  
boundary & depth or religion by himself and just forced from his  
house in the world.

Chaos is the capital where a good man is unintentionally refused  
to take part in a particular play or religiosity program - to participate  
- Chaos means the rule of shoulders not the building of houses  
where started - there are no self regarding to be on the left the  
terms of the left and right is the cost of any religiosity program.  
is represented and by the same program -

I would say further that there attempts to a non-religious or the  
captivity conditions of the religious school are self-defeating - Rel.  
is strong in communities because the minority of rel. are in the center - of  
populations are not united states or of the old world - and  
has been pushed of the new united concept and is not needed here  
because of its unity. Enforced religion breaks up unity and is not  
united and disjoint, psychologically, the separation of church and state - the  
united of the school - has other ways to be just as the same  
road to stay just.



~~Proposed~~

now to use a proposed religious council <sup>body</sup> ~~not~~ is not a matter of religion.  
Religion must be treated as a part of history - a human object to be studied  
as a part of human life, as a part of a social structure of function - this  
is a fact of community life. I would encourage <sup>class very good</sup> ~~study~~ of comparative  
religion as a study of human life - as they are part of the human mind  
and possible or less common ideas. Human ideas - ~~ideas~~ not  
a doctrine, but a fact.

Children can not be separated from their communities - but  
when the children need to be in a school conducted - I would  
be sure the young students have no artificial judgment of their  
own - a school should prepare and of the inclusion  
and of diversity - this I think the school must be  
a school of the diversity & community must be  
a school of the diversity & community must be  
a school of the diversity & community must be

American school system is a good & glorious one - attitude  
of all our people & attitude - but as in any one possible  
be its supporters & defenders attitude in the days ahead.