

and even those political parties that demand the removal of the influence of the church from the schools, do not for a moment think of throwing religion out of them. Some persons would lessen the number of hours and others would change the character of the instruction.

Prof. Paulsen, of Berlin, would do away with the confessional character of the instruction, leaving that to the church and home, and retain the historical and literary treatment of the Bible and of the development of the church. The teachers generally would leave the instruction as it is, but would have the relations of the church, or rather its authority over religious instruction in the schools, done away with, not because of the religious question but because the pastors are not pedagogically trained men.* The value of religious instruction and its necessity are everywhere recognized, and it is not probable that any material change will take place in Germany for a long time to come.

The instruction in the Evangelical schools is given by the regular teachers, that of the Catholic schools sometimes by priests, who receive no pay from the state, while in the higher schools the religious instruction is given by special theologically trained teachers.

The fact that the church is the mother of the schools historically, having long had them under her charge, that church and state are united, that the people are nearly all included in the two general religious bodies Catholic and Evangelistic, that all schools are confessional on these two lines, makes the problem of religion in the schools in Germany a vastly different one from that of Amer-

ica. The absence of traditions governing the question, the division of the Evangelical church into many sects, the utter severance of church and state in the latter country, make the problem very difficult to solve. And yet its solution is of the utmost interest to thoughtful educators and well-wishers of the nation.

We are therefore brought face to face with the following questions: 1. Is religious instruction a necessary part of education? 2. Are the American youth properly receiving such instruction? 3. If not, ought the state to undertake it? 4. How shall it be done under the peculiar existing conditions? Taking up these questions in order let us discuss:

I. IS RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION A NECESSARY PART OF EDUCATION?

All educators agree in answering this question affirmatively. The aim of education is to form character and there can be no well-rounded character where the religious side has been neglected. The hand, the head, and heart as well must be cultivated. Where the first two alone are developed, the best and most important part of our being remains, that which has to do not alone with our immortal welfare, but also with every side of life here among our neighbors and our fellowmen. Every human being possesses the religious instinct, whether it be the savage with his misty notions of the Great Spirit and the happy hunting grounds, or the most civilized and intelligent Christian enlightened by revelation. The longing for something higher, for something beyond the sphere of this life's activities, for something that comforts and sustains in this life and affords hope for the future, is inherent in every human breast. Therefore there can be no proper development of the child in which his religious side is omitted.

*In a great many cases the pastor is local school inspector. All of the pedagogical training required of him is a six weeks course.