

## **THE FOURTH GREAT AWAKENING: AN EXAMINATION OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL MOVEMENT OF THE LAST TWO DECADES**

**Claudia Guthrie**

While enrollment in public and other non-public schools has been decreasing by as much as 40% in the last 25 years, Christian school enrollment has quadrupled and now accounts for as much as 20% of all private school enrollment in the United States, a number which is exceeded only by Catholic parochial schools. Not since the Third Plenary Council of Catholic churches in Baltimore decreed that every church parish establish a school, has there been such a mass exodus from public schools. As part of a religious revival that has come to be known as the “Fourth Great Awakening,” the Fundamentalist school movement has become “the fastest growing branch of private education in America.”<sup>1</sup> Religious schools, such as Franciscan missionary schools in the Southwest and Florida and frontier Sunday schools, are nothing new in the history of our country.<sup>2</sup> According to a publication put out by the Office of Education, church schools have always played an important part in our national life since our country’s earliest beginnings.<sup>3</sup> Catholic, Jewish, and certain Protestant groups such as the Lutherans have a long standing history of private school involvement. What seems so peculiar about the Fundamentalist school movement is that for years Protestants have been content with the public school system. Obviously something has changed in the last 25 years to cause such a widespread and growing sense of dissatisfaction. In order to understand what lies behind the Christian school movement, we need to look at what is important to the Fundamentalists, how extensive the movement is, and some of the reasons for the Fundamentalists’ dissatisfaction with the public schools, paying particular attention to one specific reason. We will also look at whether or not public schools are sectarian as Fundamentalist claim, and whether Christian schools are failing to meet the goals of education as many public school advo-

cates claim. Under goals of education, we will examine the quality of teaching, methods of teaching, and curriculum content. Finally, criticisms of and alternatives to Christian schools will be analyzed.

For the purposes of this paper, Christian schools refer not to Catholic parochial schools or traditional Protestant schools, but to those schools which have been founded by evangelical Protestants, also known as Fundamentalists, who broke away from mainstream Protestant groups earlier in the century.<sup>4</sup> This is important because the reason they broke away also has something to do with the reason they are now leaving public schools en masse. R. Scott Appleby, the Associate Director of the Fundamentalist Project of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences tells us that Christian Fundamentalism was and is a “reaction against modernizing and liberalizing tendencies in the churches” which questioned the inerrancy of the Bible.<sup>5</sup> Feeling “their distinctive Christian identity to be radically threatened by an enemy from within the ranks,” Fundamentalists responded by leaving mainstream Protestant groups “to form their own churches.”<sup>6</sup> The word, “identity,” is important here for it will come up repeatedly as a motivating factor in the establishment of religious schools, Fundamentalist or otherwise.

Because the Christian School movement tends to be a local phenomena and not part of any “coordinated socio-political movement,” it is difficult to get any reliable figures on the number of schools or students in the country.<sup>7</sup> Many schools, because of their hostile feelings towards bureaucratic control of any kind, refuse to take part in surveys or are just not counted because they belong to no central organization.<sup>8</sup> Different sources give varying estimates ranging anywhere from 4,000 schools and 250,000 students to 18,000 schools and 1,500,000 students.<sup>9</sup> Average enrollment for these schools is between 100 and 200 students.<sup>10</sup> Bruce Cooper, who has studied enrollment trends in private schools, projects that as much as 15% of the school-age population may be in Christian schools by 1990.<sup>11</sup> Below is a distribution of private schools by religious affiliation as of 1978/1979.<sup>12</sup>

**TABLE 1.**Distribution of private schools and students by church affiliation, 1978/79

<u>Affiliation</u>	Number <u>of schools</u>	Percentage %	Number <u>of students</u>	Percentage %
Baptist	858	4.4	204,144	4.0
Calvinist	166	0.8	47,269	0.9
Catholic	9,849	50.1	3,269,761	64.3
East Orthodox	14	0.1	2,682	0.1
Episcopal	314	1.6	76,452	1.5
Friends	50	0.3	14,611	0.3
Jewish	406	2.1	101,758	2.0
Lutheran	1,485	7.6	217,406	4.3
Methodist	60	0.3	11,187	0.2
Presbyterian	60	0.3	12,823	0.3
Seventh-Day Adv	1,106	5.6	148,157	2.9
Other	1,351	6.7	231,317	4.5
<u>Non-affiliated</u>	<u>3,944</u>	<u>20.1</u>	<u>746,730</u>	<u>14.7</u>

SOURCE OF DATA: National Center for Education Statistics Surveys.

Schools listed under “other” and “non-affiliated” account for 26.8% of religious schools. If we add Baptist schools, the percentage comes up to 31.2%. True, all of these are not Fundamentalist schools, but it is safe to say a goodly portion are. These three groups also account for 23.2% of all students enrolled in religious schools.

Up until 1833, when a public school system was established which was theoretically non-sectarian in nature, most schools in this country were established and run by churches.<sup>13</sup> In the case of Protestant schools, the purpose of education at the lower level was to enable individuals to read in order to examine the Scriptures for themselves, and at the higher level, to prepare individuals for leadership roles in government or in the church.<sup>14</sup> With the establishment of public schools, only a “common Christianity” was to be taught.<sup>15</sup> In spite of this noble intention, schools still ended up having a definite Protestant bent and grew to be sectarian in nature. Catholics objected to the use of the King James version of the Bible, a translation commonly used by Protestants, and they also objected to the idea that individuals could search out the truth for them-

selves.<sup>16</sup> While Catholics left the public schools to establish their own, Protestants saw the public schools as a form of “parallel education” in which a “common Christianity” could be imparted to all individuals while the specifics were left up to the different churches to address.<sup>17</sup> For over a hundred years, with the exception of groups such as the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Seventh Day Adventists, Protestants saw no necessity for starting their own schools. Then came the sixties and the seventies. In 1962 and 1963, public prayers and compulsory Bible reading were outlawed from public schools.<sup>18</sup> While it is true that many Christians had been unhappy for a long time over such things as the increasing influence of Darwinism in the schools, these court cases were perceived as the straw which finally broke the camel’s back, leaving the door wide open for secular humanism.<sup>19</sup> The sixties and seventies were the beginning of a time of turmoil which continues until the present day. Everything became relative as morals and values were called into question. Drug use became rampant. God was treated as a myth in schools, and evolution was coming to be taught more and more as an absolute. For Fundamentalists, the relativism which had caused them to leave mainstream churches had invaded all of society, including the public schools. In fact, they saw public schools as the chief disseminators of the ideas that were contributing to the collapse of age-old values and standards. Historian, William G. McLaughlin stated the crisis of the sixties and seventies well when he said,

The ferment of the sixties has begun to produce a new shift in our belief-value system, a transformation of our world-view that may be the most drastic in our history as a nation.<sup>20</sup>

James C. Carper, author of Religious Schooling in America, carries that thought further by commenting,

Although it is too early to assess the total impact of these years of disenchantment and uncertainty, it appears that there has been a collapse of consensus concerning the basic nature and function of our institutions and the values, and traditions undergirding them. Indeed this erosion of consensus may mark a “watershed” in American history. In the words of

Henry Steele Commagli: “Perhaps the sixties and the seventies are a great divide — the divide of disillusionment.”<sup>21</sup>

Along with a feeling that their values and beliefs are under attack, Fundamentalists feel their very “identity” is being threatened.<sup>22</sup> It is a fear which has been shared by all religious groups at one time or another and which has ultimately been the primary reason for the establishment of religious schools as alternatives to public schools. C. Albert Koob of the National Catholic Education Association tells us that the establishment of Catholic parochial schools after 1833 was a natural defensive measure.<sup>23</sup> In like manner, the broad purpose of the Jewish school, according to Norma Hernandez and Jorge A. Descamps, “is to contribute to the continued existence of the Jews as an identifiable group.”<sup>24</sup> Settling in the Midwest in 1839, German Lutherans also began to establish parochial schools in an effort, not only to maintain their identity, but to resist assimilation.<sup>25</sup> The main difference between these groups and the Fundamentalists is simply that for these groups, the struggle for an identity is an old and familiar one. For Fundamentalist Christians, the struggle to preserve an identity is still new and frightening. Until recently, this group has not been in the position of having its beliefs attacked or its identity seriously threatened. Just as a sense of crisis has served to unite other groups in an effort to preserve their sense of identity, so the present crisis is producing the same reaction in Fundamentalist Christians. Hernandez and Descamps wrote that “Jewish identification increases when Jews are attacked.”<sup>26</sup> The same is true of any group. According to one social forecaster, John Naisbitt, the Christian school movement is also a response to “a revival in religious belief and church attendance.”<sup>27</sup> I disagree. I feel, like Hernandez and Descamps, that it is the threat or the crisis which produces an increased urgency to preserve identification and not the other way around. The same is true of countries. Sad to say, it often takes the threat of a war to unite a people.

Exactly how does secular humanism threaten the identity of religious groups? That it does is attested to by commentators such as Descamps who writes of the “powerful new forces of secularism, materialism, and scientism” which are threatening to destroy “Jewish iden-

tity.”<sup>28</sup> Like the Jews, Fundamentalists are also feeling this threat. For those threatened by secularism, the evils of secular humanism are manifested in the writings of John Dewey, leader of the American Humanist Association, publisher of the *Humanist Manifesto* in 1933. According to Dewey,

Faith in a prayer-hearing God is an unproved and outmoded faith. There is no God and no soul. Hence, there are no needs for the props of traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded, then immutable truth is also dead and buried. There is no room for fixed natural law or moral absolutes.<sup>29</sup>

The fact is that if you deny God as the source of authority, then you are left with man as the authority, and if man is the authority, then any one’s set of values is as good as any one else’s, which is what Dewey is saying when he says that there are no absolutes. Ultimately, you are left with relativism where there are no standards or values. It is this idea which Catholics, Jews, Fundamentalists, and non-Fundamentalist Christians find so objectionable — an idea which actively denies God and promotes man as the center of the universe. The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment says, however, that no particular creed is to be advanced over another. There is a vast difference between not teaching about God and teaching that God does not exist. One leaves the belief up to the individual. The other dictates a belief. Charles E. Rice, law professor at Notre Dame, stated the concerns about secular humanism as follows:

If the objecting parents are correct in their claim that the public schools are promoting the tenets of a secular religion, it must be on the basis that the nonjudgmental treatment of moral issues without any affirmation of the supernatural is itself an implicit assertion that contradictory moral positions are equally tenable, that there is no objective and binding moral order, that the supernatural is not a necessary factor in the making of moral decisions. It is not unreasonable to describe such teaching as an implicit affirmation of a position that, in

its relativism and secularism, is authentically religious. The Christian parents' concern is therefore understandable.<sup>30</sup>

In *Torcaso v. Watkins*, the Supreme Court ruled that secular humanism was, indeed, a religion.<sup>31</sup> Not only is secular humanism a religion, but the Supreme Court further ruled in *Abington Township v. Schempp* in 1963 that the government could not promote secularism. In the 1986 publication of *Classrooms in Crisis*, the authors go on to state that this would be the case if the teaching of religion were completely forbidden in the schools. Furthermore, it would be impossible to have any meaningful discussion of the social sciences and the humanities if all mention of God and the Bible were eliminated.<sup>32</sup>

In 1833, public schools tried to achieve non-sectarianism, but in actuality they encouraged Protestantism, and so remained sectarian. In 1990, public schools are again trying to achieve non-sectarianism. They have corrected their earlier mistake, though all Fundamentalists would not agree with me, by eliminating those things which were clearly Protestant in nature. However, they have gone and replaced it with something else which is equally sectarian in nature and that is secular humanism. In so doing, public schools have embraced a set of values and goals which all people can not embrace. Herein lies the problem. C. Albert Koob pointed out, "The public school . . . is not really neutral, for it gives an equivalent denial to the questions by actually taking another starting point and aiming at another goal."<sup>33</sup> As long as public schools stick to secular matters and treat all religious matters objectively, a person should be able to attend in all good conscience. This is not the case however. Teachers feel constantly compelled to state what is truth and what is not truth, when they should be sticking to presenting alternate theories to evolution; there is no reason why evidence for and against evolution cannot be presented. Allow the student to do the thinking and the analyzing. Allow the student to weigh the evidence and make the choices. Isn't this what liberal education is all about?

According to Joseph H. Fichter, Professor of Sociology and author of a sociological study on the parochial school, the purpose of education

in all schools, whether they be parochial, public, or private is “(a) to transmit to the younger generation the culture with its patterns, institutions and values,” and “(b) to supervise the socialization process whereby the child actively ‘receives’ the culture, that is, adapts himself to, and is adapted to the socio-cultural system in which he lives.”<sup>34</sup> If this is so, then Christian schools along with all parochial schools are accomplishing the purpose of education. They have a set of values to transmit, and they are transmitting those values. Who is to say, in a democratic society, which values are those which are to be imparted? In a pluralistic society, there will be many different sets of values, and in a democratic society, we will have a right to pursue those values as long as they don’t infringe on the rights of others. According to Carper and Hunt, “effective” schools have a “shared sense of mission and values,” something which religious schools certainly do have.<sup>35</sup> A different view of education is presented by Alan Peshkin. In an eighteen month study of a Fundamentalist school in Illinois, he states that, “if ‘education’ is understood by its secularist proponents to involve development of critical skills and inherent human capacities and ‘learning’ seen as an open-ended, fluid, and ongoing process, then Christian schools are engaged less in education, more in indoctrination.”<sup>36</sup> I agree that this may often be the case, but not necessarily so. My own religious training has taught me to be a very critical thinker, not only of secular matters and of the beliefs of others, but of those professed by those of my own faith. I was taught to accept nothing as true, simply because someone says it is so, but to search things out for myself. I would contend that the public schools are often guilty of indoctrination except in unusual schools such as St. John’s College in Annapolis, Maryland, where students are allowed to discuss information without having a teacher interpret it for them. Public schools, as much as private schools, are concerned with instilling certain values. In the case of secular humanism, definite indoctrination is taking place. If quality is equated as academic excellence on standardized tests such as the Iowa Basic or the SAT, rather than the ingestion of a set of values, students from Fundamentalist schools often do well.<sup>37</sup> This finding is consistent for students from most parochial or religious schools. One explanation that turned up frequently in my readings was that parents of children in private schools are more committed to and involved with

their children's schools because they have gone to the trouble of choosing these schools. This commitment was seen as an important factor in a child's success.<sup>38</sup>

As far as teaching methods, no consistent pattern could be found. Methodology ranged from traditional to individualized. Some schools stressed memorization and recitation, a style of learning consistent with indoctrination while others were into the Montessori style of teaching and encouraging creativity. Some used secular texts, and some used standardized Christian curricula.<sup>39</sup> At Covenant School in upstate New York 80% of the teachers have MAs from secular colleges. Yet, many Christian schools do not have certified teachers. One case involving the certification of teachers and other state controls on private schools raged in the courts and legislative assemblies of Nebraska for two years, between 1982 and 1984. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights refused to become involved, saying that it was a case for the state to decide. Fundamentalists from many states lent their moral support to Faith Baptist Church in Louisville, Nebraska. Automatic dialing machines were installed in the church basement, and intensive lobbying efforts were launched. Fathers went to jail. At one point, the President of the United States stepped in and called for a speedy resolution to the problem. Ultimately, it was decided that teachers of private schools in Nebraska did not have to be certified, but merely pass a competency test. As of 1980, 13 states required certification, 13 did not, and for 24, certification was optional.<sup>40</sup>

Curriculum content for Christian schools is just as widely divergent, but some things are common to all. All are centered upon Jesus Christ and the Bible. All teach science from the creationist point of view, and all teach moral values based on Biblical teachings.<sup>41</sup> In Peshkin's and Susan Rose's studies of two Fundamentalist schools, they found such things taught as the infallibility of the Bible, a universe of order, obedience to authority, a rigorous moral code, a total world, and one truth for all humanity once delivered. They also saw a desire for a moral and spiritual control over the family. Rose stated that many were premillennialists which led to a passive withdrawal from the world.<sup>42</sup> In

writing of Peshkin's and Rose's studies, R. Scott Appleby of the University of Chicago stated that Fundamentalists selectively used scriptures to support Biblical inerrancy and that they were opposed to scientific examination of the Scriptures. From my own experience, I would have to disagree with both statements. It may be true of the school which Peshkin examined, but I know it is not true of all Fundamentalist schools.

When it comes to criticisms, many have been launched against Christian schools. They have been accused of producing subservient people incapable of critical thinking. In Peshkin's words, "the organizational tyranny" he found in Bethany school served to create a "closed universe." Some fear that Christian schools are divisive, producing people who are not tolerant of the views of other people in a pluralistic society. Peshkin felt this was because Christian schools were "predicated on a sense of crisis" and therefore needed an enemy. He stated that the teaching he witnessed at Bethany was very hostile towards non-Fundamentalists and non-Christians. Susan Rose feels that the appeal of Christian schools is based on little more than the fact that they attempt to provide absolute answers in a time when there are no absolute answers. The most recurring criticism though and the one which I thought was most deserving of being examined more closely was the accusations made by Appleby of separatism and passive withdrawal from the world.<sup>43</sup> It is a criticism which was echoed by other individuals and with which I concur. William H. Willimon of Duke University Divinity School states the problem succinctly when he says,

In too many communities, parents who are talented, educated, committed Christians have withdrawn their children (along with their time, talent, and prayers) from the public schools without a thought for their responsibilities as their brothers' keeper. Without children in the public schools, they have little interest in the needs of public education....Certainly there is much wrong in today's public schools — mostly the same things that are wrong with our society as a whole. Christian parents have good reason to feel alarmed over many recent developments in public education. But who will improve it?

What kind of society will we have if all Christians abandon the public school?<sup>44</sup>

Donald Erickson voiced the same concern but in slightly different words. He saw private schools as jeopardizing the ability of public schools to provide all individuals an equal opportunity to receive an education, for he says,

If children of most concerned parents leave public schools for private ones, the social climate in the public schools will hardly be conducive to effective learning, especially in disadvantaged areas.<sup>45</sup>

Parents may have a lot more control than they realize in shaping public schools. The Oregon case or the Pierce case of 1926 did more than establish the right of parents to send their children to private schools. It established the right of parents to have some control over the education of their children. As parents, we need to fight for all children and not just our own. One way to do this is to know the law and the rights that each of us have. The Fourteenth Amendment which states that no state shall “deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law,” has been judged by the courts to include the right of privacy which includes “the rights of parents to direct and control the upbringing of their children, subject to minimal control by the state.”<sup>46</sup> Along the same line, the Hatch Amendment, a federal statute, also allows parents voice when they believe that their religious or moral beliefs have been violated. Another statute which is included in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 permits individuals to sue in federal court if their civil rights have been violated by the state. Civil rights would include the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of religion listed in the First Amendment.<sup>47</sup> The loss or denial of certain freedoms which we have been guaranteed by the Constitution occurs far more frequently in public schools than does the violation of religious beliefs. Merely being exposed to beliefs contrary to our own does not place one in the position of committing a sin. The same freedoms that allow others to express beliefs with which we disagree also allow us the right to express our beliefs. In a

pluralistic and democratic society, these are rights which we must fight to preserve. What generally happens is that these rights are threatened and our voice denied — not that we are made to violate our religious beliefs. One example is the case of *Williamsport v. Bender* in which students sued the school because they were not allowed to use the facilities after hours for religious purposes. The court ruled that the Free Exercise clause was not violated because the students were still free to meet elsewhere. However, their right of free speech had been denied. The landmark case of *Vincent v. Widmer* which involved a similar situation, was also decided on the grounds of free speech, not free exercise. Burron points out that it is conceivable that the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment could also have been used to argue these cases.<sup>48</sup> In *Classrooms in Crisis*, a book dealing with parents' rights and the public schools, the authors list two tests to determine whether the Establishment Clause or the Free Exercise Clause have been violated by a law. The Establishment Clause test was established by the Supreme Court in *Lemon v. Kurtzman*. The questions are as follows:

- (1) Does the law have a secular purpose?
- (2) As its primary effect, does the law advance or inhibit religion?
- (3) Does the law excessively entangle the government with religion?

The second, the Free Exercise test established by *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, an Amish case is similar:

- (1) Does the individual or group have a sincere religious belief?
- (2) Does the law impose a substantial burden upon the exercise of that belief?
- (3) Does the government have a compelling interest (such as health, safety, or national security) that cannot be achieved by any less restrictive means?<sup>49</sup>

Just as Fundamentalist parents have rights they may not be aware of, states are also endowed with rights, and those rights include the right to protect the interests of all their citizens. Fundamentalist parents must

remember that while “no citizen should be compelled to support any religious worship” (part of Jefferson’s preamble to the Virginia Bill for Religious Liberty, 1785-86), others are also entitled to express their beliefs.<sup>50</sup> In the court case involving the Faith Baptist Church in Nebraska, the belief was stated by some of its members that they were not bound by men’s laws, but only by the laws of God. They also asked what right the state had to tax and oversee a ministry of the church.<sup>51</sup> In his letter to the Romans, the apostle Paul plainly teaches, however, that the government has the right to rule, enact laws, punish evildoers, and levy taxes (Rom. 13:1-7). The tax-exempt status that most churches enjoy is a privilege — not a right. The Scriptures also teach that Christians are to obey these laws, and as much as it lies within their ability to do so, to live at peace with all men (Titus 3:1, Rom. 12:18). Furthermore, the Bible differentiates between the realm of the government and the realm of the church (I Tim. 3:15, I Thess. 1:8, Mk. 16:15). When churches begin to get into the business of such things as secular education, the result is split churches, and those energies which were intended to be directed towards spiritual matters are diverted into the things of the world. George Sverdrup (1848-1907), a spokesman for the Danish Lutherans, who split with the German Lutherans over the matter of schools, charged that “God...had vested, not the church, but the state with the responsibility of training children in secular matters.”<sup>52</sup> Obviously, this is a matter which will not be reconciled since church schools have been with us since the inception of this country, but whether an individual believes it is scriptural to establish a church which provides secular education or not, the fact remains that there are alternatives. We live in a country where it is possible to work within the system to bring about changes, and yes, we are our brothers’ keeper. We can not fulfill our responsibility to our brother by withdrawing from the world. At the same time, we also deny ourselves a chance to exercise our First Amendment rights of free speech. Where the laws of God and man do conflict, then, of course, a person must obey the higher authority and accept the consequences. But even this action can bring about changes. State governments are often very susceptible to the demands and needs of their citizens. Some may guarantee a moment of silence (though why this should need to be legislated eludes me), some may guarantee religious groups equal access to public

facilities (this became mandatory in September with the passing of a federal law), some allow “release time” to take students out of school a few hours a week for religious instruction, and some even go as far as avoiding scheduling homework for Wednesday nights when many churches have their mid-week Bible studies.<sup>53</sup>

In summary, the Fundamentalist movement is a reaction to the replacement of Protestant values in public schools with the values of secular humanism. While the schools need to stand firm on the issue of keeping certain things out of the schools such as mandatory prayers, the Fundamentalist has a right to object to the teaching of such things as secular humanism to the exclusion of all other beliefs, and they have a right to protest the denial of their rights to free speech and equal treatment under the law. Establishing private schools is one way of dealing with the problem, but it is not the only way.

### ENDNOTES

1. R. Scott Appleby, “Keeping Them Out of the Hands of the State: Two Critiques of Christian Schools,” American Journal of Education, Nov. 1989, p. 63. The first three “Great Awakenings” were 1730-1760, 1790-1840, and 1890-1920 and were, respectively, reactions to a national church, a missionary spirit, and the Industrial Revolution and Darwinism, (p. 79).
2. Norma Hernandez and Jorge A. Descamps, “Religion and Education,” Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 5th ed., (New York: The Free Press, 1962), IV, 1605-07.
3. Fred F. Beach and Robert F. Will, The State and Nonpublic Schools, U.S. Department of HEW, Office of Education, (Washing., D.C.: GPO, 1958), p. 8.
4. The term “evangelical” is used by James C. Carper and Thomas C. Hunt to refer to fundamentalist Christians in Religious Schooling in America, (Birmingham: Religious Education Press, 1984), p. 112.
5. Appleby 63.
6. Appleby 63-64.
7. A. P. Johnston and David K. Wiles, Christian Schools and Public Schools in Small Rural Communities of the Northeast, Report submitted to the Spencer Foundation (Burlington: Vermont University, 01 Oct. 1982), p. 3 (ERIC ED 235 958).

8. Donald A. Erickson, "Private Schools," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 5th ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1962), III, p. 1448.
9. Erickson 1448, Appleby 67, Carper 114.
10. Carper 113.
11. Carper 115.
12. Erickson 1451.
13. Hernandez 1605.
14. Hernandez 1607.
15. Hernandez 1608.
16. C. Albert Koob, "Parochial Schools--Roman Catholic," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed. (London: The Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 925.
17. Hernandez 1608.
18. Carper 116, Erickson 1449.
19. Carper 117.
20. Carper 110.
21. Carper 110.
22. Appleby 63, 80.
23. Appleby 925.
24. Appleby 1602.
25. Carper 36-37.
26. Carper 1604.
27. Carper 118.
28. Carper 1603.
29. Appleby 64.
30. Carper 117.
31. Arnold Burron, John Eidsmore, and Dean Turner, Classrooms in Crisis. Parent's Rights and the Public School, (Denver: Accent Books, 1977), p. 33.
32. Burron 69.
33. Burron 926.
34. Joseph H. Fichter, S. J., Parochial School: A Sociological Study, (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1964), p. 474.
35. Fichter 114.
36. Appleby 66, 70.
37. Appleby 66.
38. Erickson 1452.
39. Appleby 73, 77-78.
40. Robert C. O'Reilly and Beverly B. Fellman, Freedom for Religious Education and Regulation of Schools by the State, Paper presented at the An-

nual Meeting of the Nationwide Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, (Orono, ME, Aug. 1984), pp. 3-6 (ERIC ED 251 930).

41. Carper 113-114.
42. Appleby 63, 68, 70, 76, 81.
43. Appleby 70, 72-73, 81.
44. Carper 119.
45. Erickson 1452.
46. Burron 20.
47. Burron 23.
48. Burron 34.
49. Burron 29-30.
50. Donald E. Boles, The Two Swords. Commentaries and Cases in Religion and Education, (Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1967), p. 9.
51. O'Reilly 4.
52. Carper 36.
53. Burron 24-25.