

(c) It would, therefore, appear to be no violation of the letter of the law to impart to pupils any dogmatic view of life—of its origin, duties, and destiny—provided only—(a) That such dogmatic view of life shall 'entirely' exclude the spiritual and supernatural; and (b) that it shall not transcend the powers of matter, and shall limit itself to the interests of the present world only. In other words, in the letter of the law in New Zealand (as in France) there is apparently nothing whatsoever to prevent or penalise the teaching of Utilitarianism, Positivism, Hedonism, any kind of hard Materialism, or any other 'ism,' which 'entirely' excludes 'things spiritual and sacred,' and limits itself 'entirely' to this material world and to 'the present life only.' Happily, the state of public feeling makes such teaching, at present, not 'good policy' in New Zealand. But when our schools-without-God have been doing their work for another generation, it may be practicable for those then 'so disposed,' to 'play an open game.' And when the time comes, the letter of the law will no more stand in the way in New Zealand than it has stood in less conservative France.

#### 4. 'Undenominational.'

4. The *Evening Post* furthermore asserts that the utter exclusion of religion from its olden place in the schools, renders these schools 'undenominational,' and rescues them from the ogre of 'denominationalism' (March 9).

*Reply:* (a) This assertion (like Nos. 2 and 3) is not a statement of a Christian view of life, and of its duties and destiny. Much less is it a justification, on a Christian view of life, of that secular school system which atheists and other unbelievers defend on an anti-Christian view of life. This assertion of 'undenominationalism' is, therefore, irrelevant to the present phase of this discussion. (b) Once more, the *Post's* assertion assumes—what it ought to prove—that the State has, on Christian principles, a moral right to drive religion from the prescriptive place which, from immemorial ages, it has occupied in the schools. (c) The terms 'denominational' and 'undenominational' are among the shibboleths and catch-words that pass for 'argument' with practically all of the journalistic and political supporters of the godless system of public instruction. This sort of 'argument' is based upon a misconception of the meaning of the word 'denomination' and 'denominational.' Lord Brabourne (better known in the British political and literary world as Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) 'pinked' with gentle railery this fallacy of 'denominationalism' in a pamphlet published in London in 1872. 'Now,' wrote he, 'do not let us be frightened at that word. I have often noticed that when people in this country want to get up a cry against something or other, they give it a long name. It is astonishing how far a long name goes with some people. I have known measures condemned before they were half understood, because grandiloquent orators had declared that they were akin to "centralisation," which is a terrible word; and "denominational" is another instance of the same kind of thing. But "denomination," as you very well know, is only a longer word, meaning the same thing as "name" or "title." A denominational school is, therefore, only a school called by a particular name, or a school founded by people who are called by a particular name; therefore, a secularist school, from which religion is excluded, is just as much a denominational school as any other; and the more correct name for other schools would be "anti-secularist" or "religious-teaching" schools.' The substance of this quotation appears on page 13 of the Pastoral Letter over which the present discussion arose. The *Evening Post* has not so much as mentioned, much less 'refuted,' this argument of Lord Brabourne. (d) The denominational and sectarian character of our purely secular school system is further emphasised by the series of religious dogmas which are necessarily involved and implied in that system. (e) Here is an allied assertion of the *Evening Post* of February 25: that to Catholic children, the secular schools are at present open on the terms of perfect equality.' But (1) what is the evi-

dence of this 'perfect equality'? None has, thus far, been advanced. (2) How is this (unproven) 'perfect equality' to be reconciled with the unanswered facts and arguments that appear on pp. 11, 12, 41. (3) We all know that the utter exclusion of religion, by law, from the schools, suits directly and exactly the view of the atheists and other unbelievers who hold that there is no God to worship, no undying soul to save, and no future life to train children for. To demonstrate its unproven assertion of 'perfect equality,' the *Post* must show that the exclusion of religion from the schools suits just as directly and exactly the view of life of Catholics and others who believe in God, in an immortal soul, in moral responsibility to God, and in a future life of rewards and punishments, for which school education is (to them) a partial but most important preparation. This 'ugly proposition' the *Post* has avoided as if it were the cholera morbus. (4) The godless schools are 'open' to Catholic children. So are rationalists' and free thinkers' conventicles. But there is this important difference: Catholics are not compelled—under penalty of distress or imprisonment—to pay taxes for the endowment of either the explicit or even the implied dogmas taught in these conventicles. All this has been urged, in various forms, during the present discussion. And it has not been set aside. The reader is also referred to the other remarks on the 'neutrality' fallacy given above.

#### III.—The 'Taxation' Fallacy.

In its issue of February 25, the *Evening Post* devoted a leading article to the Pastoral Letter that appears at the beginning of this publication. The *Post* there quoted my words: 'We (Catholics), at least, require neither State patronage nor State pay for our religious dogmas.' The *Post*, moreover, accepted this quoted statement as the text on which to hang its criticisms. Later on, under the stress of discussion, it rose to higher temperatures, and, in its issue of March 22, began those grave misrepresentations of my plain words which form so regrettable a feature of its controversial methods. From March 22 onwards, it steadily referred to the union of religion with State-aided secular instruction as 'a policy of religious endowment,' 'to subsidise religious teaching,' to 'support it with rates and taxes,' and so on.

*Reply:* (a) On and after its 'break' of March 22, the *Post's* repeated statements, in this connection, could have had no other effect but to convey to its readers this idea: that the thing its Catholic opponent demands is an 'endowment,' a 'subsidy,' 'rates and taxes,' for the support of religious teaching in the schools. (b) From its very first article, the *Post* well knew that such an idea was entirely groundless, and contrary to the plain and emphatic words of the Pastoral Letter—besides being contrary to the notorious facts of 'the Catholic demand,' which are well known to every wide-awake pressman in New Zealand. In all the circumstances of the case, the *Post* might properly be expected to have taken especial care to avoid reasonable risks of misunderstanding, or of the conveying of misleading impressions, in this connection. (c) All this talk about 'endowments,' 'subsidies,' etc., comes with none too good a grace from the Christian champion of a system that is built up and financed upon the series of implied sectarian dogmas that are set forth in part on pp. 11, 41. (d) But what if the re-union of religion with education necessarily meant (as it certainly does not) the public subsidising of religious instruction? How would this circumstance justify—on a Christian view of life, and of its duties and destiny—that self-same secular system which atheists and other unbelievers defend on a view of life that is anti-Christian? That is the radical problem to which we always get back. The 'taxation' fallacy is not even a statement of a 'philosophy' or view of life. And on a view of life this whole discussion pivots.

(To be continued.)