

THE SCHOOL VOUCHER CRISIS

**A POSITION PAPER FROM
THE CENTER FOR INQUIRY
OFFICE OF PUBLIC POLICY**

**IN COOPERATION WITH
AMERICANS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY**

AUTHOR: EDD DOERR

DATED: OCTOBER 2012

**REVIEWING COMMITTEE: DEREK ARAUJO, JD; MICHAEL
DE DORA, MA; RONALD A. LINDSAY, JD, PhD**



Copyright © 2012 Center for Inquiry, Inc. Permission is granted for this material to be shared for noncommercial, educational purposes, provided that this notice appears on the reproduced materials, the full authoritative version is retained, and copies are not altered. To disseminate otherwise or to publish requires written permission from the Center for Inquiry, Inc.

Introduction

Should government(s) compel taxpayers to support religion-based and other private schools? This question has vexed the United States—and such other countries as Great Britain, Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, the Netherlands, and France—for over two centuries. Controversies over this question extend back to the beginning of the American republic but have been intensifying over the past half century, reaching crisis proportions since the elections of 2010.

In 2011, Indiana’s Republican legislature and governor passed a school voucher bill more expansive than any legislation previously adopted by any state. In 2012, Louisiana’s Republican-dominated legislature and governor passed the most radical, far-reaching plan for public funding of religion-based and other private schools in our history. In November of 2012, Florida voters will be asked to decide in a referendum to approve an amendment to the state constitution to allow tax aid to church-based schools. In May of 2012, presidential candidate Mitt Romney expressed support for school vouchers in his platform.

Combined with this drive to provide public funding for religious and other private schools has been an unprecedented tsunami of assaults on the public schools serving 90% of our K-12 students. These assaults involve wholesale slashing of public school budgets, layoffs of teachers and other school personnel, increases of class sizes, elimination of instructional and other programs, intense propaganda campaigns against teachers and teacher unions, and attacks on the very idea of religiously neutral, democratic public education.

Together, this two-front war on religious freedom and public education constitutes nothing short of a major national crisis.

This position paper will show how this crisis is among the most serious in our history, and how it could have profound, perhaps irreversible, effects on our future. It will argue that Americans have both the power and the duty to end the threats to our most important principles and institutions.

This paper will place the school voucher and related issues in historical perspective and show that all plans and programs for diverting public funds to religion-based and other private schools are inimical to the vital interests of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

For the purpose of this paper, school vouchers will be defined as payments from public treasuries—federal, state, or local—to cover all or part of the tuition and other costs at private schools, about 90% of which are church-related and generally “pervasively sectarian.”¹ Voucher

plans exist in almost infinite variety. They may, for example, be keyed to family income. Important variants of voucher plans are tuition tax-credit plans (sometimes referred to as “tax-code vouchers”), involving full or limited tax credits for parents or corporations or other entities that pay for tuition at nonpublic schools.² Other plans for channeling public funds have included bus transportation, textbook loans, audio-visual equipment, and part-time utilization of public schools (so-called “shared time”).

Background

Beginning in 1607, a diverse collection of people began settling the eastern coast of North America. They came from England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Africa (under duress) and elsewhere. Among them were Anglicans, Congregationalists (Puritans and Pilgrims), Roman Catholics, Baptists, Methodists, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Jews, Quakers, Mennonites, and Dutch Reformed. Many came for greater religious freedom, although most of the colonies they set up practiced varying degrees of intolerance toward dissenters and generally compelled tax support for religion.

From humble beginnings these disparate people established the most advanced free nation in the world. Central to this process was the development of a nonsectarian public school system and the generally accepted constitutional principle of separation of church and state—of religion and government.

The separation principle, though articulated in the early seventeenth century by Roger Williams, had to wait for Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and other Virginians to be implemented. In the same year that the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Virginia legislature voted to disestablish the Anglican Church and expand religious freedom. Because they thought this initial step toward disestablishment did not go far enough, Jefferson, Madison, and Baptist and Presbyterian leaders began a drive to completely separate church and state. Their efforts led to the passage in 1786 of Jefferson’s Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom. This Act ended legal compulsion to attend church services and barred tax support for religious institutions. It provided that “no man . . . shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or beliefs, but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge or affect their civil capacities.”³

By the time the First Amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1791, all the states guaranteed religious liberty to a large degree and only four retained substantial vestiges of religious establishments. As Leo Pfeffer has pointed out, the movement toward separation of church and state began with gradual extensions of religious liberty, then saw single establishments give way to multiple establishments, and ended with the cessation of all tax aid for religious institutions. Pfeffer adds:

It is important to note that in no case did the development end until complete disestablishment was arrived at: no state stopped with according freedom of worship, or indeed with less than complete prohibition of tax support of any and all religions. Moreover, every state that entered the union after the Constitution was adopted incorporated both prohibitions in the constitution or basic laws. In no case was there any attempt to establish any denomination or religion; on the contrary, in varying language but with a single spirit, all states expressly forbade such attempt. This deliberate decision was not motivated by indifference to religion: most of the states had been settled by deeply religious pioneers. Nor was it dictated by purely practical considerations; many of the states had a population far more homogenous religiously than Canada, Holland, or even England. ... The decision was in all cases voluntary; and it was made because the unitary principle of separation and freedom was as integral a part of American democracy as republicanism, representative government, and freedom of expression.

Not only did the first thirteen states all follow the example set by Virginia and the First Amendment, but from 1876 onward all new states added to the Union were required by Congress to include in their basic laws an irreversible ordinance guaranteeing religious freedom in accordance with the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment. The constitutions of the two most recent states added to the Union after World War II, Alaska and Hawaii, both contain strong provisions prohibiting diversion of public funds to religious institutions. Furthermore, when Congress considered and approved the constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico after World War II, that charter not only reiterated the Establishment and Free Exercise Clauses of the First Amendment, but it also included the stipulation that “There shall be complete separation of church and state.” Church-state separation

is an integral part of America's heritage, not—as today's Religious Right would have it—some minor footnote to history to be dismissed lightly.

The Constitution drafted in 1787 proscribed religious tests for public office and provided for an affirmation instead of an oath of office, but it did not otherwise define the relationship between the federal government and religion. The absence of a specific religious freedom guarantee bothered Jefferson and others. Six states ratified the Constitution but insisted on a religious freedom amendment. Rhode Island and North Carolina declined to ratify it until a bill of rights was adopted.

Shortly after his election to the House of Representatives, Madison introduced a compilation of proposals for a bill of rights to be added. Congress considered several versions of a religious liberty provision before adopting the following wording of what is now the First Amendment: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

President Jefferson, in a carefully thought-out 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptist Association, declared that these words built a “wall of separation between church and state.” The “no establishment” clause was noted by the Supreme Court as early as 1878 in *Reynolds v. U.S.*, but was best and most succinctly interpreted by the Supreme Court in the 1947 *Everson v. Board of Education* ruling. The Court stated:

The “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect “a wall of separation between church and state.”

Some conservatives have asserted that the Establishment Clause was intended to prevent the setting up of a single established or preferred church, but most authorities have agreed with Leo Pfeffer that the *Everson v. Board of Education* interpretation is correct.

The American public school

While it would be impossible to do justice to the complex history of public education in America in this paper, a brief encapsulation is necessary to put into perspective the current wave of assaults on public education and church-state separation.

During the colonial period American education was almost entirely a religious and private matter. In Puritan New England education was quasi-religious, quasi-public. In the middle colonies, with their greater religious diversity, church-related schooling was the rule. What formal education existed in the Anglican South was mainly private. As religious tolerance and pluralism grew, the church gradually faded from the New England educational scene, and the community-controlled public school evolved, setting the pattern for the rest of the country. Following the political and economic upheavals of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, church-related and private education diminished as true public schools proliferated.

Early nineteenth-century public schools tended to be somewhat religious in orientation, but Horace Mann and other leaders successfully struggled to move the schools to a position of non-denominationalism—at least with regard to most Protestant denominations. Protestant Bible reading and prayers, which discriminated against the growing numbers of Catholic and Jewish children, were common and were generally upheld by the state courts. Catholic children were sometimes punished or expelled from schools for refusing to participate in essentially Protestant exercises.

Catholic parochial schools developed largely in response to the generally Protestant slant of public schools in the mid-nineteenth century. By the early 1960s, Catholic private schools in the United States enrolled as many as 5.5 million students, perhaps one-half the number of Catholic children of school age.⁴ However, between the mid-1960s and 2012 Catholic school K-12 enrollment declined to about two million students, and there was an influx of Catholic students in public schools. This was due to the sharp post-World War II drop-off in anti-Catholic prejudice, the election of a Catholic president in 1960, the liberalizing of the Second Vatican Council of

1962–65, the negative Catholic reaction to the 1968 Vatican condemnation of contraception, and the bishops' unbendingly conservative positions on a number of key social issues.⁵

As early as 1872, the Ohio Supreme Court held that school boards could exclude Bible reading.⁶ In 1910, the Illinois Supreme Court, in a case brought by Catholic parents, held that school-mandated or school-sponsored Bible reading was constitutionally prohibited religious instruction, even when dissenting children could opt out.⁷ An increasingly pluralistic population not only exerted pressure to move the schools closer and closer to religious neutrality but also ensured that the courts would eventually have to settle the continuing disputes.

In 1948, the Supreme Court ruled in *McCollum v. Board of Education*⁸ that voluntary “released time” religious instruction held in public schools violated the First Amendment, although four years later in *Zorach v. Clausen*⁹ the Court would hold that such instruction held off public school premises was not prohibited. In 1962, the Court decided in *Engel v. Vitale*¹⁰ that recitation in public schools of a prayer formulated by the New York State Board of Regents violated the First Amendment, holding that “it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of American people to recite as part of a religious program carried on by the government.” The following year the Court struck down state-mandated Bible reading and recitation of the Lord’s Prayer in *Abington School District v. Schempp*.¹¹ Religious censorship of public school curricula was dealt a blow in 1968 when the Court voided an Arkansas law designed to prevent the exposure of students to the theory of evolution. This in turn was reinforced in 1987, when the Supreme Court voted 7-2 in *Edwards v. Aguillard*¹² to strike down Louisiana’s “equal time for creationism in public schools” law.

The Supreme Court, in ruling unconstitutional religious instruction and devotional activities in public schools, was neither exhibiting hostility toward religion nor prohibiting public schools from dealing with religion in ways that do not violate the First Amendment. The court pointed out in *Schempp*, for example, that the Bible may be used as a reference work and that schools may offer teaching *about* religion objectively and neutrally, as distinguished from the teaching *of* religion.

All attempts to get Congress to approve proposed amendments to the Constitution to permit “voluntary” or “nondenominational” prayer in public schools have failed. Responsible religious leaders have opposed such amendments, recognizing that all students are free to pray privately in school and that the nation has no shortage of houses of worship.

Over the years, then, the American people have developed a comprehensive system of public schools about which Justice William Brennan could write in his concurring opinion in *Schempp*:

The public schools are supported entirely, in most communities, by public funds—funds exacted not only from parents, nor from those who hold particular religious views, nor indeed from those who subscribe to any creed at all. It is implicit in the history and character of American public education that the public schools serve a uniquely public function: the training of American citizens in an atmosphere free of parochial, divisive, or separatist influence of any sort—an atmosphere in which children may assimilate a heritage common to all American groups and religions. This is a heritage neither theistic nor atheistic, but simply civic and patriotic.

It is clear now that the pan-Protestant flavor of many of our schools disappeared after the school prayer and creationism rulings (though this development tended to upset Protestant fundamentalists). The vestiges of anti-Catholicism largely vanished with these rulings, along with the aforementioned events of the 1960s that helped precipitate a decline in Catholic private school enrollment from 5.5 million in 1965 to two million in 2012, and an increase in Catholic students in public schools.¹³

International comparisons

Some perspective on the school voucher controversy can be gained with a brief overview.

Great Britain. The United Kingdom began tax subsidies for Church of England schools in 1833 and to Catholic, Methodist, and other schools by 1870. Only after 1870 did the United Kingdom set up what Americans call public schools. (“Public” schools in the United Kingdom are actually private schools.)¹⁴

Ireland. Virtually all schools are tax-supported church-related schools. However, in 2012 this may begin to change in reaction to the clergy sexual abuse scandals and cover-ups.¹⁵

Northern Ireland. Has adopted a modified form of the U.K. system. Nearly all Catholic children attend tax-supported Catholic schools, while the public schools are understandably Protestant oriented.¹⁶

The Netherlands. Public education was well developed by 1860, when 79% of students attended public schools. Catholic and Reformed Church leaders waged a long campaign to obtain tax support. Their goal was achieved a century ago by pastor and Prime Minister Abraham Kuyper, a figure much admired by American religious ultraconservatives.¹⁷

France. Beginning early in the twentieth century, French education was public, free, compulsory, and secular. During World War II Petain's collaborationist government permitted religious teachers to return to public schools, and by the late 1950s the DeGaulle government had begun public subsidies for Catholic schools.¹⁸

Canada. Practice varies by province in Canada. Ontario supports public and Catholic schools, under the British North America Act of 1867, but not Protestant or Jewish schools.¹⁹ Newfoundland presents an interesting case. The province became part of Canada in 1949. It had no public schools but five systems of church-related private schools. This was so unsatisfactory that in the 2000s the provincial government voted to replace the arrangement with religiously neutral public schools. Three-fourths of Newfoundland voters ratified the new arrangement at the polls.²⁰

Australia. After World War II, Australian politics saw extensive battles over religious freedom issues, ending with both federal and state tax aid to church-related private schools. Although Australia's constitution contains an establishment clause modeled on the U.S. First Amendment, the country's highest court in the 1970s chose to ignore it in the case brought by the D.O.G.S. (Defense of Government Schools) organization. (The author and American attorney Leo Pfeffer were involved in bringing the lawsuit.)²¹

The case against school vouchers

With this background, it is time to examine the very substantial case against school vouchers and similar plans. But first, we should take a look at the arguments for vouchers. They fly the banners of "choice," "parental choice," and "competition."

The "choice" mantra is deceptive. It carefully avoids calling attention to the fact that it is the private school that chooses which children to admit, which children and teachers to exclude, which religion or ideology to promote, and which ideas to censor (such as evolution or climate change or reproductive choice).

However, the proponents of “school choice” deny choice to taxpayers who do not wish to voluntarily or involuntarily support religious institutions, particularly those that target their own religious views as wrong or abhorrent.

As for the purported benefits of competition among schools, it is patently false that Catholic, Lutheran, Seventh-day Adventist, Baptist, Pentecostal, Jewish, Muslim, or other religion-related private schools compete for the same students.

As the case against school vouchers is multifaceted, this paper will break it down into several discrete arguments. As some readers will give more weight to some arguments over others, their order of presentation will not be prioritized.

Vouchers and religious freedom

About 90% of nonpublic schools are religion based: Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, Seventh-day Adventist, Episcopal, Christian Reformed, “Christian,” Friends (Quakers), Muslim, and independent evangelical.²² These schools are not merely similar to public schools with a religion class added; they tend to be pervasively religious. Selection of teachers, administrators, and textbooks is strongly influenced by religious criteria. Religion-related schools promote sectarian teachings on such matters as reproductive choice, evolution, history, and gay rights. While Catholic schools tend to use much the same books as public schools, Albert Menendez shows in his book *Visions of Reality: What Fundamentalist Schools Teach* (Prometheus Books, 1993) that this large segment of private schools uses textbooks so religiously slanted and wildly sectarian that they could never be adopted by public schools.

Compelling taxpayers to support religion-related private schools, directly or indirectly, is a serious violation of religious freedom. As James Madison noted in his magisterial 1785 Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments, “It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties,” and “Who does not see that the same authority which can ... force a citizen to contribute three pence only of his property for the support of any one [religious] establishment, may force him to confirm to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever.”²³

Benjamin Franklin’s view was: “When a religion is good, I conceive it will support itself; and when it does not support itself, and God does not take care to support it so that its professors

are obliged to call for the help of the civil power, 'tis a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.”²⁴

Forcing citizen-taxpayers to contribute directly or indirectly to private schools is tantamount to forcing a Catholic to support a Baptist school, a Jew to support a Muslim school, and a Unitarian to support a fundamentalist school.

Vouchers and public opinion

By virtually every measure a strong majority of Americans across the political and religious spectra is opposed to school vouchers. For 40 years the annual Gallup/Phi Delta Kappa education polls have registered opposition to school vouchers. The most recent, in 2011, showed opposition at 65% to 34%.

Even more significant are the 27 statewide referenda over a four-decade span in which literally millions of Americans have voted directly on vouchers, tax code vouchers, amendments to state constitutions to allow tax aid to religion-related and other private schools, and lesser forms of aid. The 27 referenda are summarized in Table 1.

Averaging these percentages shows opposition to tax aid for nonpublic schools at 63% to 36.5%. However, adjusting these votes to take into account the actual populations of the states involved shows opposition at 65.9% to 34.1%, almost exactly the same as the 2011 Gallup/PDK poll.

Further analysis of these referendum votes shows opposition to vouchers at 66.5% to 33.5% in eight referenda and to tax code vouchers in five referenda at 68.6% to 31.4%. Combining the figures for vouchers and tax code vouchers shows opposition at 67.3% to 32.7% in 13 referenda. Opposition to amendments to state constitutions to allow tax aid for nonpublic schools in six states averaged 62.3% to 37.7%. The average for all 19 referenda is 65.7% to 34.3%.

Average opposition to relatively more minor forms of tax aid for nonpublic schools in eight referenda comes to 56.5% to 43.5%.

These referendum results clearly show that opposition to the two main types of vouchers and permissive constitutional change in 19 referenda is two to one, while opposition to minor or more peripheral forms of aid in eight referenda is slightly less.

Table 1
The Statewide Referenda on School Vouchers or Their Variants, 1966-2007²⁵

Nebraska	1966 Bus transportation	57-43 against (%)
New York	1967 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	72-28 against
Nebraska	1970 Tax code vouchers	57-43 against
Michigan	1970 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	57-43 against
Oregon	1972 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	61-39 against
Idaho	1972 Bus transportation	57-43 against
Maryland	1972 Vouchers	55-45 against
Maryland	1974 Auxiliary services	56-43 against
Washington State	1975 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	60-39 against
Alaska	1976 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	54-46 against
Missouri	1976 Auxiliary services	60-40 against
Michigan	1978 Vouchers	74-26 against
Washington, DC	1981 Tax code vouchers	89-11 against
California	1982 Textbook aid	61-39 against
Massachusetts	1982 Auxiliary services	62-38 against
Massachusetts	1986 Constitutional change to allow tax aid	70-30 against
South Dakota	1986 Textbooks	54-46 for
Utah	1988 Tax code vouchers	70-30 against
Oregon	1990 Tax code vouchers	67-33 against
Colorado	1992 Vouchers	67-33 against
California	1993 Vouchers	70-30 against
Washington State	1996 Vouchers	64-36 against
Colorado	1998 Tax code vouchers	60-40 against
Michigan	2000 Vouchers	69-31 against
California	2000 Vouchers	71-29 against
South Dakota	2004 Auxiliary services	53-47 against
Utah	2007 Vouchers	62-38 against

With respect to the subject of public opinion, it is noteworthy that the annual Gallup/PDK polls ask respondents to give letter grades (A, B, C, D, F) to public schools. Because the results are similar each year, the most recent, in 2011, is illustrative. Gallup found that only 17% gave an A or B grade to public schools nationwide, 51% gave an A or B to schools in their community, but 79% gave an A or B to the public school attended by their oldest child. In other words, the average parent’s attitude toward public schools may be paraphrased as, “My child’s school is good, the other schools in town are so-so, and the schools nationally are awful.” Put another way, parents tend to view the school they know best as fine but the rest of the schools are not as good, and the farther away the public schools are, the worse they are perceived to be.

What can explain this trend? One credible explanation is that conservatives and conservative media tend not only to favor diversion of public funds to church-related and other private schools but also to lose few opportunities to criticize public schools, teachers, and especially the teacher unions that protect the interests of the teaching profession, the schools, and the students. Americans are accustomed to hearing or reading such comments as these: “They kicked God out of the schools and let blacks in”; “Teachers are overpaid”; “Public schools teach evolution and other ‘secular humanist’ and ‘anti-Christian’ ideas.”

Interestingly, when Gallup asked respondents to rate teachers in their local schools, 69% gave a grade of A or B. But when asked to rate the parents of school children, only 36% gave an A or B.

Vouchers, public schools, and public policy

Expansion of voucher and tax code voucher plans is inimical to religiously neutral democratic public education. The many reasons for opposing vouchers are discussed below. Each is valid by itself, but in the aggregate they make a devastatingly comprehensive case for opposing any and all school voucher plans, large or small, federal or state.

- Because of the pervasively sectarian nature of the 90% or so of nonpublic schools, voucher plans would fragment our school population along religious, ideological, class, ethnic, ability level, and other lines. Jewish parents, for instance, generally will not send their children to Christian or Muslim schools; Catholic parents will not send theirs to Jewish or Protestant schools; Evangelicals will not send theirs to Catholic schools; and moderate to liberal parents will not send their kids to schools that denigrate women’s rights, reproductive choice, and evolution.

The book *Catholic Schools: The Facts* (Americans for Religious Liberty, 2000), based primarily on data from official Catholic school sources, provides revealing information about the structure of the nonpublic school system. The data show that urban Catholic schools enroll only one-third the percentage of students in the lowest quartile of socioeconomic status as public schools and twice as many in the highest quartile.

Voucher supporters sometimes make much of the fact that some urban Catholic schools have admitted African American students to replace the white Catholic students whose families departed for the suburbs and send their children to suburban public schools. However,

complaints have been numerous that the urban Catholic schools try to convert Protestant children to Catholicism.²⁶

- Vouchers tend, for obvious mathematical reasons, to favor larger religious traditions over smaller ones. The flow of public funds to existing church-related schools would motivate other religious groups to enter the school business to get their “fair share” of the largesse. Expansion of private schools necessarily means shrinkage of public schools.

- The religious and ideological compartmentalization of education would lead to religious and ideological tests for hiring, firing, and promoting teachers. Teaching would become an increasingly splintered and unattractive profession, especially as tenure, collective bargaining, and unions are frowned upon by nonpublic schools.

- Most religion-based private schools are unfriendly toward women’s rights, reproductive choice, and LGBT rights and interests. Vouchers would deal these interests a severe blow.

- Most religion-based schools are hostile to the teaching of evolution and the science of climate change. Vouchers would thus weaken science literacy.

- Given the vast array of competing religions and ideologies, vouchers could only adversely affect economies of scale. Administrative costs would rise, staff compensation would shrink.

- About half of K-12 students require bus transportation. As public and nonpublic school attendance areas rarely coincide, as nonpublic schools serve more geographically-scattered constituencies, and as at present most nonpublic schools benefit from tax-supported school bus service, voucher-aided private school expansion would greatly increase school transportation needs and costs, further clogging our streets with big yellow school buses.

- Someone is sure to speculate that private schools could not accommodate a huge influx of students with tax-paid vouchers. But the shrinking of public school enrollment would render some public school buildings superfluous. Local governments would likely find it expedient to sell off the unused buildings. Further, the drop in Catholic school enrollment from 5.5 million in 1965 to two million in 2012 leaves a lot of space for private school expansion. Then, too, there are 300,000 or so houses of worship in the United States with religious education facilities used only on Sunday mornings. If just 100,000 of these would each provide space for 200 students, ten million children could be accommodated in new private schools at minimal additional expense.

- Finally, as this paper was being drafted in mid-June 2012, the U.S. Senate and House Appropriations Committees provided new funding (\$13.5 and \$20 million, respectively) for the District of Columbia school voucher program, passed under the George W. Bush administration. However, as pointed out in a July 14, 2012, letter by 50 educational, religious, and civil rights organizations belonging to the National Committee for Public Education (NCPE), the program is ineffective:

All four of the congressionally-mandated U.S. Department of Education (USED) studies that have analyzed the DC voucher program concluded that it did not significantly improve reading or math achievement, leaving no justification for continuing its funding. The USED studies further found that the voucher program had no effect on student satisfaction, motivation or engagement, or student views on school safety. The studies also indicated that many of the students in the voucher program were less likely to have access to key services such as ESL programs, learning supports, special education supports and services, and counselors than students who were not part of the program. Having failed to improve the academic achievement and school experience of the students in the program, the voucher program clearly does not warrant continued funding.

The bottom line

If public funds are available for private schools through vouchers or tax-code vouchers, religious and other private interests will greatly expand their presence in the education business. Children will be moved out of religiously and ideologically neutral democratic public schools responsible to elected school boards and subject to laws designed to protect the equal rights of students and staff.

Vouchers, if not stopped and rolled back, will ultimately undermine public education, weaken religious freedom, shred our American constitutional principle of separation of church and state, and negatively impact community harmony.

Voucher plans have tended to start small but expand significantly with time. Wisconsin's plan applied at first to private schools solely in one city, Milwaukee. Two decades later, the plan had been expanded significantly. Similarly, Ohio's plan, which started a bit later, was confined initially to Cleveland. The plan originally applied only to low-income families, but the eligibility

limit has been relaxed incrementally. Some plans are limited—at first—to special needs children, but once a crack is allowed to appear in the church-state separation dike, it is expanded to allow an increasing stream of money to flow to nonpublic schools.

The actions of voucher proponents make clear that their goal is full public support of a growing multiplicity of religion-based and other special interest private schools along with the slow death by strangulation of public education. For example, in 2011 Indiana's legislature passed and Republican governor Mitch Daniels signed what was, at the time, the most extensive voucher plan in the nation. In 2012 Louisiana surpassed Indiana when its Republican legislature approved and Republican governor Bobby Jindal signed the most sweeping legislation ever to pour taxpayers' money into private schools. The new voucher program has loosened income-eligibility requirements, lifted caps on the number of vouchers issued, and expanded into charter schools (a subject beyond the scope of this paper). The legislation was also accompanied by harsh attacks on public school teachers. Only days later, Arizona's Republican governor and legislature expanded eligibility for vouchers for private school tuition, tutoring, and online classes, which so far have not been shown to be effective.

Vouchers and the law

The law surrounding voucher plans is complicated because the states take various approaches to the issue of public funding of nonpublic and religious schools. Thirty-eight state constitutions prohibit the use of public funds for religious institutions, with greater or lesser degrees of clarity. (These provisions may be conveniently accessed in the book *Religious Liberty and State Constitutions*, Prometheus Books, 1993, edited by Albert Menendez and the author of this paper.) These provisions have proven to be a barrier to most attempts at the state level to divert public funds to nonpublic schools. Indeed, these barriers have led to five unsuccessful attempts to amend state constitutions to weaken prohibitions on government funding of religious education, and one successful campaign to strengthen a state constitution's prohibition against government funding of religious education. A brief survey of these six campaigns follows below.

State constitutions can be amended in various ways, including legislative approval or approval by two legislative sessions with an intervening election. Every state but Delaware requires that amendments be ratified in a voter referendum, which would require either a 50% or even 60% approval.

The first of the six referenda was held in New York State on November 7, 1967. In 1966 advocates of tax aid to church schools succeeded in electing a majority of delegates to a state constitutional convention, which predictably voted to replace the strict church-state separation provision in the state charter, Article XI, Section 3:

Neither the state nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught, but the legislature may provide for the transportation of children to and from any school or institution of learning.

The campaign to ratify the change was intense. When the nearly five million votes in the November 7, 1967, referendum were counted, 72% of New York voters had upheld the anti-aid provision.

The second referendum was held in Michigan in 1970. While the Michigan constitution already prohibited tax aid for church-related schools, lawmakers in Lansing kept trying to pass legislation to aid church-related schools. Exasperated, education leaders in the state decided to amend the constitution to strengthen the existing constitutional prohibition. This involved drafting an amendment and petitioning it onto the ballot. (The author helped write the amendment and later traveled the state to promote it.) After a hard-fought campaign, voters approved the strengthening amendment by 57% to 43%. The strengthened Michigan constitutional provision reads as follows:

Article I, Section 4. . . . No person shall be compelled to attend, or against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the state be appropriated for any such purpose. . . . Article VIII, Section 2. . . . No public monies or property shall be appropriated or paid or any public credit utilized, by the legislature or any

other political subdivision or agency of the state directly or indirectly to aid or maintain any private, denominational or other nonpublic preelementary, elementary, or secondary school. No payment, credit, tax benefit, exemption of deductions, tuition voucher, subsidy, grant or loan of public monies or property shall be provided, directly or indirectly, to support the attendance of any student or the employment of any person at any such nonpublic school or at any location or institution where instruction is offered in whole or in part to such nonpublic school students.

Referenda specifically on vouchers were held in Michigan in 1978 and 2000. Vouchers were defeated by 74% to 26% in 1978 and by 69% to 31% in 2000.

Attempts were made to amend state constitutions to allow tax aid to church schools in Oregon in 1972 (defeated by 61% to 39%), in Washington State in 1975 (defeated by 60% to 39%), in Alaska in 1976 (defeated by 54% to 46%), and in Massachusetts in 1986 (defeated by 70% to 30%). The relevant provisions of these last four states are as follows:

- Oregon: “Article I, Section 5. ... No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious or theological institution, ...”
- Washington State: “Article I, Section 11. Religious Freedom. ... No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment. ...” And: “Article IX, Section 4. ... All Schools maintained or supported wholly or in part by the public funds shall be forever free from sectarian control or influence.”
- Alaska: “Article IX. Section 10. No tax shall be laid or appropriation of public money in aid of any church, or sectarian school, ...”
- Massachusetts: “Article XVIII, Section 2. No grant, appropriation of the use of public money or property or loan of credit shall ever be authorized by the Commonwealth or any political subdivision thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any ... institution, primary or secondary school or charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and supervision of public officers or public agents authorized by the Commonwealth. ...”

Wisconsin and Ohio are the first two states to have succeeded in instituting school voucher plans. Unfortunately their constitutions provide only weak and vague protection against use of

public funds for church-related schools. However, it is instructive to look at the constitutions of three states whose Republican legislatures have enacted voucher plans in 2011 and 2012:

Indiana, Florida, and Louisiana.

- Indiana: “Article I, Section 4. No preference shall be given by law, to any creed, religious society, or mode of worship; and no man shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support, any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent.” And: “Article I, Section 6. No money shall be drawn from the treasury, for the benefit of any religious or theological institution.”

- Florida: “Article I, Section 3. ... No revenue of the state or any political subdivision or agency thereof shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect, or religious denomination or in aid of any sectarian institution.”

- Louisiana: until 1974, the Louisiana constitution clearly forbade tax aid to religious institutions in Article IV, Section 8 (“No money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister, or teacher thereof”) and Article XII, Section 13. However, in 1974 the entire Louisiana constitution was replaced in order to extend property tax exemptions, and in the process the strict separation language was replaced simply by the wording of the U.S. First Amendment, which in 1974 had a stronger meaning than the Supreme Court began applying in 2002 via *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*.

One can reasonably conclude that the Republican governors and legislatures of Indiana, Florida, and Louisiana in 2011 and 2012 have paid little heed to their states’ constitutional restrictions or to public opinion, which, as we have seen, consistently opposes vouchers and their variants. Worse still, they failed to propose appropriate constitutional amendments so that voters could say yea or nay.

We come now to the question of how vouchers or their analogs square with the United States Constitution. The answer is murky.

As we have seen, in 1947 in *Everson v. Board of Education* the Supreme Court held that:

No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal government can, openly or secretly,

participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect “a wall of separation between church and state.”

All nine justices joined that paragraph, but the Court ruled 5-4 that New Jersey’s provision of bus transportation for church-related schools did not cross the constitutional line.

Five years later, in *Zorach v. Clausen*—a ruling upholding “released time” religious instruction during school hours but not on school premises—Justice William O. Douglas, who cast the deciding vote in *Everson v. Board of Education*, wrote that in that case he had voted wrongly. But the damage was already done.

Although President John F. Kennedy favored federal aid for public schools and opposed tax aid for church-related schools, Congress was unable to pass any federal aid legislation. However, President Lyndon B. Johnson’s sweep of the 1964 elections allowed him to pass Kennedy’s aid to education package in 1965. Some aid for religion-related schools was included, though Leo Pfeffer, the leading authority on church-state law, insisted that federal aid without aid for church schools had had the votes to pass. Thought was given to a court challenge to federal aid to church schools, but the question of legal “standing” stood in the way. Since 1924 the Supreme Court did not recognize taxpayers “standing” to sue in federal court merely to challenge public expenditures on First Amendment grounds. However, two rulings in 1968 opened the door to “taxpayer standing” on limited grounds. One ruling, in the *Flast v. Cohen* case argued before the Court by Senator Sam Ervin (D-TN), granted taxpayer standing in Establishment Clause cases. But the other ruling, while recognizing taxpayer standing to challenge Establishment Clause violations, ultimately upheld a New York law that allowed tax-paid textbook loans to church-related schools. The Court in these rulings effectively opened the door to legal challenges to tax aid for church schools but also sent a message that such challenges might not fare well. This dilemma delayed any federal court challenge to such aid.

Defenders of public education and religious freedom breathed easier when the Supreme Court ruled 8 to 1 in 1971 in *Lemon v. Kurtzman*²⁷ against Pennsylvania and Rhode Island programs of tax aid to church-related schools. The Pennsylvania program allowed the state to “purchase” specified “secular educational services” from nonpublic schools, while the Rhode Island plan authorized the state to supplement the salaries of church school teachers. It is

important to note that *Lemon v. Kurtzman* was based on extensive showing of evidence of the pervasively religious nature of the schools.

Lemon v. Kurtzman was followed by similar decisions in 1973 in *Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty v. Nyquist*²⁸ and *Sloan v. Lemon*; in 1975 in *Meek v. Pittinger*²⁹; in 1985 in *Grand Rapids v. Ball*³⁰ and *Aguilar v. Felton*³¹; and in 1994 in *Board of Education of Kiryas Joel v. Grumet*.³²

However, the ground shifted in 1997 when the court in *Agostini v. Felton*³³ voted 5-4 to reverse its ruling in *Grand Rapids v. Ball* and *Aguilar v. Felton*, thanks to the appointment to the Court of Justices Antonin Scalia and Clarence Thomas by Presidents Reagan and Bush I.

A final blow was dealt in 2002 in *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*³⁴ when the Court voted 5-4 to uphold the Ohio school voucher plan. In his stinging dissent Justice David Souter charged that the bare majority had simply ignored the great *Everson v. Board of Education* ruling and decades of precedent. He further noted that “every objective underlying the prohibition of religious establishment is betrayed by vouchers,” and “as appropriations for religious subsidies rise, competition for the money will tap sectarian religion’s capacity for discord.” He further noted that, “[w]ith the arrival of vouchers in religious schools, ... will go confidence that religious disagreements will stay moderate.”

In his dissent Justice Stephen Breyer warned of “the risk that publicly financed voucher programs pose in terms of religious social conflict.” He accused the majority of “turning the clock back” on “fundamental constitutional principles” and adopting “an interpretation of the Establishment Clause that the Court rejected more than half a century ago.” He added, “I fear that this present departure from the Court’s earlier understanding risks creating a form of religiously based conflict potentially harmful to the nation’s social fabric.”

Sadly, the Supreme Court largely has ceased to be a dependable defender of the crucial First Amendment principle of the separation between church and state.

Conclusion

Vouchers not only represent an attempt to circumvent federal and state constitutional safeguards against government support of religion, but they pose a serious threat to public education in this country. Compounding this threat is the misleading way in which vouchers have been marketed, resulting in the public not being aware of the dangers posed by vouchers.

Public school budgets are being slashed while public funds are diverted to nonpublic schools not responsible to taxpayers and not subject to the reasonable regulations applicable to public schools. Class sizes are being increased while programs for special needs children are being reduced. Class sizes of 30 to 40 children are becoming more common even though large-scale demonstrations, such as Tennessee's STAR program, have shown that K-3 classes of just 15 students produce beneficial effects that last through high school graduation.

A quarter of America's children live near or below the poverty line, yet insufficient attention is paid to the effects on school performance of poverty and its concomitants. Here is just one example among many. The National Center for Education Statistics has shown that while the gap between racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups is very slowly narrowing, it is still too wide. The 2011 science scores for eighth graders in the National Assessment of Educational Programs are 163 for whites, 129 for blacks, 137 for Hispanics, 159 for Asians, and 141 for Native Americans. Comparing income levels, free-lunch eligible eighth graders scored 137 while higher income students averaged 164. Yet the public schools serving poorer families are not as well funded as those serving better off families.

As indicated, the danger of vouchers has to date escaped the attention of much of the public. This needs to change. With our Supreme Court no longer a dependable defender of public education and religious liberty, Americans—as informed citizens, as voters, as contributors to political campaigns and cause organizations, as educators and writers and as ordinary concerned citizens—must stand together to protect our schools and our basic freedoms.

Fortunately, more than 50 national education, religious, humanist, civil rights, civil liberties and other organizations—among them the Center for Inquiry—have been working together for years in the National Coalition for Public Education to oppose efforts to channel public funds to nonpublic schools. But that is not nearly enough. The general public has to become engaged with this issue. Failing to do so risks allowing taxpayer dollars to support sectarian education and damage public education—a prospect that should trouble all Americans, religious or not.

Edd Doerr is president of Americans for Religious Liberty, a past president of the American Humanist Association, and a columnist for Free Inquiry magazine. A well-published writer, he is a former public school teacher (history, government, Spanish) and since 1966 has been a full-time professional in the religious freedom field.

References

- Alley, Robert S., *The Constitution & Religion: Leading Supreme Court Cases on Church and State* (Prometheus Books, 1999).
- Butts, R. Freeman, *The American Tradition in Religion and Education* (Beacon, 1950).
- Church, Forrest, *The Separation of Church and State: Writings on a Fundamental Principle by America's Founders* (Beacon Press, 2004).
- Cubberley, Ellwood P., *The History of Education* (Houghton Mifflin, 1948).
- Doerr, Edd, *Catholic Schools: The Facts* (Americans for Religious Liberty, 2000).
- Doerr, Edd, *The Conspiracy That Failed* (Americans United, 1968).
- Doerr, Edd, "The Enduring Controversy: Parochialism and the Law" (*Valparaiso University Law Review*, Vol. 9, No. 3).
- Doerr, Edd, "Invasion of the Soul Snatchers" (*Free Inquiry*, April/May 2012).
- Doerr, Edd, "Public Funds and Nonpublic Schools" (*Congressional Record*, Vol. 119, No. 86, June 6, 1973).
- Doerr, Edd, "Tuition Tax Credits" (*New York Times*, May 29, 2012).
- Doerr, Edd, and Menendez, Albert J., *Church Schools and Public Money: The Politics of Parochialism* (Prometheus Books, 1991).
- Doerr, Edd, and Menendez, Albert J., *Religious Liberty and State Constitutions* (Prometheus Books, 1993).
- Doerr, Edd, Menendez, Albert J. and Swomley, John, *The Case Against School Vouchers* (Prometheus Books, 1996).
- Kunzman, Robert, *Write These Things on Your Children: Inside the World of Conservative Christian Homeschooling* (Beacon Press, 2009).
- Menendez, Albert J., and Doerr, Edd (eds.), *Great Quotations on Religious Freedom* (Prometheus Books, 2002).
- Menendez, Albert J., *Visions of Reality: What Fundamentalist Schools Teach* (Prometheus Books, 1993).
- National Coalition for Public Education, Statement to Senate Committee on Appropriations (June 14, 2012).
- Pfeffer, Leo, *Church, State, and Freedom* (Beacon, 1967).

Ravitch, Diane, *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education* (Basic Books, 2010).

Sager, Carrie, *Voices for Evolution* (National Committee for Science Education, 2008).

Stewart, Katherine, *The Good News Club: The Christian Right's Assault on America's Children* (Public Affairs Press, 2012).

Tabash, Edward, "The True Meaning of the Establishment Clause," Position Paper (Center for Inquiry, March 2007,

http://www.centerforinquiry.net/advocacy/true_meaning_of_the_establishment_clause/).

Endnotes

¹ Doerr, Edd, Albert J. Menendez, and John M. Swomley, *The Case Against School Vouchers*, 1996, pp. 51-66.

² Saul, Stephanie, "Public Money Finds Back Door to Private Schools," *New York Times*, May 22, 2012.

³ Menendez, Albert J., and Edd Doerr, *Great Quotations on Religious Freedom*, pp. 27-28.

⁴ Doerr, Edd, *Catholic Schools: The Facts*, p. 9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-14.

⁶ *Board of Education of Cincinnati v. Minor*, 23 Ohio State 211.

⁷ *People ex rel. Ring v. Board of Education*, 245 Illinois 234, 92 N.E. 251.

⁸ 333 U.S. 1.

⁹ 343 U.S. 306.

¹⁰ 370 U.S. 421.

¹¹ 374 U.S. 203.

¹² 482 U.S. 578.

¹³ Doerr, Edd, *Catholic Schools: The Facts*, p. 9. Also, there is one problem that might be mentioned in connection with the preceding, which is detailed in Katherine Stewart's book *The Good News Club: The Christian Right's Stealth Assault on America's Children* (Public Affairs Press, 2012), and which the author reviewed in the April/May 2012 *Free Inquiry* under the head "Invasion of the Soul Snatchers." Over the past decade, fundamentalist Christian missionaries have been infiltrating public schools as a result of some court rulings. But that goes beyond our subject.

¹⁴ Cubberley, Ellwood P., *The History of Education*, 1948, pp. 620-621; A. Stafford Clayton, *Religion and Schooling*, 1969, pp. 11-93; John P. White, "Catholic Education in England," in *Catholic Education in the Western World*, ed. James Michael Lee, 1967, pp. 209-250.

¹⁵ Menendez, Albert J., *The Bitter Harvest*, 1973, pp. 69-119.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Clayton, A. Stafford, *Religion and Schooling*, 1969, pp. 100-180; Albert J. Menendez, "Church and State in the Netherlands," in *Church & State*, November 1974; Josephus J. Gielen and W.J.G.M. Gielen, "Catholic Education in the Netherlands," in *Catholic Education in the Western World*, ed. James Michael Lee, 1967, pp. 113-154.

¹⁸ Piveteau, Didier J., "Catholic Education in France," in *Catholic Education in the Western World*, ed. James Michael Lee, 1967, pp. 1-60; Ellwood P. Cubberley, *The History of Education*, 1948, pp.588-603; Albert J. Menendez, "Church and State in France," in *Church & State*, January 1975.

¹⁹ Doerr, Edd, "Canadian, German Experience Supports U.S. System," *Church & State*, September 1968.

²⁰ Menendez, Albert J., "Newfoundland Endorses Public Education," *Voice of Reason*, No. 85, 2003-2004.

²¹ Graves, Stephen, "Parochialism Down Under," *Church & State*, December 1970.

²² Doerr, Edd, Albert J. Menendez, and John M. Swomley, *The Case Against School Vouchers*, 1996, pp. 51-66.

²³ Menendez, Albert J., Edd Doerr, eds., *Great Quotations on Religious Freedom*, pp. 209-215.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 172.

²⁵ "Voters vs. Vouchers," August 1, 2012, www.arlinc.org

²⁶ Doerr, Edd, *Catholic Schools: The Facts*, p. 73.

²⁷ 403 U.S. 602.

²⁸ 413 U.S. 756.

²⁹ 421 U.S. 349.

³⁰ 473 U.S. 373.

³¹ 105 U.S. 3232.

³² 114 S.Ct. 2481.

³³ 114 U.S. 2481.

³⁴ 536 U.S. 639.