

APR 10 1911

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

# THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

APRIL 1911

NUMBER 2

## THE CHURCH, HER COLLEGES AND THE CAR- NEGIE FOUNDATION.

The history of Education in America is inwrought with the history of the Christian Church. The early annals of the Church record the narratives of the state of Religion, the missionary journeys among the Indians, the opening of new preaching stations in the settlements of the West, and, along with these as of equal claim upon the interest of the Church, the progress made in the establishment of academies and colleges. The preacher and the teacher were one in aim and often one also in person. The fear of the Lord was recognized to be the beginning of wisdom. Intelligence, integrity and piety in happy combination were the end that was sought. Perhaps the strongest motive in establishing the earlier academies and colleges was the need of an able and competent ministry. The records show that the ministry led the way to the establishment of what are now our oldest institutions and they were seconded by the most devoted members of the churches. This support was by earnest prayer, by self-denying effort and by gifts which in their day were as notable as the great gifts of to-day.

### I.

#### THE STRUGGLES OF THE COLLEGES

From the beginning, the problems of support pressed upon the fathers of the Church. They were braver men than some of their sons, for they launched their movements with resources which in our day would be wholly inade-

quate. Harvard University was founded on the bequest of the Rev. John Harvard, amounting to less than £400, and Yale received from Gov. Yale £500.<sup>1</sup> As late as 1768, the Synod of New York and Philadelphia in response to a request of the Trustees of the College of New Jersey voted £50 to aid in the support of a professor of divinity and promised a collection from the churches. In presenting the cause to the churches, the Presbytery of New Brunswick was obliged to state that the permanent funds of the College had been reduced to £1300.<sup>2</sup> In 1797 the funds of Princeton consisted of \$17,733.31 in Government stocks, two shares of bank stock, sundry bonds amounting to \$3,862.33, and \$305.74 in cash. In 1800 the actual income from the funds of the College was \$252.67, in 1808 \$174.50.<sup>3</sup>

In 1830, the available funds of Yale, exclusive of land, were \$17,856.26. The net receipts including \$11,735.00 from tuition were \$19,471.47 and there was a deficit of \$837.59. In the seventeenth century, the cash donations to the colleges were about £7000 O. T., two-sevenths of which came from England. Between 1719 and 1726, Mr. Thomas Hollis gave to Harvard £4840, the largest sum received during the first hundred years of its existence. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the productive funds of all colleges amounted to less than \$500,000.<sup>4</sup> Dr. Thwing sums up the situation as follows:

“Their history is a story of small beginnings made in poverty; of hard struggles to procure funds for either endowment or immediate expenditure; of a success usually moderate in such endeavors; of expenses frequently exceeding income; of economies at times foolish in method, at times wise, but usually necessary; of constant anxieties borne by officers—anxieties at times which crush; of inability to keep covenants, either expressed or implied; and

<sup>1</sup> Birdseye: *Individual Training in Our Colleges*, p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> Hodge: *Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church*, ii. 298.

<sup>3</sup> Maclean: *History of the College of New Jersey*, ii. 27, 31, quoted by Birdseye.

<sup>4</sup> Birdseye, *ibid.*

of consequent suffering of teachers—sufferings under which teachers find the support in the value of the high commissions entrusted to them. Such is the outline of the financial history of the American college.”<sup>5</sup>

These facts are enough to show both the place which the Church had in the founding of our historic institutions and also the struggles which were made to maintain them. Faith exercised itself in the great doctrines of Scripture and also in reliance upon God for money. Prayer went up for spiritual blessings, but also for bread and butter for both professors and their students. Synods and associations gave hours of their time to the question of ways and means for their institutions. It is therefore no new thing that in these latter days the Church should feel the burden of her new and struggling institutions. Conditions have changed, but the struggle is the same.

How greatly conditions have changed appears from the latest figures on Education in America. A total school and college population of 19,776,694, a working income of colleges and universities for men and for both sexes (exclusive of that of public schools and other institutions) amounting to \$65,792,045,<sup>6</sup> show the revolution which has

<sup>5</sup> Thwing: *History of Higher Education in America*, p. 323.

<sup>6</sup> The statistics of education in the United States show a total enrollment as follows:

Teachers in Public Schools.....	496,612
Pupils in Public Schools.....	17,061,962
Public High Schools (professors and students) .	1,098,764
Private High Schools (professors and students)	102,360
Universities and colleges for men and both sexes:	
Professors and instructors.....	21,960
Students, Preparatory.....	65,026
Collegiate .....	134,386
Graduate.....	9,449
Colleges for Women A and B.....	30,396
Theological Schools, professors and students..	11,568
Law Schools, professors and students.....	19,896
Medicine Schools, professors and students....	30,115
Special schools such as evening, business, reform, deaf, blind and feeble-minded.....	793,652

---

Total for United States..... 19,776,694  
(*The Chicago Daily News Almanac* 1911, pp. 405ff.)

come in the educational world. The college president of one hundred years ago would be staggered by these figures. They present problems to our modern administrators which the fathers never knew and, to that extent, impair the value of educational precedents.

## II.

### THE SACRIFICES OF THE TEACHING FORCE

It is coming to be recognized now that the weakest spot in our modern educational system is its meagre support of professors and instructors while they are teaching and its want of provision for them when they have ceased to be efficient. Our institutions have grown enormously in the number and splendor of their buildings, in the variety of courses they offer, in the departments they have organized, in their athletic facilities and in the endowments by which all of these great improvements are supported. Living salaries, are, in most institutions, provided for the president but the ordinary professor or teacher is overworked and underpaid. Dr. Fritchett has calculated that, in our older and now independent universities and colleges, the average salary of the professors is \$2,441, in State institutions \$2,167, in Church institutions \$1,534, but in more than one hundred Church institutions the average salary is less than \$1,000.<sup>7</sup> The teacher and the preacher fare alike. The recent report of the Department of Commerce and Labor of the U. S. Government covers the statistics of 186 denominations in the United States, which include 32,936,445 members, 61.7 per cent Protestants, 36.7 per cent Roman Catholics. The average salary of ministers in all these denominations is \$663. The highest average is the Unitarian \$1,653, then the Protestant Episcopal \$1,242, the Universalist \$1,238, the New Jerusalem \$1,233, the Jewish \$1,222, the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. \$1,177, the Congregational \$1,042. Presbyterian and Congregational pastors receive, therefore, about the same

<sup>7</sup> *The Relation of Christian Denominations to Colleges*, p. 24.

average salary as the professors "in more than one hundred Church institutions".

These salaries of professors and ministers to be estimated aright must be compared with the salaries in secular life. Taking as an example, the municipal service of the City of Chicago, we find that the higher salary paid to professors in Church institutions, \$1,500, is the salary of the paying teller in the office of the Comptroller, of the deputy clerk of the Municipal Court, of the sergeants of the Police Department, the engineers of the Fire Department, the chief dairy inspector and sundry clerks. The second figure paid to professors in Church colleges, \$1,000, is the salary of the coal-passers, the chief matron of the Police Department and the meat inspectors.<sup>8</sup> Allowing for the extra cost of living in the city, these figures mean that professors in our Church colleges, after their long training and with the demands of continuous intellectual service, are on the same financial level with the humbler grades of city employees, who enter upon their duties with scarcely any preparation. In one college town where wealthy citizens make their abode, the social relations between the wealthy citizens and the college professors are so cordial that the professors are often invited to dine with the wealthy citizens. As the professor sits at the table, he is tempted to reflect that the butler and the doorman of his host have a larger income than he. In one instance, a professor distinguished for learning, eked out his living by renting his house, during the summer, to the second chauffeur of one of his wealthy friends. The social equality which he enjoyed with the wealthy citizen could not hide his financial inferiority to the wealthy citizen's second chauffeur. An assistant professor in a large eastern university, writing anonymously, says:

"For a dozen years I have watched tragedies. I have seen brilliant young men, full of promise, full of life, unselfish and highminded simply ground down by overwork,

<sup>8</sup>*The Chicago Daily News Almanac*, 1907, pp. 418ff. [Figures unchanged since 1902].

underpay and high prices, with the result that they have grown narrow and hard and embittered. . . . We don't get the best men in college teaching, and we don't make the best of the men we do get. We collect in our colleges great masses of dead wood; men who can't hold a better position, men with their ambitions ground out of them; men who draw small salaries and do not earn them, no matter how hard they work. They are conscientious—I know no body of more conscientious men. But . . . it is true of many college professors that they would leave if they were any longer capable of more remunerative work".<sup>9</sup>

And a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation says:

"About a third of the American colleges and universities report an average salary to a full professor of less than \$1000, and not quite half report an average of more than \$1000 but less than \$2000. . . . Heretofore little has been done to fix salaries in respect to any fair or even possible line of comfort. And it has, therefore, happened that, at the same time, when small economies have lowered an entire faculty into discontent and inefficiency, an amount sufficient to raise the teaching body into an atmosphere of content and cheerful work has been spent on facing the campus buildings with marble, and in giving the athletic field the appearance of a Roman amphitheatre".<sup>10</sup>

The efficiency of our colleges, therefore, requires as the very next reform, such a revision of the annual budget as will make adequate provision for the men and women who are the vital forces in these institutions. Brick and stone and iron and green lawns must wait till the living material is adequately provided for. The straits to which scholarly and devoted men are reduced and the mortifying expedients which they must employ to maintain the proprieties of their position make up a life-long sacrifice. The call for relief is the louder because the sufferers are themselves estopped from the ordinary methods of agitation. Locomotive engineers, policemen, firemen, carpenters, plumbers, bricklayers, etc., may move when they feel inclined to enjoy

<sup>9</sup> *The Saturday Evening Post*, June 11, 1910.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

higher wages, but men and women of academic life, surrounded with academic restraints, must be dumb until a sentiment yet to be educated recognizes the sore injustice of their situation. If the echo of these words were vocal, the ears of the friends of Education in America would suffer from the detonation.

### III.

#### THE VETERANS AND MR. CARNEGIE'S BENEFACTION

Leaving, however, the large question of adequate compensation for professors in active service, the case of the veteran who has outlived his period of efficiency, presents a distinct and a pressing problem. On such salaries as those just indicated, he has, of course, made no provision for his old age. He is a veteran in name but without a veteran's reward. The Government has for a long time recognized the claim of its veteran soldiers and sailors and the Church, in a modest way, has provided for the relief of her aged and infirm ministers and for their widows and orphans. Of late, progressive corporations have begun to pension worthy employees who have reached the age of retirement and to adopt profit-sharing schemes. The principle is making headway, albeit slowly. The claims of men in the Classified Civil Service of the Government are only now coming to be recognized. While Government employees in other branches of the service, numbering 147,547, have, within the last five years received increase of salaries amounting to \$12,655,736.66, the 185,874 persons employed in the Classified Civil Service have been passed by with the exception of 680 of their number.<sup>11</sup> In the matter of civil service retirement, our Government is as backward as Venezuela and Haiti, these three being the only civilized countries on the face of the globe which are not providing systems of retirement for aged and disabled civil servants.<sup>12</sup> The question is now before Con-

<sup>11</sup> *The Civil Service Advocate*, ii. 2, p. 210.

<sup>12</sup> Hon. R. W. Austen, *Congressional Record*, 55,428-9385, p. 8.

gress. President Taft,<sup>13</sup> Mr. Secretary MacVeagh,<sup>14</sup> and men eminent in the business life of the country,<sup>15</sup> are all outspoken in their support of the movement, and some solution will doubtless be reached soon.<sup>16</sup>

Mr. Andrew Carnegie has placed our modern educational system under many obligations. His gifts to colleges, including many Church colleges, are royal in their amount.<sup>17</sup> Apart from these, and supplementing many of them, he has brought into being The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and has given \$10,000,000, the income of which is to be used in providing retiring allowances for professors who have reached a proper age, in institutions which comply with certain requirements, primarily of an educational and financial character. This Foundation is "not a charitable institution, but an educational agency."<sup>18</sup> It affords relief to the professor who has reached the age of retirement; it frees the institution from providing for him in retirement or of re-

---

<sup>13</sup> "It is impossible to proceed far in such an investigation without perceiving the need of a suitable means of eliminating from the service the superannuated." *Annual Message to Congress*.

<sup>14</sup> There is no practicable way to put the government service properly on its feet without a fair and just method of civil-service retirement. This is not only a requisite; it is a prerequisite; and unless Congress shall give the Executive this necessary method of improving the service, the country must accept the service that is not fully satisfactory and which cannot be made fully satisfactory." *Annual Report*.

<sup>15</sup> "Like the tenets of religion, such a principle is primarily a matter of the heart, and the discussion of it from the standpoint of political economy, like the discussion of religion from the standpoint of theology, is of quite secondary importance in the establishing of it." Mr. James B. Forgan, President First National Bank, Chicago, *Congressional Record*, 55,428-9385, p. 12.

<sup>16</sup> The bill is based on the contributory plan as against the straight pension.

<sup>17</sup> The latest information at hand shows a total of 317 academies, colleges and universities, to which he has given \$3,695,753 for library buildings, \$1,185,459 for science buildings, \$5,210,595 for other buildings, \$9,395,861 for endowment, \$878,285 for other purposes, making a total of \$20,365,953. Included within this list there are many institutions related in different ways to the Christian Church.

<sup>18</sup> *Christian Denominations and the Colleges*.



taining him in service after his usefulness has been impaired; it affords assurance to all professors in such institutions that, on reaching the age of retirement, they will be adequately provided for; and it gives an opportunity to enforce certain standards of educational policy. At the outset, the trustees of the Foundation believed that, if they could establish the principle of retiring allowances in one hundred institutions of learning, the effect would be to bring all other institutions to the same basis through means provided by their friends. Since then, they have widened the scope of their undertaking to almost the limits of our American system of education.<sup>19</sup>

This Foundation has been subjected to serious criticism. So much of this as questions the right of the founder to define the scope of his benefactions is manifestly out of place. The Foundation, in the eyes of the law, is a private corporation. It bears the name and executes the purpose of its founder and represents no one but himself. Its sole business is to ascertain and carry out his purpose in the disposal of his fund. The only difference between Mr. Carnegie's gift and that of the benefactor who establishes a scholarship for the support of a college student is in the amount. If under advanced sociological conceptions it be denied that Mr. Carnegie has the right to dispose of so great a fortune, it must be admitted that there is, as yet, no recognized authority to restrain him. The maxim of law holds: *Cujus est dare ejus est disponere*.

The Foundation was limited by the founder in two directions. In his letter of April 16th, 1905, in which he handed over the fund to the trustees he had appointed, Mr. Carnegie excluded from its benefits the professors and

<sup>19</sup> *The Independent* in an editorial dated June 17, 1909, in full appreciation of the benefits of the Foundation asks: "Who anticipated that in less than five years it would effect profound changes in the constitution and management of our colleges, severing venerable denominational ties, tightening up requirements for admission, differentiating the college from the university, systematizing finances, raising salaries, and in many more subtle ways modifying the life and work of thousands of educators?"

officers of tax-supported educational institutions on the ground that State governments might prefer that the relations of their professors and officers should remain exclusively with the State. After two years of administration, it appeared to the trustees that "from the standpoint of educational unity and coherence it would manifestly be a misfortune to divide the colleges and universities of the country into two groups separated by the line of State support. All colleges and universities, whether supported by taxation or endowment, or by tuitions, are public institutions. . . . There are no private colleges." Upon this conclusion, and on the express desire of the National Association of State Universities, Mr. Carnegie, on March 31, 1908, authorized an extension of the scope of the Foundation, so that State institutions could receive the benefits when their governing boards apply and the governors and legislatures of the States approve. He did this with the understanding that if all the State universities applied, five million dollars more would be required.<sup>20</sup>

#### IV.

##### THE BAN ON THE CHURCH COLLEGE

In establishing the Foundation Mr. Carnegie also excluded from its benefits another class. In his letter he says:

"There is another class which States do not aid, their constitution in some cases even forbidding it, viz. sectarian institutions. Many of these, established long ago, were truly sectarian, but to-day are free to all men, of all creeds, or of none—such are not to be considered sectarian now. Only such as are under the control of a sect or require trustees (or a majority thereof), officers, faculty or students, to belong to any specified sect, or which impose any theological tests, are to be excluded."<sup>21</sup>

No reason has ever been assigned by the founder for this exclusion of institutions belonging to what he calls

<sup>20</sup> *Third Annual Report*, pp. 61-63.

<sup>21</sup> *First Annual Report*, p. 8.

“sects”. Many explanations have been given by the beneficiaries or the would-be beneficiaries of the Foundation, but they require no attention as they are entirely without authority. Mr. Carnegie has exercised not only his right of giving as it pleased him, but his right also of withholding his reasons for not giving. Christian men, representing Christian institutions, should be the last to quarrel with him.

How far reaching this exclusion is appears from the analysis of Church institutions made by the Foundation. The various methods of legal connection between the Christian denominations and their institutions of higher learning are described as follows:

I. Colleges with theological tests for entrance and residence.

II. Colleges where specified religious membership is required of trustees or faculty. Such requirements as are:

A. Provided by the charter of the college upon 1. the boards of trustees; 2. the faculty; 3. the corporate body of the college.

B. Not in the charter but 1. by by-law; 2. by acceptance of an endowment for a chair; 3. by agreement with an outside corporation.

C. Subject to change by 1. the vote of the trustees; 2. the amendment of the charter; 3. legal penalty of forfeiting gifts.

III. Colleges under the control of sects.

A. The property owned outright.

B. Property owned in equity.

C. The institutions owned by a religious order.

D. Controlled through the board of trustees.

The right to 1. elect trustees; 2. nominate trustees; 3. confirm trustees.

E. Colleges that formally report at specified intervals 1. by law; 2. by voluntary action.

F. Authorized statements at specified intervals in the college catalogue.

G. Students required to attend services of a specified non-academic congregation.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *Second Annual Report*, pp. 40-42.

It would be difficult to discover any method of legal connection between the Church and her colleges which is not included in this exhaustive analysis. Apart from the purpose of excluding Church institutions, with which it was framed, it has a value in its very suggestiveness.

In the hope of securing some relaxation of the rule excluding Church institutions, a memorial was presented to the president and executive committee of the Foundation by a group of representative college presidents, including President Faunce of Brown University, President Hunt of Denison, President Boatwright of Richmond, Baptists; President Jones of Haverford, Society of Friends; President Welch of Ohio Wesleyan, Methodist; President Miller of Heidelberg, Reformed Church U. S.; President McMichael of Monmouth, United Presbyterian; President Hechert of Wittenberg, President Hefelbower of Pennsylvania, Lutheran; and Presidents Nollen, of Lake Forest, Parsons of Parsons, and Holden of Wooster, Presbyterians. This memorial gives the following weighty reasons against the changes in the charters necessary to bring their institutions within the requirements of the Foundation:

1. The severance of the historic relation between the college and the religious body that founded and nurtured it, is in some instances, open to serious ethical objections.

2. The severance of this relation would inevitably be misconstrued by many of the alumni and patrons of these colleges as a sacrifice of principle for monetary gain. Controversy would thus be provoked and the college constituency weakened.

3. The formal relation between the college and the denomination makes it easy to arouse the interest and enlist the support of a constituency which would otherwise be lost to the cause of education. The severance of the relation would sacrifice this advantage.<sup>25</sup>

It would be difficult to state in better words the objections to changing the charters of our colleges, and the able men who presented the memorial voiced the sentiment of the churches with great accuracy. They expressed the

<sup>25</sup> *The Fourth Annual Report*, pp. 4-6.

opinion that these changes would result in "serious injury to the College concerned and to the cause of education in general" and urged that their colleges

"are not now maintained for sectarian ends, but represent the contribution of the denomination to the general educational work of the country. In view of these considerations, we respectfully petition the President and the Executive Committee of the Foundation to present these facts to Mr. Carnegie, with their recommendation that he make provision by which the benefits of the Foundation may be extended to those institutions:

1. Which meet the academic and financial standards of the Foundation.

2. Whose property is not specifically held for a denomination by an ecclesiastical officer or a religious order.

3. Which do not prescribe denominational tests for administration officers, faculty or students, and,

4. Which do not require the teaching of denominational tenets."<sup>26</sup>

This petition so respectfully presented by this representative body of men proposed to yield everything demanded by the Foundation save the right of the Church in the selection of the trustees, which is expressly reserved by the charters of many institutions. It is amazing to learn from the Report that the only reply vouchsafed to this petition was a letter addressed by the President of the Foundation, Dr. Pritchett to each of the presidents which says:

"The committee at once proceeded to lay before Mr. Carnegie a copy of the memorial presented by you at that time. The committee sent this to Mr. Carnegie without recommendation, as it did not feel itself justified, after careful examination of the subject, in recommending the removal of all denominational restrictions in the use of this endowment. Mr. Carnegie has carefully considered the communication, and, while the committee has received from him no formal communication, it has, unofficially, (*sic*) been led to believe that it is not his intention to change at the present time the present situation of the Foundation by making a gift free from the restrictions of the original gift."

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

The request of the petitioners could hardly have encountered more summary treatment, although no complaint, so far as known, has escaped their lips. Possibly they are themselves responsible for presuming to present such a petition, or at least for not ascertaining in advance that an official communication would meet with so unofficial a reply. Certainly no circumstances are conceivable which would impose upon them the duty of subjecting themselves again to this experience.

## V.

### THE CHANGES IN COLLEGE CONTROL

The reports of the Foundation recite in great detail the history of the negotiations which, from year to year, were entered into with various Church colleges with a view of making them eligible to its benefits. In each of them, the chief concern has been the elimination of every trace of organic relationship to the Christian Church. The action of the executive committee, as presented in the reports of the Foundation, suggests that delicate process of engraving, which, by the use of an acid or mordant, produces the incised lines that appear in the printing. The result of this concentrated acid, skillfully applied to the Church college, is the complete disappearance of the control of the Church and a picture which, whatever else it has in it, lacks that control.

Various examples may be mentioned. The charter of the *University of Denver* provided that "no test of religious faith shall ever be applied as a condition of admission" and on this ground the chancellor sought to place the institution upon the Foundation; but the application was refused on the ground that the trustees were elected by the Colorado Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that "when the majority of a college's governing board is designated by a denomination through a power of election residing in one of its constituent councils, the college is, in the language of the Foundation's charter 'under the control' of the denomi-

nation, although the utmost freedom may be exercised at present in the election of College trustees."<sup>27</sup> A trustee of *Wesleyan University* seeking the decision of the Foundation as to colleges, a majority of whose trustees are elected by the trustees themselves or the alumni but with a minority selected by a religious body, was informed that, while such colleges came within its discretion, the committee felt that the time had not arrived when they should be presented.<sup>28</sup>

*Drury College*, Missouri, in its articles of association provided that a majority of the trustees should be "connected with the family of Christian churches commonly known as the Congregational churches of the United States". In a later section, its articles explain that no religious test for study and instruction shall ever be established and the foregoing restriction is "intended only to guard the interests of the college from the unseemly and dangerous rivalry of other sects, and to place the college so closely in sympathy with some one religious denomination that it shall always have a constituency and a home". This provision, mild as it is, was enough to exclude the college from the Carnegie Foundation, and accordingly, the articles of incorporation have been amended "so as to eliminate from them all reference to any denominational restriction upon the board of trustees".<sup>29</sup>

*Drake University*, at Des Moines, Iowa, in its charter provided that two-thirds of the board of trustees should be elected by the Iowa Christian Missionary Convention and that two-thirds of the trustees must be members of churches of the Disciples of Christ. In order to make the institution thoroughly representative, the charter was amended, the churches consenting thereto, and any requirement as to the religious beliefs of the trustees was eliminated, and it was provided that only twelve trustees must be elected by the convention. The Foundation, however, required that even

---

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>29</sup> *Third Annual Report*, p. 28.

the right to elect these twelve be surrendered by the Church which had founded the institution and that a resolution be passed certifying that, in the choice of trustees, officers and teachers no denominational tests will be imposed. And this was done.<sup>30</sup>

*Central University* of Kentucky, as it now is, is the result of an amalgamation of two institutions in 1901. The administration of the united University was to be in the hands of a board of trustees, one-half elected by the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, North, and one-half by the Presbyterian Synod of Kentucky, South. In the first approach to the Carnegie Foundation, it was represented that the original charter of one of the colleges contained provisions against any teaching "of doctrines peculiar to any one sect of Christians", and that the two Synods were under no obligation to elect Presbyterians as trustees of the University. Later, the Foundation was informed that the trustees were willing to certify that no denominational considerations entered into the choice of trustees. This approach having been unsuccessful, it was proposed that the board of trustees be made self-perpetuating, the election of the new members to be reported to the Synods each year, and the Synods to retain the power of veto but to agree that this veto power should never be exercised on sectarian grounds. Even this proposed self-effacement on the part of the Synods was insufficient and only when they were induced to resign their power of electing the board of trustees was the University "admitted to a full participation in the privileges of the Carnegie Foundation".<sup>31</sup>

*Coe College*, Iowa, at the time of its application, was so related to the Synod of Iowa, that the election of members to its board of trustees must be reported to the Synod and be subject to its approval. To meet the demands of the Foundation, it was agreed that the election of trustees should not be submitted to Synod for approval but it was hoped

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21-26.



that their names might possibly "be reported" as they were elected. It appears, however, that even a report to an ecclesiastical body, carrying with it no power of approval or disapproval, was too much, and, at last, even this was surrendered and Coe College was "admitted to the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation".<sup>32</sup>

In the case of a college legally connected with a denomination by a charter which required that the names of newly elected trustees be submitted to an ecclesiastical body for confirmation, the authorities, feeling that it would not be wise to submit the charter to the State Legislature for revision, in view of the fact that the charter as it now is releases the college from all taxation, asked if, in lieu of the elision from the charter of the right of confirmation by the ecclesiastical body, a waiver by that body of its exercise of this power would be acceptable. This, of course, assumed that the ecclesiastical body would consent to the waiver. The executive committee, however, felt that it could not admit the college on this extra-legal basis, as, in view of the legislative and representative character of the ecclesiastical body, it is doubtful if a waiver executed at one session would be legally binding on future sessions.<sup>33</sup>

## VI

### TWO COLLEGES WHICH DECLINE THE BENEFACTION

Two other institutions require attention in view of the fact that, having fully considered the conditions imposed, they have declined the benefactions of the Foundation. One of them, the *Randolph-Macon Woman's College*, is briefly mentioned in the reports of the Foundation,<sup>34</sup> but the full statement of the facts is shown by the official publications of the Virginia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and of the board of trustees of the Randolph-Macon College. The Randolph-Macon System of Colleges and Preparatory Schools had, through many years,

<sup>32</sup> *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 17.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

grown up under the fostering care of the Methodist Episcopal Church, especially the Baltimore and Virginia Conferences. In 1870, the board declared to the Legislature of Virginia that "the creator of the college is the Virginia Conference" and that "the college is in moral law and justice the property of the Conference".<sup>35</sup> The controversy, which has stirred so deeply the Methodist Church in Virginia, began in 1907 when the trustees of the Woman's College, which is a part of the Randolph-Macon System, applied for admission to the benefits of the Foundation, stating that, while the college was in sympathetic relation to the Conference, it was independent of it in government and they passed the resolution required by the Foundation certifying that, in the election of trustees and officers, no denominational tests would be applied. The question came up at the annual Conference in 1907 and has appeared at each annual meeting ever since. The Conference demanded that action be taken, recognizing the legal and the moral right of the Church in the college, and calling on the trustees to secure an amendment to the charter which would guarantee to the Conferences the right to participate in the selection of persons to fill all vacancies, or, as an alternative, that a clause be inserted setting forth that the property is held in trust for the Conferences and that three-fourths of the trustees shall be either clerical or lay members residing within these Conferences. The trustees stated in reply, that they had neither the legal nor the moral right to transfer the power of electing trustees to any other person or body,<sup>36</sup> adding that they have always recognized that the college is one of the agencies of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for the education of youth and that, next after their duty to God, comes their duty to the Church. They expressed the belief that they were an integral part of the Church, charged with specific duties just as other agencies are charged with

<sup>35</sup> *Virginia Conference Annual*, 1909, p. 74.

<sup>36</sup> *The Randolph-Macon System: Its relation to the Church and the Carnegie Foundation*. Published by direction of the Board of Trustees, p. 38.

specific duties, so that, while declining to seek changes in the charter, they would show their respect for the wishes of the Conference by adopting the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, that when a vacancy occurs in the board of trustees, such vacancy shall be filled by the election of this board, but, before such election, the name of the person proposed to fill such vacancy shall be submitted for approval to the Conference within whose bounds such vacancy shall occur, and upon approval he shall be elected to the board.

"Inasmuch as misunderstanding has arisen, and misrepresentation has been made of our relation to the Church, in view of the fact that Randolph-Macon has been accepted as a beneficiary of the Carnegie Foundation, and being intent upon retaining the closest possible relations to the Church and Conference to which we owe our existence (*sic*), we hereby decline any benefits from said Foundation so long as it requires any severance or weakening of the tie by which we are bound to the Church."<sup>37</sup>

The effect of this action was to exclude the Woman's College from the Foundation, but it was not sufficient to satisfy the Conference. At Richmond in November, 1910, the question again occupied the closest attention.<sup>38</sup> A series of six resolutions was proposed and, after prolonged consideration it was agreed that committees representing the two Conferences should again meet with the trustees. The case is interesting as illustrating the deep convictions of a representative Christian Church as to its rights and duties in the institutions under its care. Whether or not the charter changes are made, the benefits of the Foundation have been renounced and the institution has been acknowledged to be an integral part of the Church. More, perhaps than in any other instance reported, was the voice of the Church heard in this case. In other cases, the action effecting the release of the college from the control of the Church has been taken before the Church was fully aware of its significance. It is to be expected that hereafter a full understanding will be had before so serious a step is sanctioned

<sup>37</sup> *Virginia Conference Annual*, 1909, p. 73.

<sup>38</sup> *Times Dispatch*, Richmond, Va., Nov. 10, 1910.

by any representative body of the Christian Church. As intimated by the petitioners mentioned hereinbefore, (p. 196) such an agitation as this is more damaging to an institution than any return in money can make good. Confidence is worth more than money. Indeed, it is worth money too.

*Brown University* at Providence, Rhode Island, was not mentioned in the reports of the Foundation, probably because no application had been made. Its president, Dr. Faunce, is a trustee of the Foundation but the University is under a charter which prescribes that its trustees shall be taken chiefly from the Baptist churches and, in smaller numbers, from the Congregational, Quaker and Episcopal churches. This inclusion of other denominations, was, in its day, a mark of the breadth of view prevailing among the Baptists who founded the institution. Since then, other denominations of Christians have come in and church ties are viewed differently, so that the trustees have been embarrassed in filling vacancies even from their own alumni. For two years, the question of charter-revision has been before the trustees, and two reports have been submitted by a committee consisting of President Faunce, Mr. Justice Charles E. Hughes of the United States Supreme Court, Mr. Thomas S. Barbour, Dr. George E. Horr, Mr. Henry K. Porter and others. The reports are models of clearness, of lofty regard for principle and of delicate consideration for all the interests involved. The Preliminary Report, submitted in 1909, states the reason why the change in charter is desirable, and, while denying that the motive in seeking the change was merely to secure the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation, frankly adds:

“It is useless for any institution to pretend, in changing its charter as we propose, it has no reference whatever to the standards of the Carnegie Foundation: on the contrary, we freely acknowledge that the desire to secure retiring allowances for our teaching staff is one of the objects that we desire—though by no means the chief one.”<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> *Preliminary Report*, p. 10.

The Final Report, submitted June, 1910, notes at the outset that

"Some elements in the situation have undergone decided change. College faculties have begun to fear certain kinds of assistance they formerly sought. The public mind has, during the past year, been unable to disentangle the moral from the financial question. It has been inclined to assume—perhaps naturally—that every college now making any material change in its constitution does so from sordid motives (*sic*).

.....Your committee is therefore of opinion that measures should be taken to separate the question of financial aid from charter revision. To this end it recommends that the University consider the advisability of securing from its alumni and friends an addition to the common fund of sufficient size to enable the corporation to provide pensions for the faculty on the same scale as the pensions offered to college teachers by any other organization. The time for securing such a fund is now at hand."<sup>40</sup>

On the question of the changes, the committee divided, a majority recommending that membership in a religious denomination should not be required to make one eligible to election to the office of trustee, fellow, president, professor, tutor or other office.<sup>41</sup> With this Dr. Horr, Mr. Barbour and Mr. Porter do not agree. The greatest concession made was that the president and three-fourths of the trustees shall forever be elected from the communicant members of the Christian churches,<sup>42</sup> and this seems now to be withdrawn. In response to the charge that Brown University, founded in 1764, is "hopelessly archaic, in its charter," Dr. Horr cites the fact that it is "not more antiquated" than the charter provision of the University of Chicago,<sup>43</sup> which every-

<sup>40</sup> *Final Report*, pp. 4-5.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>43</sup> "At all times two-thirds of the trustees and also the President of the University and of the said college, shall be members of regular Baptist churches, that is to say, members of churches of that denomination known and recognized under the name of the regular Baptist denomination; and, as contributions of money and property have been and are being solicited, and have been and are being made, upon the condition

one will admit is a very modern institution. Other modern instances might be cited. This Final Report has not been acted on as yet, but "Notes on College Charters" prepared by Mr. Barbour, approved by Dr. Horr, and submitted to the trustees, states that to attempt to secure radical changes in the charter would be to invite "ultimate defeat."<sup>44</sup>

From these instances, it must be clear that no organic connection with the Christian Church, no connection by which the Church can control or direct the policy of the institution, will be permitted in any college receiving the benefactions of the Carnegie Foundation. Their charter forbids it. Only by release from all control of the Church, however indirect, may a college be admitted to the list of "accepted institutions". That some of the trustees have not relished this task we may well believe; that they have been willing to continue to discharge it shows, on their part, a high appreciation of the Foundation.

The Fifth Annual Report of the Foundation for the year ending September 30, 1910, comes to hand just as these pages are finished. It is about one-half the size of the preceding Report. It recognizes the action of Brown University in going forward on its present charter and enlarging its pension system as "most creditable" (p. 34). The Executive Committee has voted that "It is not expedient in the future to grant retiring allowances outside the accepted list, except in cases of special significance" etc. (p. 17), so that individual professors in institutions which do not come up to the requirements will no longer be provided for. The Committee also decided that institutions, a minority of the board of trustees of which were designated by a denominational assembly, were eligible if the institution was conducted "without denominational partisanship" (p. 4). There is nothing in the report that modifies the action taken in any of the cases quoted hereinbefore.

last named, this charter shall not be amended or changed at any time hereafter so as to abrogate or modify the qualifications above mentioned, but in this particular this charter shall be forever unalterable." The date of this charter is June 18, 1890. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>44</sup> *Notes on College Charters*, p. 43.

## VII

## THE CHURCH AND THE COLLEGE: "A REAL VITAL RELATION"

The able men who have advocated the acceptance by Christian colleges of the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation in spite of the conditions imposed, have done so upon grounds which in their judgment are sufficient, and their position should be clearly understood. Everyone familiar with the problem of modern college administration will sympathize with the presidents and the members of the boards of control in their desire to avail themselves of every benefaction which is within reach. To have ready at hand a provision for their veteran professors looks to them like a godsend; a practical addition to their endowment; a relief from the burden of continuing a professor merely to afford him a livelihood; an assurance for all younger professors that in their time they shall be provided for; a prestige growing out of enrollment along with notable institutions, in contact with eminent educators and under ideals which in many respects are worthy of praise.<sup>45</sup> The man who is indifferent to these considerations is wholly outside the world of modern Education.

On the other hand, it is needful to know the grounds on which those who are in charge of distinctively Christian institutions have justified their efforts to enroll their colleges under the Carnegie Foundation. We may be sure that, if they believed the interests of their institutions would suffer in any direction, they would have declined the benefactions of the Foundation without hesitation. Their grounds seem, in substance, to be, that admission to the benefits of the Foundation, while requiring the severance of the legal and organic relation to the Christian Church, does not interfere with "the real vital relation in any shape or form", and that such an institution "stands before the

<sup>45</sup> One of these college presidents goes so far as to say: "It is not too much to state that the Foundation in its history thus far has given a greater stimulus to higher education than any other force that has been in operation in the history of Education in the United States." *Christian Observer*, Sept. 16, 1908.

Church and its whole constituency as a Christian college, devoted in its work to the fundamental principles of the Christian religion."<sup>46</sup> We are reminded that "the Foundation is not concerned with the fact that a given college was founded under the auspices of a religious organization or that it continues today its sympathetic relation with it."<sup>46</sup> The presidents of several institutions which have severed their relations with the Church testify that their connection with the Church is practically the same and point out the strong and positive Christian influences which are at work. This testimony is surely cause for rejoicing. At the same time, inquiry starts concerning this "real vital relation" which persists after the organic relation has been severed. How a relation can be vital that is not organic is not clear. Biology recognizes the vital only in the organic, however simple the organism, as, for example, the amoeba. A relation may be close and amicable without being vital, but a vital relation which is not organic is a contradiction in terms.

Passing this by, however, we are told that the Foundation has agreed that its "accepted institutions" may be published in official denominational publications provided the following sentence precede:

"The following institutions are not connected with the Church by any legal ties, nor are they subject to ecclesiastical control. Their history, however, and association with the life and work of our Church, are such as to justify our earnest co-operation with them."

This, of course, is not a vital but a co-operative relation and the co-operation seems to be limited to that of the Church with the college without defining the co-operation of the college with the Church. This, perhaps, may be defined in the language of a college president, who led his institution to seek the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation at the sacrifice of its organic relation with the Church. This co-operation appears in that:

A. We cherish and cultivate every relation of sympathy and co-operation with the Presbyterian Church. . . .

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*



B. In this connection, I visit and address the Synods each year. . . .

C. To keep in touch with our historic constituency, we invite the Synods to send committees of visitation to report to the Synods on the character, work and facilities of the college. . . .

D. I am quite satisfied that the Carnegie Foundation has no objection to such arrangement. The statement so often made that the Foundation is hostile to the denominations is entirely without foundation in fact. . . . . Mr. Carnegie was quoted to me as asserting that, provided the requirements of the charter of the Foundation in the matter of legal denominational connection were complied with, he did not care how Methodist or Presbyterian, etc. the college might be.

These statements should be taken at their full value. On some of them the Church will probably desire more light. If, for example, the Church should exercise the privilege to appoint visitors to the college accorded to it in exchange for the right which it had from the beginning, it would need to understand that the functions of the visitors would be severely limited and that any report which they might make would be in the way of interesting information rather than as a step to authoritative action. Should these visitors learn of irregularities in the institution, such as false teaching on the great facts of religion, and so report to the Church court, the court might plead for but it would be powerless to require a correction of such teaching. It is not likely that our Church courts will continue for many years a visitation which means so little. Again, the addresses which these presidents make in the Church courts must be prepared with unusual care, lest on the one hand they mislead the Church into supposing that she has at least some vestige of control, and, on the other, lest they overstep the bounds set for them by the Foundation. It is easy to see that an earnest Christian man, devoted to his Church, and consenting to the severance of his institution from it only under dire necessity, might very readily trespass upon the requirements of the Foundation. What the penalty would

be, one can hardly say. The dread of it, however, would be sufficient to take all the force and fire out of the address. The address really belongs in the class of those given in behalf of the various benevolent and philanthropic enterprises outside of the Church to which the representative bodies listen when they have time. What a contrast to the days when the educational address stirred the Church to gird herself afresh in behalf of her youth!

The reproachful inquiry is sometimes made whether the institutions, which in times past have done so much for the Church under self-perpetuating boards of trustees, are not a guarantee that Church institutions which now become self-perpetuating in their boards of trustees, will serve the Church as effectively as the others have done. There are such institutions and their place in the Church has been close and greatly blessed. The situation, however, is completely changed by the appearance of the Carnegie Foundation. An institution may have the most self-perpetuating board of trustees imaginable, but, if it be accepted by the Carnegie Foundation, its relation to the academic world and to the Christian Church is radically different from what it was before. Once it looked to the Christian Church for guidance, now it looks elsewhere. Its centre of gravity has shifted from the Church which founded it and nourished it to a body which was not in existence ten years ago, and the attraction of gravitation to this new centre is so strong that the centrifugal force may be said to be practically eliminated. The strict requirements of the Foundation are enough to prove this. The result of a violation of those requirements has probably not been faced by many of those who have accepted its benefits. The very proposal of withdrawal would awaken not only the loud protests of those who are now dependent on the Foundation for a livelihood, but of those who have served for years in the expectation of a pension,<sup>47</sup> and of the larger circle of those who fear

<sup>47</sup>How strong this expectation has already become appears from the stir made by the withdrawal of the service pension first offered by the Foundation. Into the question of good faith raised by some of those who expected to be beneficiaries, we need not enter here.

the loss of prestige if the institution is no longer connected with the Foundation. Is there any doubt that the centripetal force is well-nigh supreme?

We are, however, told that, granting the immense influence of the Foundation in the educational institutions under its care, that influence is exercised only along financial and academic lines. How inaccurate the statement is will appear later on. Mention need be made here only of the frequent references in the Reports to academic honesty, integrity and truthfulness, all of which are ethical qualities. But, granting that, at the present time, the sphere of the Foundation is only financial, academic and ethical, there is no guarantee that in the future the sphere shall be thus restricted. Enlargement has taken place in other directions, why not in this? Nothing in the conditions of admission limits the sphere of influence. The highest interests of the institutions and of education in general are to be promoted by the Foundation. If the trustees were to find a course of study or an atmosphere which, in their judgment, hindered the best interests of the institution, there is nothing in the agreement to restrain them from seeking to change it for a better. And, if a number of them were to believe, as some men always have believed, and as some prominent educators now believe, that the great foundation truths of Christianity are burdens on the human mind, and hindrances of human progress, it would be their duty, and certainly within their right, to object to the teaching of those truths in the institutions receiving their benefactions. It is not enough to say that this has not yet taken place. The Foundation is new and has been feeling its way very cautiously and in many directions very wisely. But prudent men in charge of Christian institutions would require guarantees of the strongest character that, at no time in the future, shall interference be made with the teaching of the great fundamentals of the Christian faith to the youth in Christian colleges. Whatever confidence we may have in the intentions of the present members of the Foundation, the history of educational

corporations points eloquently to the need of adequate guarantees of the place of religious instruction in our Christian institutions. These guarantees, it is needless to say, do not exist. In their place, there are only hopes, and in dealing with sacred funds, as with one's own funds, hopes will not take the place of guarantees.

That these conclusions are fully warranted appears from the authoritative statement of the Foundation. The President, Dr. Pritchett, relieves all uncertainty when he says:

"In order that there be no further misunderstanding on this point, let me add again that, in our understanding, an institution which has agreed to elect its trustees in the manner prescribed in our resolution, could not, consistently with the resolution, go before a conference or other religious body on the plea of being a church school, since the only thing that could make it a distinctive church school would be the indirect control which might come by choosing trustees from the denominations, an act which is contrary to the spirit of the resolution." . . .

"The resolution committed the board of trustees, in our judgment, to a choice of members on the ground of fitness for the board, neither rejecting a man nor taking him on account of the denominational ties. Under such a policy honestly administered, the board will in the long run contain a considerable proportion of members who are not Methodists."<sup>48</sup>

These quotations ought to be conclusive. Honesty, in the judgment of the Foundation, forbids an institution to accept its benefits and at the same time to call itself "a church school". That is, a school, founded and nourished by the Church and flourishing under her influence, dare not go as a daughter to the Church to ask for a blessing, or to seek guidance in her perplexity. Guidance, she may, indeed she must, have, but it is not the guidance of the Church, the mother which brought her into being. It is a guidance which comes in after the prayers, and the tears, and the sacrifices of the Church have brought to her an endowment, which, to satisfy the requirements of the Foun-

<sup>48</sup> *Baltimore and Richmond Advocate*, March 19, 1908, extract from an official letter dated Dec. 14, 1907.

dation, must be at least \$200,000, all of which passes beyond the control of the Church, when the college enters upon this new relation. The daughter is an exile, by her own act.

It must be obvious, therefore, that it is a grave misuse of terms to claim that a Christian college, accepting the benefits of the Foundation, may maintain "a real vital relation" to the Church. The Church, as well as the Foundation, demands honesty and accuracy. The change in the relations of such a college to the Church is fundamental and becomes more and more manifest as the years go by. That the extent of these changes was not apprehended at the outset by those who have advocated them, we may readily believe and modify our judgment accordingly.

It needs to be said in justice to the college presidents and boards of control, who have obtained release for their institutions in order to accept the benefits of the Foundation, that they have, in the case of one denomination, at least, acted within the limits of ecclesiastical authority. The Presbyterian Church U. S. A. has, from its beginning, been recognized as a college-building, rather than a cathedral-building Church. The General Assembly, in harmony with the historic policy of the Church, in 1908 unanimously adopted the following:

"That since experience indicates that the Church is a true friend of the Christian College, the relation of our institutions to the Church should remain in its present form, and should be kept close and prominent, and the urgent attitude of the Board on this subject should be strongly supported."<sup>49</sup>

The very next year, however, the General Assembly adopted the following, as recommended by its Committee on Administrative Agencies. It authorized the College Board

"To secure and receive moneys and other property for the benefit of any needy college or university, which is (1) organically connected with the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. or (2) required by its charter to have at least two-thirds of the board of control members of said church, or (3)

<sup>49</sup> *Minutes of The General Assembly, 1908, p. 108.*

actually under Presbyterian approval at the time of receiving assistance."<sup>50</sup>

The phrase "Presbyterian approval" is very general. Whatever understanding there may be, this new definition of the scope of the College Board does not make clear whether the approval is that of the Presbyterian Church in one or another of its representative courts, or merely that of a number of Presbyterian individuals. Further, the Presbyterian Church gives apparent sanction to the requirements of the Carnegie Foundation in that for several years past it has permitted institutions now under the Carnegie Foundation to be published on its list of colleges co-operating with, or reporting to, the College Board, with the following prefix in small type:

"The following institutions are not connected with the Presbyterian Church by any legal ties, nor are they subject to ecclesiastical control. Their history, however, and associations are such as to justify our earnest co-operation with them."<sup>51</sup>

With this authority, colleges, once Presbyterian and now under the Carnegie Foundation, are at liberty to enroll themselves under the Presbyterian name. This is in apparent conflict with the original requirements of the Foundation, although as shown above, it is permitted by the Foundation, probably as a concession to churchly sentiment. That the Church is willing to give even a quasi-endorsement to the institutions in the management of which it has no voice, and to which it merely lends its name for whatever good they can secure from it, without any means of protecting that name, is simply incredible. It will not be permitted to continue when it is generally understood. Indeed, it is to be presumed that the action was taken before its significance became apparent, and that the whole question will be reopened shortly and settled on lines consistent with the historic policy of the Church.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 1909, pp. 235-236.

<sup>51</sup> *Report of the College Board.* 1908, p. 27.

## VIII

## THE CUMULATIVE ARGUMENT FOR CHURCH CONTROL

Church colleges (and all who are concerned in their welfare), which are considering the advantages offered them by a connection with the Carnegie Foundation, will more and more take into account a number of considerations which need to be weighed against these advantages.

The *legal* questions, of course, concern only such institutions as are related to the Church in one or another of the modes of control enumerated above. They differ in each case, but each case deserves the attention of impartial men well versed in the law. The questions arising are not new, and the precedents of the courts are well-defined and numerous. Of the many, it is enough to cite here the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1819 in the case of Dartmouth College. The Rev. Eleazer Wheelock, at his own expense, and on his own land, founded a school for the religious training of the Indians, which afterwards was enlarged and with a donation of £50, and in view of his services as agent and trustee, was named for the Earl of Dartmouth. A charter was obtained from the King of England, incorporating the trustees with power to erect and conduct a college and control the operation thereof, and to elect their own successors. Afterwards the Legislature of New Hampshire passed a bill enlarging the number of trustees, adding the names of others to the original number, creating also a board of overseers to have perpetual succession to disapprove the votes of the trustees as to the appointment or removal of the president, professors, etc. In the case arising, appeal was taken and finally reached the Supreme Court. The views presented by Mr. Webster were sustained by Chief Justice Marshall, who in an extensive opinion said :

“The founders of the college contracted not merely for the perpetual application of the funds which they gave to the objects for which those funds were given; they contracted also to secure that application by the constitution of the corporation. They contracted for a system which should,

as far as human foresight can provide, retain forever the government of the literary institution they had formed, in the hands of persons approved by themselves. This system is totally changed (by the action of the Legislature). The charter of 1769 exists no longer. It is reorganized; and reorganized in such a manner as to convert a literary institution, moulded according to the will of its founders, and placed under the control of private literary men, into a machine entirely subservient to the will of the government. This may be for the advantage of this college in particular, and may be for the advantage of literature in general, but it is not according to the will of the donors, and is subversive of that contract, on the faith of which their property was given."<sup>52</sup>

Applying this principle to the case of Brown University, Mr. Barbour aptly says:

"It was apparently the inviolability of the right of founders that gave inviolability to the position of trustees, and indications seem to be conclusive, that, with respect to the fundamental organic provisions of charters, and certainly with respect to provisions declared to be unalterable, limitations upon trustees are not less real and inviolable than limitations upon independent legislative action."<sup>53</sup>

These principles apply, not merely to institutions with self-perpetuating boards of trustees, but also to those in which the control of the Church is recognized. In either case, the charter is the basis on which donations have been made, and the rights of donors are as clear in one case as in the other. Kind-hearted legislatures may grant amendments to these charters, but they are not the final authorities, and the courts are open to those whose interests are at stake. Church courts, holding relations of control or substantial interest in educational institutions, have a duty to protect those interests and the rights of donors, rather than to acquiesce in proposals arising out of a temporary situation and an apparent advantage. Neither piety, nor fidelity to a sacred trust will quietly submit to the aliena-

---

<sup>52</sup> *4 Wheaton*, p. 517ff.

<sup>53</sup> *Notes*, p. 40.



tion of property in which the Church has substantial interest.

On the *economic* questions involved, we are indebted to the Foundation for valuable information. It has gathered this information from sixty-two institutions:

“A college whose faculty included twenty professors of all grades at an average salary of twenty-five hundred dollars, would have an annual pay-roll of fifty thousand dollars and would expend twenty-five hundred dollars in maintaining its retiring allowance systems. Whether this is a fair indication of the expense involved it is difficult to say.”<sup>54</sup>

If this estimate is accepted, it brings the retiring allowance system within reach of many colleges which have not thought of establishing it, because of the large expense involved. On this basis, \$50,000 or \$60,000 will provide enough for an institution having twenty professors of all grades. This is no more than the cost of many buildings. It raises the question whether the guidance, if not the actual control of the institution, should be surrendered to an outside corporation in return for a sum of money no larger than this.

An institution which, for over fifty years has sustained corporate relations with the Church, and has acquired in that time grounds and buildings valued at more than \$850,000, a productive endowment of over \$600,000, making a total of about \$1,500,000, has now two professors eligible for retirement and in a few years may have three more. The minimum allowance of the Carnegie Foundation is \$1000, the addition in each case being a matter of adjustment. If all of these five men should live and be retired, the allowances would amount to \$5000, or a little more. A wise economy raises the question whether \$5000 annually would be an adequate return for the surrender by the institution of its historic relation to the Church and for the surrender by the Church of her power to influence the course of education in an institution numbering four hun-

<sup>54</sup> *Third Annual Report*, p. 51.

dred students. An addition of \$100,000 to the endowment would provide all that would be needed as a pension fund for years to come. It is strange that, amid lavish expenditures on the mere externals, faithful professors should be left unprovided for, when a sum like this is given to our colleges every week of the year.

The *ethical* questions involved are the more pressing in view of the growing sensitiveness of public opinion. These underlie nearly all the other questions. The committee of Brown University unitedly recognized the fact that a college seeking material changes in its constitution was liable to a charge of "sordid motives" and found that many of their constituents believed that such a change cannot be made "without grave misunderstanding".<sup>55</sup> And Mr. Barbour, and Dr. Horr, close their "Notes" with the following weighty words:

"We would not, however, wish it to be understood that this necessity, in our judgment, results exclusively from legal considerations. From the outset, we have been persuaded that the legal difficulty inheres in a moral difficulty. Whenever the founders of an institution have been encouraged to believe that the conditions imposed by them would remain inviolate and gifts have been received upon this basis, and by legal presumption with the same intent and understanding, we believe that the governing boards are morally bound to regard the essential terms of the Foundation. For these boards are not simply administrative, they are also custodians and the two forms of obligation are equally inviolable (*sic*). We cannot too earnestly express our conviction that the power of a trustee does not extend to alteration of the fundamental terms of a charter. The question at issue is not what as individuals we would favor, but what as guardians of a trust we are free to do."<sup>56</sup>

For over three years the state of Virginia has been ringing with the protests of those whose fathers before them, as well as they themselves, have prayed, and labored, and given to Randolph-Macon College as an institution of the

<sup>55</sup> *Final Report*, p. 5.

<sup>56</sup> *Notes*, p. 44.

Church, against the proposal to alienate the college in order to secure the pensions of the Foundation. The tender sympathy for the veterans has been none the less real because of the larger ethical questions involved in the proposal. As shown above, the protest has not ceased with the withdrawal of the institution from the Foundation, and a persistent demand continues for the recognition in some unalterable way of the rights of the Church. The Carnegie Foundation advocates educational honesty so strongly that it will surely sympathize with the Methodists of Virginia in this demand. Buildings and endowment may be all that could be asked for, but the buildings will be empty and the endowment will be unemployed if the institution has violated the sense of right in the minds of its constituency.<sup>57</sup> More than one such melancholy instance could be cited.

Moreover, the effect of such changes upon the student body needs to be taken into account. They are not wholly unaware of them. They understand, in general, that their college is no longer connected with their church because it desired the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation. College presidents, in addition to the regular courses in sociology and ethics, will doubtless find it desirable to explain fully the reasons for which these relations were changed.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> The first of these courses (severing the legal connection) does not commend itself to the management of the most of our denominational institutions. Some few, it is said, have made a spectacle of themselves in their hurry to change their charters and constitutions to conform to the requirements for admission. This conduct was hardly fair to their founders and must in time bring reflection on themselves in the eyes of all thinking men. If when there was no fund designated for such purpose as that of the Foundation, men were willing to make the sacrifice, they must recognize that their sacrifice is no greater now, and their deprivation no added hardship. An institution bedded in the affection of a devoted constituency, and which has gathered about it a history of achievements that come only with years, cannot afford to tear itself aloof from the trust and confidence of its friends, especially if by such an act it detached itself from the fundamental things that brought it into being. *Lutheran Quarterly*, October, 1910, p. 506.

<sup>58</sup> Mr. J. P. Cushing, of the High School at New Haven, Conn., asks: "What will these boys say (and they are a pretty keen lot) as

On the broad question of *educational policy*, full importance should be attached to the aims outlined for the Foundation by its President, in view of the many defects of our present educational system. A hearty support is due to every effort to elevate our colleges in honesty and efficiency of administration, and yet a growing number of thoughtful men question the value of a corporation created by the generosity of one man, a private corporation, working simply along the lines laid down by him and responsible neither to Church nor State so long as it keeps within its own broad charter. Its present aim seems to be to compass the whole system of American education. No institution of higher learning is beyond its reach. Even those which are barred from its benefactions receive the inquiries of its industrious executive and feel obliged to respond to the demands. In State institutions, the benefactions are granted only when the applications to this private corporation are approved by the governors and the legislatures. As we have no national university, no need has yet arisen for the President and the Congress of the United States to apply for assistance. President Schurman of Cornell is widely recognized as an educator, and his words derive special significance from the fact that he is a trustee of the Foundation. In his address before the National Association of State Universities in October, 1909, he notes the rise of a new species of corporations by which benefactors have learned to perpetuate themselves:

“The rich philanthropist who objectifies himself in such a benevolent corporation, of course names the trustees; and subsequent vacancies in the Board are filled by coöptation. . . . A corporation of this kind is a distributing agency for wealth set apart for educational purposes. . . . It may do anything and everything that tends to create an efficient system of state or national education. . . .

they discuss the ethical principles involved in a college renouncing its allegiance? Will they not sometimes recall the story of the young man who sold his birthright? Is the cause of teaching advanced when colleges, once strongholds of higher education, are tempted to forsake the faith that has made them what they are?” *The Nation*, March 10, 1910.

"I cannot but think that they create a new and dangerous situation for the independent and privately endowed universities. Just in proportion as these are supported by those benevolent corporations is their centre of gravity thrown outside themselves. It is no longer the case of a rich man giving his money, going his way (eventually dying) and leaving the university free to manage its own affairs. The purse strings are now controlled by an immortal power, which makes it its business to investigate and supervise, and which lays down conditions that the university must accept if it is to receive grants of money. An irresponsible, self-perpetuating board, whose business is to dispense money, necessarily tends to look at every question from the pecuniary point of view; it wants its money's worth; it demands immediate and tangible results. Will not its large powers and enormous influence in relation to the institutions dependent upon it tend to develop in it an attitude of patronage and a habit of meddling? The very ambition of such a corporation to reform educational abuses is itself a source of danger. Men are not constituted educational reformers by having millions to spend. And, indeed, an irresponsible, self-perpetuating board of this sort may become a real menace (*sic*) to the best interests of higher education. . . . I make no exception even of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to which Mr. Carnegie has given such large endowments for the pensioning of the professors in the colleges, technical schools and universities of the United States and Canada, and I certainly speak with no prejudice as I regard that endowment as the best thing any benefactor has ever done for higher education in America, and I have myself the honor of being one of the trustees."<sup>59</sup>

These bold words have created a profound impression. In certain quarters they have been minimized and, as if to provide against this, Dr. Schurman in addressing the same association in November, 1910, broadened his statement as follows:

"The trouble, I fear, about all these organizations, like the Rockefeller Foundation in this country, and for that matter the Carnegie Foundation (of which I am one of the

---

<sup>59</sup> Address before the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Universities, Oct. 8-9, 1909, pp. 14-16.

trustees), and the similar Carnegie organization in Scotland, is, that I think, they all have the tendency (I do not say it is always actualized) to shift the centre of gravity of universities outside themselves. . . . I had an opportunity not long ago of talking the matter over, first with professors in Scotch universities, and secondly with the officers of the Carnegie organization itself. The professors complained that the independent, autonomous life of the university, was menaced by the institution, for the authorities of the university were no longer the masters of their own life and destiny. The organization which controlled the money-bags controlled them (*sic*). If that organization said: 'We will give money for modern languages', or 'for a commercial course', or some other course which they thought desirable, and the faculty or the governing boards, or the trustees would never have thought of such department, they must either accept it or go without the money which this organization has at its disposal. . . . It is a question in my mind whether . . . you can have organizations with large sums of money at their disposal, chartered with authority to bestow that money upon other institutions which are doing a good work for the community—educational, charitable, religious, or what not, without tending (and in many cases the tendency would be realized) to disarrange and even disorganize the work of those institutions."<sup>60</sup>

Dr. Schurman is entirely free from the odious charge of religious sectarianism, but as yet no one representing the Christian Church has spoken as severely as he has in these two successive years. It is greatly to the credit of the members of the Foundation, and of the founder, Mr. Carnegie, that these utterances of Dr. Schurman do not seem to have impaired the value of his counsels as a trustee. In this broadminded tolerance, there lies great hope. These views are Dr. Schurman's; some publicists and educators go beyond him.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> *Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities*, 1910, pp. 287-288.

<sup>61</sup> *Popular Science Monthly* for April 1910, says editorially, "The Foundation supplies an additional income to a number of colleges and universities, but this appears to be the end of its usefulness. The attempt of an energetic president to lord it over the educational devel-

The experience of the *George Washington University* shows that institutions not connected with the Church are also subject to the general educational policy of the Foundation. The statement of Dr. Pritchett is not complete or even sufficient to an understanding of the case.<sup>62</sup> It appears that the endowment had been reduced below the limit fixed and in that there was ground for inquiry, if not for action, on the part of the Foundation. As to the two professors, perhaps no one outside of the faculty or the board of trustees is competent to speak, the differences being over questions of university efficiency. No mention is made in Dr. Pritchett's statement of the third ground at first assigned for the action, the number of special students.<sup>63</sup> Reserving judgment on the merits of this case, our institutions should take notice that, according to the statement of the president of the University, which stands unchallenged, the agent of the Foundation in his brief visit was shown every courtesy and expressed to the president his appreciation, and when invited to give his views made

opment of the country, has done some temporary harm; but the money by which he can purchase submission will soon be exhausted. It has been a sorry sight to see institutions raising standards which they cannot and should not maintain, freeing themselves nominally from denominational control—one has offered to establish an undenominational holding company—and most of all to watch the great state universities begging the favors of a private corporation. Thirty-two state legislatures have approved the request for money, and the Foundation finds that four of the universities are worthy, while the others—institutions such as California and Illinois—must be further investigated. The President tells the Governor of Ohio how the University of that great state should be administered; he says, that 'in nearly every state' there is 'educational demoralization'. In his last report Dr. Pritchett makes all kinds of recommendations. Some are in themselves good and some bad, but all are bad in so far as they come from that source, for there is an implicit threat everywhere that institutions must do as they are told or they will not receive Carnegie money (*sic*). The best thing that could happen would be for the Foundation to retire its president with a liberal pension, to write about education over his own signature, and then, as the Peabody Fund has wisely done, to dissolve and distribute its funds among our colleges" (p. 414-415).

<sup>62</sup> *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 42.

<sup>63</sup> *The Independent*, July 1909.

a few remarks, in part complimentary, and in part a friendly criticism, but without any intimation that the investigation was being made with a view to terminating the relation of the University to the Foundation. With almost oriental swiftness and severity, the blow fell.<sup>64</sup> If it were intended as a warning to other institutions it could not have been more effective, and yet an institution can hardly do satisfactory work if it lives under the constant dread of such treatment.

The question has been raised in regard to state universities as to how far the tax-payers of the state will be willing that a private corporation, doing business at one end of the country, shall set the standards by which their universities are to be regulated. This is a question of public, as well as of educational, policy. It would be unfortunate if it were to be injected into political debate.<sup>65</sup>

The *ecclesiastical* questions involved are many. Some persons might suppose that denominational institutions, being excluded from the benefactions of the Foundation, would also be deprived of the benefits arising out of the scrutiny of the President of the Foundation. This, however, is a hopelessly narrow view. He seeks to elevate, by his criticisms, institutions which the Foundation declines to assist with its money, and not institutions only, but de-

---

<sup>64</sup> In his letter to President Pritchett, dated June 11, 1909, the President of the University says: "It is a matter of sincere regret on the part of everyone who has read the letter, that your organization, with its high aims for the advancement of all true efforts in educational work, should have taken this action without any notice to the university, and without giving it any opportunity to be heard upon the real and apparent reason for your action, as shown by your letter. That an institution of learning, with 1500 students, should be struck such a blow without warning, or opportunity to correct any defect in its administration that might be shown, is difficult to comprehend, and as expressed by others than myself, almost impossible to believe." *Statement of President Needham*, p. 11.

<sup>65</sup> "In those states where state universities control educational policies, put this question. What right has a State legislature to allow its State university, and institutions supported for the public by public taxation, to be controlled as to standard or policies by an outside body?" *The Nation*, March 10, 1910.



nominations as well. On the question of the Church's right to continue her historic work of education, he says:

"What is needed to-day is religious leadership. Whether such leadership is more likely to be secured by seeking it within a specified denomination or without regard to denominational lines, and whether the leadership chosen within a given denomination will tend rather to be denominational than religious, are questions on which men are likely, for some time to come, to have different opinions. The experience of the past certainly inclines thoughtful men to question whether those whose primary object is to save men's souls are the best qualified for training their minds. . . . Whether a denominational connection or control tends to improve the organization of a college, the reply almost universally will be that denominational conditions, such as the requirements that trustees shall belong to a given denomination, are serious limitations and the denominational control is a hindrance, not a benefit, to the college organization."<sup>66</sup>

From this it appears that the President has definitely committed himself to the dissolution of the ties which bind the colleges to the Church. In doing so he enters into the intimate life of every denomination whose institutions are inclined to look to the Foundation for assistance. This is a position of tremendous responsibility for one man, however gifted, and however highly educated.

The system of ministerial education, also, comes in for criticism. We learn from the President of the Foundation, Dr. Pritchett, that

"Another disadvantage under which the ministry has labored is the burden of sectarianism, the most common form of devotion to specifics (*sic*), which the world has known. In this respect, the profession of the preacher resembles somewhat that of the medical practitioner, with the difference that the medical sects are fewer in number. . . . Much has been said in recent years of the decay of churches and the weakening of Church ties, particularly among Protestants. Many explanations have been given of this tendency. No doubt many factors have a share in the result which we see. Amongst these one of the most evident is

<sup>66</sup> *Second Annual Report*, pp. 53-54.

inefficiency of the ministry due in the main to low standards of admission. . . . The old mother Church has pursued a more farsighted policy in this matter than the majority of her daughters. She requires of all her priests a long and severe training. . . . To it is due in very large measure the enormous moral power of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world, particularly among the great masses of working people in the city, where Protestantism has been so markedly ineffective."<sup>67</sup>

Thus, we have a judgment not only on the wisdom of that policy of the Christian Church which has provided education for her youth, but also on the highest form which that education takes, the education of her ministry. With this question councils, conferences and assemblies, some of them ecumenical, have wrestled, and have reached their conclusions slowly and announced them with many qualifications. Not so, however, with the President of the Foundation. Protestantism is ineffective: Its ministry is inefficient: This inefficiency is due to low standards of admission: The Roman Catholic Church, on the contrary, requires a long and severe training: She has in consequence an enormous moral power. These judgments are given us without qualification. Presumably they are final, at least for all those who either covet or dread the influence of the President of the Foundation. It does not appear where he acquired the information and the experience which warrant such broad statements. They imply a familiarity with theological encyclopedias under either Protestant or Roman Catholic auspices, and with the problems of ecclesiastical administration as wrought out in the various bodies with which he now undertakes to deal. It is not to be supposed that the technical school, from the charge of which he was called to his present position, afforded opportunities for special investigation. Probably we should regard these judgments of his as intuitive. They certainly seem to have been formed prior to experience.

But the ecclesiastical ventures of the President go beyond

---

<sup>67</sup> *Third Annual Report*, p. 162.

the principle of denominational education and even beyond the type of theological instruction, to the questions of Church administration. Even the educational boards and the courts of the Church are under surveillance. The Presbyterian Church, through its College Board, and with the approval of the General Assembly, has established and is maintaining Westminster University at Denver, Colorado, which has property valued at \$300,000 and received last year gifts for current expenses amounting to \$22,655.05.<sup>68</sup> We may assume that the College Board acted with its characteristic conservatism in assisting this new institution, and that the General Assembly was within its discretion in recognizing it, but this does not weigh with the President of the Foundation, who says:

"I very much fear that the Westminster College is not a college of the Apostles, and that it crept into the fold at one of those unfortunate moments when denominational ambition and real estate promotion temporarily got the upper hand."<sup>69</sup>

We cannot suppose that the Presbyterian Church occupies a position of peculiar privilege with Dr. Pritchett, but rather that his watchful eye scans the whole field of denominational activity, and that he scrutinizes with equal freedom the administrative acts of Baptist Associations, Methodist Conferences and Episcopal Councils so far as they bear on education. His decisions in the different cases which come to him, *sub judice*, are doubtless rendered as promptly as possible, but as yet no way seems to have been found for communicating these directly to the various Church councils. Something must be done at once; if nothing more, the annual reports which contain these decisions, must be read at these councils, lest the members take action unadvisedly concerning their institutions.

It is unfortunate that such lucubrations should mar the really valuable investigations of Dr. Pritchett along the lines of general education. It is apparently a case of

<sup>68</sup> *Report of the College Board*, 1910, pp. 19-25.

<sup>69</sup> *Fourth Annual Report*, p. 120.

overmuch writing for which no one is responsible but himself. But the plea can no longer be made that the Foundation concerns itself only with "financial and academic" questions.

The purpose underlying this wide range of criticism of ecclesiastical proceedings, is to protect educational institutions from the evils of sectarianism. It was the "sects" which were excluded when the Foundation was created, and the spirit they foster is to be fought to the end. Just what is to be understood by this odious phrase in its present use it is hard to say. Very early in its history, Christianity was known as "the sect of the Nazarenes",<sup>70</sup> "a sect which everywhere was spoken against".<sup>71</sup> If it be said that it is not Christianity, but Christianity in its denominational form that is objected to, we must ask for a definition, intensive as well as extensive, of undenominational Christianity. The most ardent denominationalists among us would accept, as the basis of definition, one or another of the great creeds or confessions held in common by the universal Church, but the impression has been made that these creeds are themselves open to suspicion as being the embodiments of sectarianism, in that their teachings are standing athwart the pathway of educational progress as understood by some modern educators. Negatively, it is easy to say what this undenominational Christianity is not, but the authorities upon it have not yet been able to agree as to its positive form. Instead they refer to what they call the "spirit" which they find in men who repudiate every distinctive tenet of the historic faith quite as often as in those who receive this faith and live to exemplify it. Earnest Christian men will quietly endure the opprobrium of "sectarianism" as a part of "the reproach of Christ", with an increasing sense of their oneness in Him, and of the priceless value of the truth He has given to them in common.

The chief consideration affecting the Christian Church

---

<sup>70</sup> Acts xxiv. 5.

<sup>71</sup> Acts xxviii. 22.

is, of course, the *religious* one. The Church has no quarrel with men who oppose her faith or her methods, or who seek to neutralize her influence, so long as their course is open and straightforward. The only sinister influence in such a movement arises out of a formal profession of the Christian faith and an acceptance of the solemn ordination vows as affording a position for assailing that faith the more effectively. Men of the world are often more severe in their judgment of this course than is the Church itself, and sooner or later the offenders are detected and exposed. All Christians, worthy of the name, are united in the purpose to maintain the historic faith, though they may differ as to their mode of doing so. They find in it the only tenable solution of the problems of the universe, the only satisfactory answer to the cravings of the human spirit, the only promise of a future that is at once worthy of the dignity of man and within the reach of sinful man. Modern investigation, which has thrown such a flood of light on religious as on other questions, has not abated the needs of men, nor has it dissolved the historic faith. The attack, which at the moment seems severe, is merely the repetition of that which the Faith has met in every age. The waves dash high, and seem to overwhelm the rock, but the rock abides long after the wave has receded. If much of our current so-called religious literature appears to contradict this, it is because that literature is itself only a part of the wave. In the face of the abiding value of God's revelation to man, the Church founded her colleges and is now maintaining them, for the sake of our youth, who, like ourselves, need to come into the presence of things unseen and eternal. Under this view, education means something beyond cultural and technical courses, something beyond a merely scientific Bible study. Education in the highest sense is had only when the soul rests on God, and, thus resting, lives a life transformed within and without. If this end be reached, Christian Education has not failed, though it may be incomplete. If this end be missed, no academic qualities can atone for the fail-

ure. The scrutiny which the Church makes of movements which bear upon the religious life is therefore close. At the risk of being misunderstood, she must require of these movements that they declare themselves.

Approaching the Carnegie Foundation with this inquiry, we find that its generous founder "has no hostility to any denomination, least of all does he wish to hamper in any way the cause of religion".<sup>72</sup> We find also that the trustees are men of high character, and of large influence in the modern world, and that a number of them are members of Christian churches and some of them are in the Christian ministry. How far their personal attitude towards the Christian faith will mould the policy of the Foundation is not clear. Though most of the institutions upon their roll are in some sense Christian, they have given no expression to their common faith. The only information available is in their public writings. Of the trustees, the President, of course, occupies the foremost place. His views on religion differ probably from those of many of his associates, but it is safe to say that the attitude of the Foundation will not be very different from that of its President, as long as he is President. After assuring us that Mr. Carnegie would not "hamper the cause of religion", the President goes on to say,

"The essentials of religion are the same whether men belong to one religious organization or another. Religion is a life springing up in the human soul which blossoms into forgetfulness of self, in service to God and men."<sup>73</sup>

This definition of religion was given in a formal address before the Educational Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It may, therefore, be taken as expressing the mature judgment of the President of the Foundation. It is in accord with his views as given in his book, in which he says:

"That this (scientific) conception of religion and of God is inconsistent with the idea of a divine, omnipotent person,

<sup>72</sup> *Christian Denominations and The Colleges*, p. 5.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

interfering directly in the affairs of our lives and of our world, seems to me clear. The whole conception of the universe, as the man of science sees it, leads him to recognize the presence of God in the working of steadfast and unchanging laws. So far as his observations go, and so far as his researches into the history of mankind throw light upon the question, no instance of such interference has ever been known (*sic*). On the other hand, it is against his whole conception of the orderly and just development of the universe.<sup>74</sup>

“The man who finds that his reason leads him to accept the scientific view of God, does not truly accept a spiritual relationship less rich, less sincere, less helpful, than he who thinks of God as a Father, and as governing directly and arbitrarily the affairs of his own life and of his own world. Do not for one moment let yourself believe that, if you find the traditional, historical conception of religion impossible, you have thereby ceased to be a religious man.”<sup>75</sup>

These citations illuminate the conception of religion as held by the President of the Foundation. They deserve the close attention of the guardians of Christian colleges who would conserve Christian truth. If no instance of God’s “interference in the affairs of our lives and of our world” “has ever been known”, there is of course no place for the Incarnation of our Lord or for His Resurrection and ours or for Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, to say nothing of the many other miracles of Scripture. One such sentence, if true, sweeps away the Christian Faith and makes it the product of purely natural forces. Dr. Pritchett’s “man of science” may “see” the Universe thus, but, as Dr. Orr has shown, he is not of the class with Bacon, Newton, Faraday, and Brewster and Kelvin. The late Prof. Tait said “that the truly scientific men and true theologians of the present day have not found themselves under the necessity of quarrelling.” And the late Prof. Romanes gave, as one reason for his return to faith, the fact that in his own University of Cambridge the avowed Christians included the men of the highest attainments in science and he names

<sup>74</sup> *What is Religion?* pp. 39-40.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid* p. 41.

among others, Sir George Stokes and Profs. Tait, Adams, Clerk Maxwell, and Bayley. Whatever one may think of these sweeping statements of Dr. Pritchett's, it is within bounds to say that there is scarcely an institution upon the Carnegie Foundation which claims to be in any sense Christian, that would sanction, as an official utterance, this unqualified denial of the essentials of religion. And yet the views just quoted were expressed in a series of chapel addresses to young men in the institution over which Dr. Pritchett presided before he became President of the Foundation.

As if to show that he was dealing, not with the intellectual and philosophical aspects of religion only, but with religion in its personal and devotional aspect, he says :

"It seems, therefore, clear to me that, in the sense in which I have used the words, all serious men, whatever their intellectual training, must pray, not, perhaps, for material help, not in expectation that the laws of the universe shall be changed at their request, nor even primarily for strength to live rightly and justly (*sic*), but as the supreme effort of the human soul to know God. And whether that which we call prayer be a direct communion with Him as our Heavenly Father, or whether it be a communion with our higher consciousness, which is in touch with Him (*sic*), in either case the time can never come when a human soul will not rise from such communion purified and strengthened, with new hope and new patience, and with a more serene view of his own duty and his own future."<sup>76</sup>

This, perhaps, marks the climax of the religious teaching of the President of the Foundation. It was reached several years ago and nothing since then has appeared to indicate any change of view. Prayer which does not ask for help, nor even for strength to live rightly or justly, is the mockery of needy man. Prayer which is simply communion with our higher consciousness is a travesty.

The issues thus raised by the President involve, of course, the fundamentals of the faith. It is not a question of denominational differences. If this be 'sectarianism'

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 93.



the Christian Church as a whole lies under the charge. Whatever be the form of doctrine, or government, or worship, the God of the Church is One to whom she approaches, saying "Oh, Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come!" If such views become current in our academic halls by reason of the official visitations of the President of the Foundation, the chapels in which from day to day the voice of prayer has been heard, may be converted into gymnasiums or laboratories. Young men, even under compulsion, will not engage in mockeries and travesties of the faith of their fathers, even if their own faith be not strong. Earnest young men to whom the problems of life are already real, and who have learned to carry them to God, will turn, some of them from the institution, and some of them from God Himself. Like Elijah, the youth of our Christian homes have learned to believe in the prayer-hearing and the prayer-answering God. And, if it be said that the President of the Foundation, when visiting the institutions, refrains from expressing these radical views, is it to be supposed that either professors or students will remain uninfluenced by what they know to be the real belief of the man whose place is the most powerful in the Foundation under which their institution has been brought? In such a case, silence is more eloquent than speech and it is an eloquence which forbodes spiritual death to all who come under its spell. Let us again remind ourselves that these are the views of the President alone, and that we are under obligations to him for his frankness and for his lucidity, and further, that he is entitled to all freedom in holding and propagating them. Let us also remember that the trustees and the founder are entirely within their rights in the selection of a president for the Foundation. The question lies not with the founder, nor the Foundation, nor the president, but with the Christian men in charge of Christian institutions carrying this overwhelming responsibility: If the cause of religion suffers in such an institution, the blame will lie with those who, representing the institution, have

urged and consented to its separation from the Christian Church.

These, the legal, the economic, the ethical, the ecclesiastical, the general educational, and the religious, are some of the considerations which must weigh with Christian institutions looking towards the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation. These considerations vary in their application to each case, but in one form or another they bear upon the life of every one of our colleges. The president or the board of control of a Christian institution making application to the Carnegie Foundation says, virtually, to his own constituency, to the Church in which his institution has been nourished, and to the Christian community at large ;

#### NECESSARY ASSURANCES AND GUARANTEES

1. No legal hindrance arising out of the charter or the constitutional relations of our college exists. Not only our lawyers, and our legislature, but the higher courts, justify us in renouncing our relationship to the Christian Church and assure us that the rights of all parties in interest are conserved by this step.

2. A wise economy of the financial resources of our institutions, and a careful forecast of our expectations from the community and the Church alike, commend our application for the benefactions of the Foundation.

3. The moral right of our case is so clear that no reasonable man would misunderstand us or judge that we were exalting unduly the value of money in the life of our institution. Our young men, who are soon to go out into life, will carry with them from our act the highest ideals of character and conduct.

4. The policy we will hereafter pursue under the guidance of the Foundation, makes for the largest results in, not only the intellectual training of our students, but the preparation of them for life as self-reliant, independent thinkers and workers in the complex social organism of the day.

5. Our relations with the Church with which we have

been affiliated, will not be hindered by this new relationship, nor will we be influenced thereby to policies contrary to those which the experience of the Church has approved.

6. The religious life of our faculty and our student-body is so surely, and so fixedly, Christian, that we can without danger bring our institution into personal contact with those who openly deny the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and we cheerfully accept all responsibility for the results of such contact.

These considerations, in one form or another, will of course be duly weighed by those who are now in charge of our Church institutions. If, under the conclusions they reach, they are obliged to decline the benefits of the Foundation, they will feel a sincere regret that advantages so great must be relinquished, and that the generous founder, in the exercise of his discretion, saw fit to fix conditions which are insurmountable obstacles to their acceptance of his benefactions. They will be grateful for the gifts he has made to their institutions without these conditions. They will feel confident that he and every other sane man will recognize the principles by which they are guided, and the trusts which they are called to administer. And they will part, if part they must, as friends and fellow-workers in a large field, though with the aims in view standing out in sharp contrast.

## IX.

### THE CHURCH AND HER VETERANS: AN ADEQUATE PROVISION

Meantime, the needs of the veteran professors press for attention. They are aging, and their service to the college is not what it once was, yet they have no means of livelihood except their salary.

What is to be done is, of course, a large question. President Schurman thinks that "the menace" of such corporations as the Carnegie Foundation would be removed if the trustees were made answerable to the public, or if the money were distributed among the colleges. In some in-

stances, the fine example set by Brown University will be followed. It will appear that, as at Brown: "There would be a keener interest in giving to a pension fund than in giving to any other object whatsoever. The appeal on behalf of our teaching staff would reach the heart of every alumnus".<sup>77</sup> The cost of a new building would give a fund sufficient to provide for the veterans, and although this may be a new appeal, the conscience of the constituency would respond.

In other instances, the resources of the college are so slender, and the material needs are so great, that such a fund is out of the question. Provision must be made from the outside for a pension fund as it is already made in part for salaries. The appeal must be made to the great heart of the Church which brought the college into being and has sustained it thus far. The Church must care for the veteran professor doing the work of God as she has cared for the veteran preacher of the Word of God. The President of the Foundation, Dr. Pritchett, has, with great directness, pointed out the duty of the Church to the institutions which she controls: "It is no part of Christian education to hold control of a college and leave it to starve".<sup>78</sup> It is, of course, easier for the Church to surrender this control and to leave an outside corporation to provide the funds than it is for her to provide them, but the history of the Church is full of instances in which she has risen to the need as it appears and provided for the work entrusted to her hands.<sup>79</sup> In

<sup>77</sup> *Final Report*, p. 5.

<sup>78</sup> *Christian Denominations and The Colleges*, p. 25.

<sup>79</sup> "While there is no hiding from our eyes the fact that there is in this new movement a serious menace to the cause of religious education, there is one possible outcome of it that may result in vast good to our cause. The only real charm in the new movement is the gold there is in it. It becomes, therefore, a terrific challenge to the Church to endow its schools adequately, and to provide a foundation for the sustenance of retired teachers. That the Church is amply able to do this there cannot be the slightest question. If it should decline to make such provision and thus allow the higher educational work to pass from its hands, it would become guilty of selling its most interesting and fruitful field for mere gold. This the Church will never do. It is

this conviction, she has established her colleges and endowed them, she has sent her missionaries throughout the land and through foreign lands, she has provided for the education of young men for the ministry, and for the relief of aged and infirm ministers. She did this in the days of her poverty. Now those days are past and she can no longer say "Silver and gold have I none". She raises today a hundred thousand dollars more readily than she raised a thousand dollars a hundred years ago. In this day of large gifts to Education, the difficulties are not to be thought of in comparison with those which were encountered when the great funds of the Church were first established. The appeal to Christian givers of broad sympathies and of large means would be effective, and this appeal would not interfere with those objects which, in the ordinary channels of Church benevolence, are already established. No conflict, therefore, would arise between this and the great causes which now claim the attention of the Church.

The question is, of course, a large one, but we are accustomed to large things today. The figures are, for the most part, available. A table prepared by the College Board of the Presbyterian Church affords the basis of calculation.<sup>80</sup> The results of the valuable investigations of the Carnegie Foundation into the actuarial and other questions are before

morally capable of the struggle necessary to raise any amount of money, but it is not morally capable of forsaking this supreme obligation to mankind." From an *Address before the Religious Education Association* at Nashville, Tenn., March 19, 1910, by Right Rev. James Atkins, D.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Waynesville, N. C.

<sup>80</sup> Inst.	Denomination	Faculty	Students	Property	Endowment
*11	Baptist	2,310	33,329	\$25,476,000	\$22,058,000
20	Christian	415	6,091	2,170,000	1,131,000
42	Congregational	1,746	21,769	6,662,000	24,394,000
47	Lutheran	557	8,842	3,039,000	767,000
103	Methodist	3,171	41,268	23,206,000	18,780,000
77	Presbyterian	1,578	19,796	14,096,000	8,688,000
10	Prot. Episcopal	667	5,744	17,284,000	18,970,000
61	Roman Catholic	1,649	16,248	25,350,000	1,517,000

us in the Reports.<sup>81</sup> Possibly the Foundation would place at our disposal information more in detail. The rules to be followed would require some modification, but those of the Carnegie Foundation appear to be both just and considerate.<sup>82</sup>

Such a fund should provide not only for the professors in our Church colleges but for all who serve the cause of Christ in the capacity of teachers or instructors in the institutions of the Church. The man or woman whose life has been given to teaching in the missionary schools in foreign lands, or in the missionary schools scattered throughout America, and this on a salary far below that of the average college professor, is as truly worthy of a retiring pension as the college professor. The missionary boards of the Church could confirm this statement, and probably would welcome such a provision for the devoted men and women who are under their direction. The professors in theological seminaries would have to be included if the system were comprehensive. The institutions would have to be classified and each class dealt with according to its grade and its scope.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>81</sup> *Bulletin: Financial Status of Professors in America and Germany.*

<sup>82</sup> The underlying principles of these rules as stated by Dr. Pritchett are:

1. The retiring allowance must come to the teacher as a right and in accordance with fixed rules.
2. It should form a fair proportion of his active pay and a larger proportion of smaller salaries than of large ones.
3. The retiring allowance should be available at some fixed age and after some stated period of service.
4. Some account should be taken of disability.
5. Provision should be made for the widows of teachers who had become eligible.

<sup>83</sup> In the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., steps have already been taken to bring this question before the General Assembly. Overtures from the Synods of Illinois and Ohio, substantially the same, will be presented to the Assembly. The overture from the Synod of Illinois is as follows:

"The Synod of Illinois, having in view the needs of certain institutions of learning which are dependent on, or organically related to the Church, in the way of some provision for professors and teachers who have reached the age of retirement from active duty, and finding

If such a movement be too large for any one ecclesiastical body, it would be entirely in keeping with the trend of Christian sentiment if these bodies were to group themselves together, under their common denominational names, to provide this fund. Their institutions could readily be classified and a comprehensive plan applying to them all wrought out. Whatever the reasons be that keep these bodies apart, there is hardly anything which would prevent co-operation in this direction. The institutions are sufficiently alike, and their standards near enough together, to warrant co-operation. Every principle of efficiency and economy would favor such a combination, and substantial Church unity along the lines of least resistance would be secured, or, if not unity, federation in the best sense of the word. It would be easy to provide safeguards for the protection of the different constituent bodies.

It is entirely reasonable to anticipate that were such provision made, the institutions which in different ways have been related to the Christian Church and have altered their relations that they might be eligible to the Carnegie Foundation, would gladly resume their former relations, or even enter upon closer relations with the churches by which they were founded and in which they grew up. They parted from the Church with great reluctance and under what seemed to be the stress of financial necessity. Their attachment to the Church remains unabated and the interest of the Church in them is as great as ever. Is it too much to hope that, with many of these institutions, the establishment

that these institutions are of several different classes, finding also that, in the pressure of other claims, no provision has been made by these institutions for such professors and teachers, and having learned of the ample provisions now being offered to institutions which are without legal or organic relation to the Christian Church, does hereby overture the General Assembly of 1911, to inquire, by a special committee or otherwise, into the number and the classification of institutions of learning dependent on or organically related to our Church, which have no provision for retiring allowances for professors or teachers; to ascertain the equitable basis for such allowances and to propose a plan for a fund which shall provide, year after year, regular allowances to these devoted veterans in the service of Christ and His Church.

of such a fund would mark the glad day of their return to the Church?

Such a plan was, of course, undreamed of by our fathers and lacks the authority of precedent; but the general educational situation also lacks the authority of precedent. As our fathers heroically met the situation which faced them, so ought we to meet the situation which is before us. As they in their day had to make precedents, so must we in ours. This is true conservatism, and at the same time, true progress.

When the Church shall establish this fund, she will give to her educational work a stability which is greatly needed. She will not only provide for her veteran teachers and professors, but she will assure to those who are now in active service a sufficient support for their old age. Meeting thus the new demands, she will be able to maintain her historic place as the friend and guide in Christian education. Acknowledging the services of the generous founder of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, who, by his benefaction, pointed out the need and showed the way to meet it, and availing herself of the valuable results of the work of the Foundation, she will see to it that her colleges and academies are developed according to the highest standards, that they are kept abreast of the times in science and art and philosophy, that their courses meet the new demands of modern life, and, besides, that, more than ever, they surround their students with those influences which make for integrity, purity, courage and fidelity to the tasks of the common life. It is no secret that modern educators, in their efforts to withstand the trend of a purely secular theory, are looking wistfully for the sources of these higher influences. And the Church will serve the cause of education in general, as well as her own institutions, if she will show again that these influences take their rise in supernatural sources, that faith in God is the source of faith with and service to man, that the eternal world holds for men by far the larger part of



life, that the sure guide to the eternal is the Word of God and that true wisdom for man is to sit at the feet of Him Who is the Eternal Wisdom Incarnate.

The Church which girds herself for this task will command the sympathy and support of every man who has discovered the real lack in the present system of education.

W. S. PLUMER BRYAN.

*The Church of the Covenant.*

*Chicago.*