THE

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW.

No. 34.—April, 1888.

I.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

THE title of Mr. George's well-known work is enough to explain its popularity. It is not only an inquiry into the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth, but it purports to have found the remedy. A medical student, when leaving college, is often told to have faith in himself, not to look perplexed or doubtful when he has made his diagnosis, but to give his prescriptions with an air of cheerfulness and assurance. Your patient is likely to have faith in you if you have faith in yourself, whereas if you tell him that there is nothing wrong with him, or that there is no remedy for his trouble, he is not unlikely to betake himself to the first quack who comes along, laden with sympathy and a panacea. Undoubtedly, Mr. George has faith in himself and in the remedy he prescribes, and he has succeeded in inspiring his followers with a like faith. His views have been subjected to criticism from many sides, but he would probably say to-day what he said in 1880 in the preface to the fourth edition of "Progress and Poverty."—"There has been nothing in the criticisms they have received to induce any change or modification of these views—in fact, I have yet to see an objection not answered in advance in the book itself." The language of his followers about the book is even more extreme. "To the law and to the testimony" is their cheerful watchword on every occasion. Start a difficulty or submit a case, and the answer is, "Read 'Progress and Poverty.'" When this has been done, and still light does not appear, "Read 'Progress and Poverty' again," is pretty sure to be the next prescription, and the next. A gentleman who undertakes to answer criticisms made

III.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE WEST.

IT should not be inferred from the above heading that the West has a system of education peculiar to itself, or different from that found in the East. It is an unquestioned fact that neither of these geographical divisions can boast of what is known in Germany or in Britain as a national system of education. Both, however, have a large number of excellent schools, academies, and colleges that compare favorably in their courses of instruction and discipline with similar institutions across the sea. This is especially true of our *public* schools. Bishop Fraser, of England, who devoted much time to the study of our educational institutions, declares that "the Americans, as a whole, are the most intelligent and best-educated people on the globe." Dr. Scheib, of Germany, on the other hand, pronounces "our school system an utter failure." These statements are not absolutely contradictory. The learned Teuton looked at what we call our *System* of education in the light of that known to him in the Fatherland, while the Anglican prelate dwelt more upon its results as noticed by him in men's talk on the streets, in the railway cars, and in society. That our schools and colleges have lifted the masses and laid the foundation of the education of a large number of statesmen, ministers, judges, authors, and soldiers of the highest grade, no unprejudiced man can deny. They have also laid and confirmed the political principles on which our Government is based, and prevented the formation of wide, if not ruinous, social distinctions among the people. But all this has been accomplished in spite of gross ignorance of pedagogical principles and of the utter want of a national system. Conceal it from the other nations as we may, it must be confessed among ourselves that we have no *National* system of education. We have a National Bureau of Education, which probably presents to other nations the semblance at least of a national system, but in reality its vocation is to collect items of information regarding education,

reduce them to a system, and publish the results for the benefit of the whole country. That Bureau has no control over the States, and no authority to introduce a plan or to correct a fault. In fact, " the universal sentiment of the country," says Principal Levi Seeley, " is against the principle of national education ; and the great size of the Republic, the vast diversity of interests in the various sections, the differences in taste and in the wants of the people, make a national system impracticable. Each of the thirty-eight States and the ten Territories insists on having its own independent school system. Massachusetts and the other New England States were the first to adopt it ; New York, Pennsylvania, and the other Middle States followed." Fortunately for the West, the new States and the Territories have, almost without an exception, introduced the system regarded as the best in the East. Hence, the common schools in Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas are unquestionably the peers of those of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York. If we should venture to institute a comparison between the common schools in the East and those found in the West, candor and justice would compel us to affirm that there is more enthusiasm, if not more real ability, to teach among the principals and teachers of the latter than among those of the former, and greater willingness on the part of State legislators to furnish them with the newest and best appliances for their work.

If it can be truthfully said that we have no national system of common schools, it can be affirmed with ten times the emphasis that we have no national system of high schools and colleges. Indeed, no attempt has ever been made to reduce those institutions into a system, and it is extremely doubtful whether it can be done in the present condition of things in the West. We do not think, however, that it will be impossible to do it in the future, when the people have become more settled and their educational needs are more thoroughly understood. The object of this paper is to furnish the reader with some idea of the materials out of which such a system may be constructed, and to indicate, in a general way, how this much-needed but difficult task may in time be successfully performed.

The institutions which furnish the West with higher education are of two kinds—namely, those established and supported by the State, and those founded and aided by the Church. Both alike draw largely from, if they do not mainly depend upon, the common schools for their pupils. There are also in our large cities a few private schools that furnish the universities with a small number of students from the families of the rich, but they are not sufficiently important

to demand the briefest notice in this connection. Those which are of a higher grade than the *public* schools may be divided into two classes—to wit, the high schools supported by the State, and the academies or grammar schools which are aided by the Church. The former are supported by taxation on the principle that it is the duty of the State to qualify men and women to fill all its important political offices. Consequently, a considerable number of the pupils who pass the required grade in the common schools are allowed to pass through the high schools free of charge. The course of study prescribed for them in these higher institutions is theoretically, if not practically, intended to give some all the training required to fill the lower offices, and to prepare the others to enter the universities in which they are to be trained for the higher ones. The object in view by the State in educating these youth shapes to a great extent the whole course of instruction. It is made necessarily more or less technical, since it directly aims at qualifying men for a calling. The courses of study differ, however, in different States. In most of them no Greek is allowed, but scientific studies and modern languages are substituted for it. In other States, the amount of Latin taught ranges from the rudimentary principles of the language to the full preparation required for entrance into the most advanced Eastern colleges. Except here and there through the personal influence of certain members of the school board or of the instructors, there is scarcely a study in any of these institutions specifically adapted to cultivate the moral nature of the men and the women who are here undergoing the course of training that is to prepare them to conduct the affairs of the State. Religious instruction does not form any part of the system, though it is sometimes given by a conscientious Christian teacher without remonstrance on the part of the powers that be.

The omission of religious instruction in the common schools may be readily tolerated on the ground that at this stage the scholars live at home, where religious instruction is given to those who have parents capable and willing to impart it. But to neglect moral and religious instruction in the high schools and the universities in the case of youth at the most impressible age, and away from the religious influences of home, is not only making the course of instruction criminally defective, but it also keeps out of it the most important elements fitted to qualify men to be acceptable officials of a Christian State.

Church and State being united, it is claimed, in Germany and Great Britain, and rightly too, that it is the duty of the State to teach religion, which, we believe, is the general practice. It is not

our belief that the State in America, in which the Church and State are independent, is under obligation to teach religion in its public schools. Nevertheless, it is our decided judgment that the State is in duty bound to make provision for its own stability and prosperity by introducing studies on morality for its embryo citizens and officials. This is certainly in keeping with the spirit and the letter of our American institutions. The perpetuity and power of a nation governed by the people lies in the moral character and the intelligence of the individuals who constitute it. It may be affirmed that the Church, which seeks to lead men to religious experience and lives of piety, is doing this indirectly. In America each branch of the Church endeavors to accomplish that end in the best way it can, but multitudes of persons are not thus reached by the Church, and hence they are not taught at all the principles of morality and virtue. Is it, then, not the duty of the State to furnish this large class of citizens with the principles of right and wrong? What can be better adapted to secure good citizens than a thorough drill in the foundations of loyalty and obligation? In our judgment, it is the most solemn duty of the State to do this for its own safety. And since the foundation of all true morality is found in the ethics of the great Teacher, we are unable to see why our public schools should shut out the New Testament and allow the Republic of Aristotle to remain?

The number of these high schools is very large. As a matter of fact, they are not limited to what is supposed to be the demands of the State. The idea formed of their character and object is perhaps somewhat undefined. Many look upon them as important means of filling gaps in regions of country in which there are no intermediate schools to prepare students for college. Each of the States has very nearly enough of these high schools to furnish with the necessary preparation all its citizens who desire a college education. But they are defective for this purpose in their courses of study, as well as wanting in their moral tone and instruction to meet the views of the majority of parents who have children to be liberally educated.

The last and the highest grade of State institutions is the *University*. This is theoretically the culmination of the State system of education, and it is intended to qualify men and women to fill the highest offices in the State. It has an undergraduate and a post-graduate, or professional, departments. The undergraduate department consists of what is understood as a college, with college studies and regulations. It has ordinarily no dormitories or refectories, the students not being furnished with such accommodations by the State. The college curriculum, except, perhaps, in one or two

States, is low in grade and very defective. It has to be so in order to take into the freshman class the graduates of the high schools, in which no Greek and only a very moderate amount of Latin is taught. Many of the regents and the members of the faculties of these universities are far from being satisfied with their courses of instruction, but they are helpless in any efforts to improve them on account of the interference of politicians. To make the matter worse, the general sentiment of State legislators and largely that of their constituency is that Greek and Latin belong to the Middle Ages, and should be relegated to monasteries and the fossilized institutions of the East. Modern languages and scientific studies are substituted for them. In consequence of this, the collegiate department of the State universities in the West tends strongly to reduce, or to keep low, the standard of higher education.

The post-graduate or professional departments of these State universities are one-sided and wanting in method. Even in the best of them the medical department, to say nothing of the theological, which, like that at Ann Arbor, is struggling for bare existence, is not in a very satisfactory condition. It may not be the fault of the trustees or the faculty of these institutions, but that of circumstances. For the convenience of the citizens, the State universities are usually located at the capital, or in some central town that precludes by its surroundings the possibility of having a flourishing law or medical department. In such places there is very little or no opportunity for clinical work and hospital practice. What is still worse, there is a doubt existing in the minds of many in regard to the propriety and even the justice of taxing all property owners to educate a *class* who seek wealth and fame in the professions. This, we are told, is beginning to affect the appropriations necessary to make the State universities first class. The evident tendency of affairs in nearly all the States, and the opposition to the principle of taxing the people to educate a class, threaten in the near future to reduce the grade of, if not to utterly destroy, the high schools and reduce the universities in the West. At any rate, their future success is so doubtful that this vast and growing part of our country cannot afford to depend on them alone for its higher education.

The second class of higher institutions in the West running parallel with those just considered is that called academies, intermediate or grammar schools, colleges, and universities supported by the Church. Their name is legion. The designations given them are so confused and mixed as to defy all rational classification. In many places an institution that is hardly worthy the name of an intermediate school is called a college, and sometimes a university.

Many a small college that has not a single characteristic of a university has for its chartered name a university. This confusion has arisen in a variety of ways. Ambition has given some of them the highest title that could be found. In other cases the founders intended in time to make them what they were pleased to christen them. It is plain that those who named many of our Western institutions had no well-defined ideas what they were eventually to be—high schools, academies, colleges, or universities. In educational, as in many other matters, the beginnings in a new country are more or less tentative. It is hardly fair, therefore, to ridicule what is often called the pride, if not the stupidity, of the West in not observing the rules of propriety and decency in naming their institutions of learning. A youthful town, city, or State, like a youthful person, is very apt to have a florid style and indulge unduly in strong expletives. Surely such an insignificant fly should not render unsavory the sweet ointment of higher education in the West.

The number of well-established and creditably endowed intermediate schools and academies is very small in the West. Outside the large cities and the centres of population they are hardly found at all. The people of the rural districts and the small towns are compelled to content themselves with the State high schools. This is not to be wondered at. If even in New England and the Middle States the Eatons and the Rugbys, or the German Gymnasia, are few and far between, what must be expected in those sections of country where the great struggle is for bare subsistence, and not for luxuries; where the great majority of the people are thankful for public-school instruction, and never expect to furnish their sons and daughters with the luxury of liberal education? Such education comes only with the growth of wealth and the accumulation of fortunes. Still, the different branches of the Church have made a commendable beginning in this direction. They have found here and there a friend of education who has been able and willing to lay the foundations of good academies and colleges. If all the schools thus established were put together, the aggregate number would be quite large. If the extent of territory they are intended to cover were not prodigious, the supply would not appear very meagre. The scarcity of such schools in the West interferes materially with the ability of the colleges to raise their standard of scholarship. They are compelled to condition the majority of those who enter, and to supply them with "coaches" to carry them, often with difficulty, to full membership in the class. This, of course, must tend largely to discourage the student and to increase the expense of the institution. But, with all these drawbacks, the onward and upward

movement in the direction of higher education in the West is commendable and encouraging.

The colleges under the care of the Church are very numerous. We have seen the simple mention of Western colleges create a broad smile. More than one of our foremost educators has pronounced their number a great evil, ruinous to education and Christian benevolence. Many have an impression that there are no colleges West that give anything worthy the name of education, not to mention discipline and culture. This is a great mistake. In spite of their multiplicity, meagre endowments, small faculties, and poor appliances, a goodly number develop in the students the sturdiest kind of manhood, the greatest energy of purpose, and the most prodigious ability to carry out such a purpose in practical life. In proof of this it is sufficient to call attention to many of the most influential of our Congressmen, a considerable number of the ablest of our instructors and original investigators, and to not a few of the most gifted of our preachers.

The number of the Western colleges is not, as many suppose, the sole result of zeal not according to knowledge, nor of bad judgment, but largely of circumstances which no one could control. If the Church were a single body like the State, it is possible that the colleges under her care would not be more numerous than those under the care of the State. But every branch of the Church feels called upon to furnish the educational facilities necessary to perpetuate its ministry, and to prepare its gifted youth for the professions. These denominations oftentimes select the same general locality for their higher institutions, because there is no one to counsel them against the possible evil arising from it, much less is there any one with authority to put an injunction on unwise crowding of colleges in one region of country. In addition to this, a rich man offers a plot of ground and thousands of dollars toward the erection of a college in the same district, because he had amassed his wealth there, and no one is able to persuade him to select another location. This accounts for the overstocking of certain favorable parts of a State or contiguous sections of two or three States with colleges.

Though the aggregate number of colleges in the West be very great—possibly too great—yet it is not, as some suppose, an unmitigated evil. Even the old colleges in the East are patronized largely by the States in which they are located and those adjacent thereto. It would be a matter of surprise to many who have paid but little attention to the subject to be told that about three fourths of the students of Harvard University are from the little State of Massachusetts. Only a few outside the States in which they are located attend our

Western colleges. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of our most gifted youth would not be liberally educated at all if there were no colleges in their immediate neighborhoods. There is scarcely one out of the two or three hundred Western colleges that cannot point with pride to a number of graduates who have distinguished themselves in some department of life. If the planting of colleges and the power to decide where students should go for their training were vested in the Government, as it is more or less in England and Germany, in which Church and State are united, it is possible that we should have fewer colleges, and they more largely endowed, and consequently capable of doing better work; but as the fundamental principles of our Government require the separation of Church and State, we are compelled to submit to whatever inconvenience or waste of money may arise from that condition of things.

It is supposed by many that the multiplicity of colleges in the West renders them powerless to secure suitable accommodations or give thorough instruction. This is not the case. A college may be very thorough in its drill and complete in its course of instruction without being able to boast of superior accommodation, to claim large endowments, or to point to palatial halls. In Germany, not the college buildings, but the reputation of the professors, make the universities. Comparing small things with great, it can be truthfully said that there is scarcely a college of any size or age in the West that cannot point to one or two professors who have had a thorough training in the East or in Europe, and who have subsequently acquired some reputation in their departments. It may be true that they are generally young men, but they are young men of ability and ambition to make for themselves a name. A number of them have prepared the best classical and scientific text-books in use to-day in our largest Eastern colleges. A few have distinguished themselves as original investigators in biology, zoölogy, and other departments of science. Nearly every one of the colleges in the West, numerous as they are, can boast of at least one man in its faculty of considerable distinction which ought to give it a standing. "Arnold alone," says another, "made the name of Rugby known over the world. Jowett rendered Baliol distinguished among the colleges of Oxford. Horace Mann, single-handed, lifted little Antioch into notice. The genius of the elder Pierce of Harvard gave a charm, says Higginson, to the study of mathematics which for me has never waned. President Bartlett confesses his debt to the 'powerfully educating influence' of Professor Park, of Andover. President Dwight says of Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor, of New Haven: 'To me he was inspiring in a degree beyond my power to describe.

I felt that I must at the earliest possible moment take up the subject, whatever it might be, on which he was speaking, and make it a matter of special investigation.' Dr. Wayland reproduced some part of himself in the character of almost every one of his students. ' His robust personality,' says President Angell, ' was felt throughout the whole life of Brown University.' By one ten-minute speech, at the only time the young man ever saw him, he fixed the line of President White's whole career. Dr. McCosh has put new blood into every artery of Princeton College. The grand old educator, whose body was recently put at rest in the Berkshires, impressed himself through his students upon our national life." The West can count among her educators a few men like the above, who will leave their impress upon the millions of men and women that shall at some future day inhabit the widely-extended plains and mountains which are yet without inhabitants.

The curricula of the majority of our Western colleges are nearly the same as those of the Eastern colleges when they trained the statesmen, the judges, the authors, and the preachers of the last two or three generations. By this is meant that they contain the disciplinary studies of the past, with a small sprinkling of the polishing ones of the large and wealthy colleges in the East. They have not as yet introduced largely the elective system of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, for the reason that they feel that they have not the facilities necessary to teach them well. There is an impression in the West that it remains yet to be seen whether or not the dilution and undue expansion of the course of study are conducive to mental training and the ability to use our faculties for the accomplishment of great tasks. The people are not fully convinced that the loose system of Harvard, that affords, doubtless, greater facilities for the acquisition of knowledge, is better adapted than the narrower one of the past to produce such writers as Hawthorne and Hodge, such poets as Longfellow and Bryant, such statesmen as Webster and Calhoun, and such preachers as Joseph Addison Alexander and Henry Ward Beecher. "The acquisition of knowledge," says one of the ablest of Americans, "is not the chief end of a collegiate education ; but to secure vigor and discipline of mind, and the elements of knowledge as the foundation of future acquisition and use. The amount of knowledge, however, inseparable from the preceding course of training, will be greater than can be acquired by any other course of study. For not only have habits of attention and method and precision and investigation been acquired, but the knowledge which has been gained is elementary, accurate, and imperishable. That which is committed to the memory may be forgotten ; but

that which is seen and handled of truth is inseparable from the mind's being, and is the ground of its future and eternal progress." This is the prevailing view of educators and the general practice of the majority of the best colleges in the West. Some of the more advanced of them have introduced electives, but very *sparingly*. They are acting on the principle that the large and wealthy colleges in the East are better able than they to experiment in educational matters.

Religion occupies an important place in all the Western colleges which are under the care of the Church. It is more or less incorporated in their courses of study, and urged upon the attention of the students in a variety of ways. A great difference in this regard is observed between the State universities and the colleges and universities under the supervision of the Church. In the former religion is simply tolerated out of regard to the views of some of the regents or members of the faculty or the Christian community ; in the latter, it is looked upon as indispensably necessary to thorough education, if it does not form its very basis. It is true that even the trustees and faculties of the colleges under the care of the Church differ in their views of the place to be given to religion in the curriculum, and the amount of it that should be required. Statistics clearly show that the number of professed Christians among the students varies according to the prominence given to religion in college instruction. The smallest number is found in the State universities, where it has no recognized place, and the largest number is in those under the care of the Church. Very few candidates for the ministry come from the State universities, while very many are furnished by such institutions as Lake Forest, Marietta, Beloit, and others. Some of these colleges are visited almost yearly with powerful revivals of religion.

From what we have seen, the West is already in possession of some of the best elements of higher education. If the high schools and the academies, the colleges and the universities, could only be unified so as to aid each other in advancing the standard of scholarship and realizing the best results of education, we should at once be in possession of all we could desire. In order to bring this about, important changes will have to be made, and extensive consolidation effected. Since in this country the separation of Church and State is believed in, and likely to be cherished to the end of time, it is not likely that the State universities will ever be changed so as to meet the views of the Church ; nor is it likely that the Church will ever regard them as being the best adapted to furnish the country with the right kind of higher education. Judging from

general principles and the trend of popular opinion, at least west of the Alleghanies, those institutions which give higher education than that furnished by the common schools will be poorly patronized, if they do not fall into decay. The conviction, we are informed, is rapidly growing in the West that it is not right to compel men to pay yearly larger or smaller sums of money toward educating a *Class*, who seek wealth, high standing in society, and influence in the Government. Since the State does not undertake to clothe and feed the gifted students who are allowed to enter its high schools and universities, it follows as a matter of necessity that the children of the well-to-do alone can enjoy that privilege. Those of the poor are compelled as soon as they leave the common school to find a situation for making their living. Thus a distinction between its citizens is made by the State itself. It compels many of the comparatively poor to furnish professional training to the sons and daughters of parents in comfortable, and oftentimes affluent, circumstances. If it be reaffirmed that the State is in duty bound to provide suitably trained men to fill its civil and military offices, and not to depend on outside institutions for its supply, the answer is at hand. Only a few of the men educated by the State ever become office-holders in it. If it were in the power of the Governor, the Secretary of State, or the Legislature to fill all the offices, the facts might be different ; but our form of Government forbids this. The majority of State officers are elected by the people, who pay not the slightest attention to the institution in which they received their training. Besides, if the theory of education in the State could be carried out, and only those educated in the State universities were eligible to office, it would soon give rise to serious trouble. The high schools and universities of the State give, as we have seen, no, or very little, religious instruction to their students, consequently four fifths of the citizens who are believers in religion would be compelled to accept State officers that are indifferent, if not hostile, to religion, and who are made so in many cases in institutions supported in part by them. It is very doubtful, in our judgment, whether any higher education than that given in the common schools will be given long at the expense of tax-payers.

Leaving out of consideration the high schools and the universities of the States, we shall confine ourselves to the way it is possible to unify the academies or intermediate schools, the colleges, and the universities under Church patronage. Since the church is divided into a number of branches having separate, individual educational interests, it will be difficult to unify, co-ordinate, and locate them where they can be most useful to the country. In order to indicate

our meaning, we will take as an example the higher education in the Presbyterian Church. We are clearly of the opinion that the common-school education should be at the basis of the higher education, by whomsoever given. It should therefore be conserved, protected, and made as efficient as possible in the training of our youth to become intelligent citizens. To provide for the Christian ministry, the other professions, and the offices of the State, higher institutions should be established. It should be made the duty of the Presbyteries to see that each of them, if the members of the churches and the population of the district should demand it, had an academy or an intermediate school to prepare their youth for business and for entrance into college. These academies should be well endowed, thoroughly equipped with scientific appliances, and permeated with the spirit of religion. A large number of these are now needed, and a still larger number will be needed in the near future. To all of them a number of scholarships should be secured to aid students of promise. The Synods, if sufficiently large and strong, should each have a wisely-located, ably-manned, and well-endowed college. It is immaterial, as far as our plan is concerned, whether the college is under the immediate care of the Synod or under that of trustees who are Presbyterians. The Church should be taught that it is a part of her great mission in this country to superintend the cause of higher education, not for the purpose of supplying her own pulpits merely, but also to supply the professions, and afford liberal education to all who may desire it for its own sake. The General Assembly, also, should be encouraged to establish a few universities in which all the graduates of the colleges under the care of the Synods could be trained for the learned professions. These should occupy central positions, that the candidates resorting to them might not have a great distance to travel in order to reach them. They should be put in localities in which facilities could be obtained for professional studies. They should be, perhaps, in or near the large cities, where the law students could attend the courts of justice, the medical students find bodies for dissection and hospital practice, and the theological students find opportunities to teach Sabbath-schools, hold prayer-meetings, and preach on the Lord's day. One such university should be in the East, say in Princeton, another in the valley of the Mississippi, in the Northwest or the Southwest—perhaps one in each—a third in the Rocky Mountains, and a fourth on the Pacific coast. Such an arrangement would reduce our higher institutions, which are at present in a chaotic state, into a system; it would save a large amount of money, or secure thousands of dollars that are now wasted for those

institutions that are at present waning. The other branches of the Christian Church should do likewise. Then, a general plan should be adopted by which a complete system of co-ordination and subordination of all the schools could be effected. For example, one branch of the Church should have intermediate schools, colleges, and universities of similar grades with those of other branches of the Church, and all of them should be open to students of every name. They should be without denominational rules in their government or denominational teaching in their courses of study.

It may be asked, Why may not the different branches of the Church follow the example of the Episcopal Church in Ann Arbor, and establish a theological school in connection with the State universities? In answer to this it may be said, first, that they cannot afford to let all the professional men be educated without some religious instruction. Second, the State institutions furnish but few candidates for the ministry—not enough to supply the demand. Third, experience has demonstrated that the higher education of the universities of the State have failed to meet the needs of society. "One thing is certain," says ex-President Porter, "that all the experiments which have been tried in this country to conduct institutions of learning without Christian worship and Christian influences have failed; that all the so-called State colleges have, in some sort, been forced to adopt, either directly or indirectly, the same methods of religious influence which are employed in the Christian college; that, in the choice of their officers, they have largely given the preference to men of positive and earnest Christian faith, for their greater usefulness as teachers and their greater acceptableness to the community." It is not probable that they will continue to be thus forced to that which is opposed to their views and principles for the sake of meeting a sentiment in the community.

If that cannot be done, why may not all the branches of the Christian Church unite in an effort to consolidate their colleges and universities? To this question the following from Dr. Porter is very satisfactory:

"A college in which several denominations have a partial interest will inevitably be divided and dishonored by ignoble sectarian strife. The several denominations which hold it in common will regard each other with that eternal vigilance which in such cases easily degenerates into perpetual suspicion; its officers will be elected and its policy will be determined with a judgment divided between the interests of the sect. In the present divided condition of Christendom, there seems to be no solution of the problem, except the one which has been accepted in this country—namely, that the college should be in the hands of some single denomination, in order to secure unity and effect to its religious character and influence, and that it should be preserved from sectarian bias and illiberality by its responsibility to the community which it undertakes to mould, and the enlightened and catholic influences of the culture to which it is devoted."

The supervision which the Church gives is the best possible guarantee for the economical and proper use of the money given or bequeathed to the cause of higher education. Individuals die, political corporations become corrupt ; the Church lives, and the presumption is that she will see that the interests committed to her keeping are honestly administered and steadily advanced.

Whether or not our higher institutions of learning can be reduced in the near future to anything like a system, the Church cannot afford to pause an instant in her work of establishing colleges in the new States and Territories of the West. The Board of Aid and similar agencies in the other denominations must follow close on the heels of the Home Missionary societies, if this broad land is to be possessed for Christ, or the nation to retain its present liberty and political privileges.

"The colleges of a republic are eminently the guardians of liberty and equality, and the great practical equalizers of society. So great is the wealth of this nation and so fast is it accumulating, that were it not that by collegiate education the children of the poor can hold competition with the rich, the entire cultivated intellect of the nation would soon be in the families of the rich, and the children of the poor doomed to an iron cast of hopeless inequality of intelligence and influence. Moreover, in a republic, where the whole people legislate and public sentiment is the supreme executive, the intellectual and moral culture of the nation must become universal and elevated, demanding an increase of colleges and professional men proportioned to the elevated standard and universality of education. A nation can no more educate itself for a republican government without colleges and academies, schools and professional teachers, than it can feed and clothe itself without agriculture and manufactories. The enemy of colleges is, therefore, the enemy of civilization, of republican institutions, of liberty and equality, and is especially the enemy of the poor, who have far more to lose by their absence and more to gain by their multiplication than any other class which the republic can possibly have."

WILLIAM C. ROBERTS.

Lake Forest, Illinois.