

ARTICLE IV.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN COLLEGE.¹

BY THE REV. JOSEPH LEONARD DANIELS, D.D.

THE American college is one of the richest fruits of American civilization; for it must rank among the five notable contributions which this country has made to the permanent progress of the world. These are the Christian college, the public school, the self-supporting church, the formal separation of church and state, and the most complex and yet harmonious system of representative government. It properly heads this list both historically and logically; for, while the compact in the Mayflower was the germ of the American Constitution, while the legislatures of Plymouth and Massachusetts colonies antedated the founding of Harvard, while the college has gradually been transformed in the two hundred and fifty years of its history, it has, none the less, been a vital factor in this nation's life. For it has from the first trained the men who have formed public opinion and have been the leaders in church and state. This was the one reason affirmed for the founding of a college—to train the preachers and teachers for the coming generations. "Without a nursery for such men," said Cotton Mather, "the churches of New England would have been less than the business of one age, and soon have come to nothing." Pilgrim and Puritan alike believed in Christian education. As early as October, 1636, Massachusetts voted four hundred pounds for a college. Almost simultaneously with this was founded the public

¹ An address before the Alumni of Olivet College, Michigan, June 19, 1901.

school: in Boston in 1635, at Hartford in 1637, at New Haven in 1642.

In 1646 Massachusetts required every community of fifty families to maintain such a school; and a community of one hundred families, a grammar school. Connecticut adopted this law in 1650. Thus Harvard and these grammar schools as feeders, were the educational system of New England for more than half a century. Then arose Yale, and Dartmouth, and Williams, and that galaxy of Christian colleges that to-day numbers almost five hundred.

That these institutions originated in America is not claimed. They were at first but the reproduction of Cambridge and Oxford. They bear the distinctive marks of their English parentage. In their later development they have incorporated many features of the German universities. And yet they have not copied either England or Germany. As a rule, they have not been dependent on the government, except for their charters. They have not recognized titles and classes and social distinctions. They have been independent in their government, democratic in spirit, progressive in method, religious in aim, and patriotic in every national crisis. They have been both the reflex of a free public opinion, and no less the makers of such an opinion. They are creatures of circumstances, and yet creators of their own environment. For they have excited the thirst for knowledge by opening its perennial fountains. They have attracted and incited thousands of youth to seek an education by lifting up the torch of truth in every part of our land. They have brought knowledge to the homes of the people. The distinctions of race, class, and color have ceased to be a barrier to their privileges. Their doors are open wide to women as well as men, and the possibility of a liberal education has come to be universal. Admitting, as I do, the excellences of other systems of education, is it not true that America has made her own?

Has she not stamped it with her own personality, and made it as unique as her national history? Has she not developed a college purely American, truly Christian, at once the most conservative and the most progressive in the world? And were not these seeds planted in Cambridge in 1636, and in New Haven in 1701? Have not these little democracies in the intellectual world made the great democracy in the political world of to-day?

These are questions England is asking herself most seriously. Her wisest men are seeing that her future supremacy depends on bringing the higher education within the reach of the middle classes of society. They see that the Scotch universities in 1900 had 6,061 undergraduates, while Oxford and Cambridge had but 6,421, although the population of England is seven times as large as that of Scotland. They see the United States enrolling 84,955 college students—five times as many *pro rata* as in England—new recruits for the great army of thinkers, the home guard of the republic and the vanguard of civilization. They see more than this, that the skill in the manufactures, commerce, and business of to-day is the product of trained minds; that thought rather than force is to be the arbiter of the future; and that intelligence and moral leadership are to rule the world. They are re-reading the history of the last hundred years, somewhat as Professor Andrew Fleming West interprets it for the Paris Exposition of 1900, when he says:—

“The [American] college lies very close to the people. Distinctions of caste may manifest themselves occasionally, and yet the college is stoutly, and we believe permanently, democratic. Its relation to the better side of our national life has been profoundly intimate from the beginning. The graduates of Harvard and Yale in New England, of Princeton and Columbia in the Middle States, and of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, contributed powerfully to the formation of our republic. Edmund Burke attributed the ‘intractable spirit’ of the Americans to ‘their education,’ and by this he meant the college education. ‘The colleges,’ wrote President Stiles of Yale, shortly after the Revolution,

'have been of signal advantage in the present day.' When Britain withdrew all her wisdom from America, this revolution found above two thousand in New England only, who had been educated in the colonies, intermingling with the people, and communicating knowledge among them."

And what was true then has been true in our subsequent history. Though not one in a hundred of our white male youth has been college-bred, yet the colleges have furnished "one-half of all the Presidents of the United States, most of the Justices of the 'Supreme Court, not far from one-half of the Cabinet and the National Senate, and almost a third of the House of Representatives."

That the colleges have had even greater influence on the educational, moral, and religious life of the American people there is hardly room for doubt. For from these centers have come the great teachers and preachers and leaders both of the schools and of the church. The young men have been the enthusiastic pioneers in college and church building all over our land. The great missionary projects that have belted the world, like the "haystack meeting" at Williams, and the more recent Student-Volunteer movement, have begun in American colleges. These have been more manifest, yet not more potent, than that silent, all-pervasive educational and religious spirit which has penetrated every hamlet in our republic.

Such, in a word, has been the history and influence of the American college. And yet to-day, after this unparalleled record, its very existence is imperiled. The recent words of President Hadley, of Yale, most vividly depict the situation:—

"The American college at the beginning of the twentieth century is confronted with a set of conditions which may threaten its very existence. The growing tendency toward specialization in American life creates a necessity for a lengthened period of professional study. This makes it harder for students to spare the time for a course of study which is non-professional. Yet it seems of vital importance for the welfare of the country that this period of non-professional study—collegiate study in

the old sense—should have its place in our education. The American college in the past has been a school of public sentiment, a place for forming conceptions of duty, based on considerations of self-interest and standards of intellectual attainment unaffected by considerations of commercial value. . . . If the American of the twentieth century is to become a part of a vast machine, there will be no place for the American college. If he is to remain a free citizen of a free commonwealth, the overwhelmingly important work of the American college lies in fitting him for such freedom."¹

Has, then, the American college fulfilled its mission? Is its work already accomplished? Is the old *régime* to give place to a new and a better? Or is it, with its independent and flexible organization, to meet the new conditions, and accomplish a larger work than ever? It shall be my effort to show that

1. The college has still a *place* in American life.
2. It still has a *work* for the church and the republic.
3. Its *limitations*, so-called, are in no small degree its *excellences*.

I. Has the college still a place in our system of education? The changing conditions of American life naturally raise this question. The beginnings of our educational system were very simple; now they are very complex. In the seventeenth century there was the local grammar school and the college. The many received only the education of the former, the few entered the college. The candidates for the freshman class came from one of two sources,—either the graduates of the grammar school, or from pupils privately taught by the minister of the parish. In the latter part of the eighteenth century arose the endowed academy, of which Phillips of Andover and Phillips of Exeter are a type. While these institutions are still doing their special work in fitting students for college, the modern high school has become the great rival of the endowed academy and the private training-school. This began in Boston in 1824, and to-day is found in every city and village of our

¹ Education, Vol. xx. p. 588.

land. It is a municipal organization, and democratic in its spirit and policy. It is therefore as variable and flexible in its character and requirements as the diverse constituencies that support it. There are three somewhat well-defined theories in regard to it:—

(1) One is that its course of study should be brief, practical, and designed to furnish a good business education.

(2) A second is that it should aim to fit students for college, in accordance with the contention of President Eliot of Harvard, that “no course of study can so well fit for ‘life’ as that which fits for college, and that it is unfair to maintain short and disconnected courses which must throw a scholar off the line or bring him to a pause, if he afterwards wishes to take a college course.”

(3) A third view combines the two theories already named, and offers a short course for “life” and a longer course for college.

Under the old *régime*, the college set the standard for admission, and the academy or private training-school simply met the requirements. These were clearly defined, uniform, and adapted to a fixed and prescribed college course. But to-day the high school furnishes a large percentage of the students for college. This institution, being municipal and democratic, fixes its own courses of study and standard of scholarship according to the citizenship of the community. It is the reflex of the city itself. This great variety and diversity in preparation has led to the flexibility of the modern college course; to the establishment of new and special courses of study; to the introduction of the elective principle; and, finally, to the recognition of equivalence in determining the standard of admission to college, and also the standard of graduation, henceforth to be represented by one degree, viz., the bachelor of arts.

Thus the high school has been instrumental in broadening and enriching the college course. It has done more.

It has brought the possibility of the higher education to many a bright lad in many a city, who, without the opportunity and incentive of the high-school training, would never have found his way to college. Thus genius born of humble parentage has found its place and work, and been saved to society and the state.

But with all these merits of the high school, there are also some disadvantages. These arise from its ambition to do college or even university work. It is certainly questionable whether it is wise for candidates for college to undertake elementary scientific work in the high school, when it can be so much better done in the college or the university. Far worse than this is the tendency to-day to transfer the high-school graduates at once to the professional school without any intermediate training. In both these ways the high school is encroaching upon the college. No argument is offered for this, except the false economy of time and money, at the expense of positive detriment to the professional man and inferior service to the public. If you add to this, political influence in the election of school boards, and in consequence the frequent changes of superintendents, teachers, and policy of school management, you have a very unstable type of training-school compared with the old-time academy, whose trustees and teachers and policy were as stable as the college itself. Now, whatever the causes, the facts are, that secondary education has encroached upon the higher education a full year since 1856. Then the freshman at Harvard was seventeen years and seven months old. In 1866 he was eighteen years and two months. In 1875 he was eighteen years and six months. To-day most writers agree that the average freshman in American colleges is nineteen, and the average graduate twenty-three.

On the other hand, if we turn to the graduate side of the college, these conditions have changed even more. Both

professional and technical schools have arisen. At the time of the Declaration of Independence there were but two professional schools in this country,—the medical college of Philadelphia, founded in 1765, and the Medical Department of King's College (now Columbia College), founded in 1768. There are now 532 professional schools, 55,669 students, with \$50,000,000 of invested property. The number of students in these schools increases faster than the population. The note of alarm in some quarters has already been sounded. Restrictive legislation, both for admission and graduation, will apparently soon be necessary for the protection of the people. They will demand intelligence, character, and thorough training for those positions that involve the property, life, and the moral and spiritual welfare of the whole community.

The present chaos in regard to entrance requirements of professional schools is seen in the recent report of the Bureau of Education. In four theological schools there are no entrance requirements. In twenty-four they are indefinite. Nineteen demand a grammar-school education. Three require high-school work. Others vary, requiring one, three, or four years of college work. In sixteen law schools there are apparently no entrance requirements whatever. In eight they are practically worthless. Twenty-six demand a grammar-school education. Four require some high-school work. Harvard demands an education equivalent to admission to senior class in college. Columbia will be maintained as a graduate department after 1903. In two medical schools the requirements are indefinite. Twenty-nine demand a grammar-school education. A few, high-school work. Johns Hopkins requires a college course. Harvard will also after 1901.

The reports of the United States Commissioner of Education showing the percentage of professional students who hold a college degree are too incomplete to be of much ser-

vice. Not much more than half of the professional schools in 1898 show any college graduates. So far as returns are made, the schools in theology show fifty-three per cent of college graduates; in law twenty-nine per cent; and in medicine twenty-one per cent.

These facts are significant and speak for themselves. What is the remedy? If these professional schools exist for themselves, and the supreme motive is to increase the numbers of imperfectly trained men, then their past policy has certainly been successful. If, on the other hand, these schools are for public service, to supply strong, symmetrical, well-equipped men for the responsible work of physicians, lawyers, and ministers, then they ought to improve the quality instead of increasing the quantity; they ought to raise the standard of admission; they ought not to reach down to the grammar school and the high school, but rather to draw their new recruits from well-trained college men. They ought to get the best, and the best are none too good for these sacred trusts. What are they doing? They are extending their own courses, but still taking in the crude material from the grammar and high school. During the last twenty-five years, the law and medical schools have lengthened their time between one and two years.

Such is the situation. The high school has lengthened its course a full year; the professional school from one to two years. This extends the whole time of preparation for the professional man, if he takes a college course, two full years, and in some cases more. As President Thwing puts it, "The college is in danger of being ground to pieces between the under millstone of the preparatory school and the upper millstone of the professional school." This, when translated, means that the college student of to-day is nineteen years old when he enters college; he is twenty-three at graduation; he is twenty-six or twenty-

seven when he enters his profession. This means that many will be tempted to omit the college course, and pass from the high school to the professional school, and enter life work at twenty-two or twenty-three.

Some minds will solve the problem by shortening the college course to three or even two years. Others will say, "Let the college electives be made in the line of one's chosen work, and thus anticipate and overlap the professional course for one or two years." A still more reasonable plan is the abridgment of the elementary and secondary school courses, so that the student shall enter college two years earlier. What the final solution will be no one knows. One thing, however, may be safely affirmed. The college ought to retain its place between the secondary education and the professional schools. For

2. The college has still a great work to do both for the church and the state, viz., the training of men and leaders. This has been its work in the past, this will be its work in the future. The elementary school will go on teaching the child facts. The secondary school will interweave these facts into groups and principles and laws. Manual training will become more and more a feature of both, in preparation for the useful and the practical in life. The professional and technical schools will become more and more postgraduate schools, to fit men for the callings, the professions, the specialties of life. But between these—between the secondary and the technical schools—lies the all-important, the supreme work of training the man. For the man must be a *man* before he is a specialist. The minister, the doctor, the lawyer is impotent in his profession if he lacks the poise, the symmetry, the character, that we call *manhood*.

No school has ever accomplished this so well as the American college. For it takes the student already familiar with principles and laws, and teaches him to view these

comparatively, to reduce them to rules of action. It appeals to his will, his judgment, his ethical nature, his moral sense. He is ever in the valley of decision. He settles a question to-day only to find a more important one to-morrow. He is ever in search of truth, and for the most part truth that touches upon his own life. His work is chiefly with the humanities. His subject is man, and in studying man he is studying himself. And this is the great work of the college, to reveal the man to himself.

There is no more marvelous transformation than the college boy into the college man; from the crude, untested, unpolished lad as he enters college, not knowing his own powers nor what to do with himself, to the young man of decision, poise, culture, and character as he stands at last to receive the benediction of his alma mater, and goes forth to find his place and work in the world. It is not the humanities alone that have wrought this change. To be sure, philosophy has unlocked the mysteries of human nature, history has mirrored man in the past, sociology has pictured his needs to-day, language and literature have revealed the life and thought of other peoples, the sciences have unfolded the divine plan in nature, and the Bible the personal revelation of God to man.

But, apart from his growth in knowledge, there has been a deepening and expansion and enrichment of his personality, which is the end and aim of the highest culture.

“For this is the final efficient and the final cause of all things. Things have no value, no meaning, are nothing, apart from consciousness. Mind gives value to these. Thought, feeling, will; these are the great realities. Things have value only as they afford the ground for actions and reactions of the mind. They are indeed a part of human environment, but only a part. In larger degree they are determined by the human will and human character. Indeed, the most important part of human environment is personality. Persons are the best educators of persons.”

Xenophon tells us that nothing was more profitable

than association with Socrates, and the spending time with him anywhere and on any subject whatsoever. So thought Garfield of his revered teacher Mark Hopkins. Athens was an ideal city, unparalleled in its literature and art. Williamstown is an ideal college home. So Jerusalem shines like a star in the Orient. But even *there* was "One greater than the temple."

For, personality imparts itself to personality. It is not abstract ideals, but ideals incarnate in the life, that move the world; not books but living teachers; not even the perfect law of God, but God sending his own Son. For the divine personality in Jesus is the greatest educator. Now the great work of life is the expansion and enrichment of personality. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" What if he gain all knowledge, all professional success, all honor from men, and lose his own personality, his divine birthright, his heavenly heritage?

Now the Christian college is the rare and unique place for the development of personality. In this respect the Christian home stands first and best. It alone can do the work of the earlier years. There is no influence so sacred and so permanent as that of the Christian father and mother. But not all homes are Christian. And even Christian parents have their limitations and defects. So here the college comes in to supplement the work of the family. A score or more of devoted teachers, each enthusiastic in his own department, take the place of the parents. The scenes are new. The field of thought is new. The studies open up many new vistas and broaden the mental horizon. It is not the work of the specialist, it is not preparation for a certain kind of life, but for life in its fullness; life physical, intellectual, moral, and religious; life eternal, which changes not with professional success or earthly conditions. Such is the relation of the Christian college to the individ-

ual student; such its aptitude to the development of the truest *manhood*.

But the modern college has a larger and broader field, and never so large and broad as to-day, in its relations to the church, the state, and the civilization of which we are a part. The college is not only to train *men*, but to train men to be *leaders* of men.

Mr. William T. Harris, Commissioner of Education, shows by comparing the statistics of 1872 and 1898 that in twenty-five years our college students have more than doubled, our professional students have nearly trebled, the technical students have increased sixty-five per cent, and the graduate students have multiplied twenty-five fold. If this means that the professions are overcrowded, that we are graduating each year more than twice as many as can fill places of honorable service, and that therefore they are to be idlers and drones, living by their wits and preying upon the public, then the situation is not only serious but alarming. But this does not seem to be the case.

There is an ever-increasing number of college graduates who enter no profession. They take the college course as the best equipment for life. They aim to be broader men, better business men, better citizens. President Carter of Williams College estimates this number at present to be nearly fifty per cent of all our graduates. It will no doubt be larger as the twentieth century advances. Whatever this fifty per cent may be and may do, they are to be leaders in church, in state, and in the world. Now a leader must be himself a well-trained, a symmetrical man. He must know men. He must know something of everything that pertains to man. He must know the world of to-day both at home and abroad. He must be versed in history, philosophy, science, government, and religion. He may in some things have the intensity of the specialist, but he must have the breadth of general culture. This is the work of

the college and will remain its special field. In it must be the element of sufficient time, the maturity of the student, the study of the humanities, and the impress of religion under the inspiration of Christian teachers. This has been its work in the past, and its fruits have been magnificent. Its graduates have been leaders in every noble cause. This will be its work until such leaders are no longer needed. Nor will the public care whether the man is twenty-one or twenty-three or twenty-six when he enters upon his life-work, if he only enters upon it fully equipped. The nineteenth century has added several years to the average of human life.¹ The world will say to the modern student, Take some of that time for extra preparation. For when great interests are at stake, when property and person and life are in peril, the public will call for the fully prepared man. That man in the twentieth century will be the college man. Not the man who has jumped into his profession at twenty-one; not the expert who is so narrow that he can see only his little self and his own little work; but the man who is a *man* before he is a specialist, who has thoroughly fitted himself to be fit for his own special work, wise in his own affairs, and a wise leader in church and state.

3. One more consideration claims our attention, that the limitations of the typical American college are in no small degree its excellences. It is not claimed that limitations are always beneficial, yet often they bring great incidental advantages. This is seen in American college building.

A few of our institutions are creatures of the state. They

¹ William Roscoe Thayer, in *Forum*, February, 1900: "During the past one hundred years the length of life of the average man in the United States and in the more civilized parts of Europe has increased from a little over thirty years to about forty years." The average age of the most eminent men in Europe and America (330 names) is sixty-eight years and eight months.

spring into life at once, draw their supplies from the state treasury, are dependent in no small degree upon the good will of each new legislature, and are subject to evils and limitations belonging to a political organization, often more serious as affecting a true education than the limitations of the independent college. A few, also, are the offspring of millionaires, have come into life with the stroke of a pen, and are worthy monuments to their founders.

But the typical American college is born, and not made; it is a growth, and not a building. It is conceived in a few great souls, who pray over it, and plan for it, and at length rejoice that a new life is born into the world. It has no patrimony but poverty; for it is born to be poor, that it may make the world rich. It is fortunate if it find a godfather who will be sponsor for its future. Its baptismal gifts may be nothing more than a few old books from ministers' libraries. But it is a child, and not a thing. It has a soul, and not a purse. For the lives of its founders live within it, unselfish lives of service and consecration. It comes at length to rejoice in its great mission and to take on new strength with the years. "It increases in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

The college in time becomes the loving mother of a numerous family. She has her birthdays and her anniversaries, when the children come home to greet her. With songs and acclamations they swell her praises. With one heart and one accord they voice the loyal college spirit as they sing:—

"Many a mother has done excellently, but
Thou excellest them all."

Hundreds of such colleges have grown into the life of the American people, and they will not let them die. Their trials, struggles, and limitations have made them all the dearer. Their history is their power. We love them

not only for what they are, but for how they have become what they are.

Again, there are certain limitations in education which must be regarded as exceptions to the business maxims of the world. It may be true, and it may not, that combination and consolidation are universal laws. The oil trust, the sugar trust, and the steel trust may be best for the world, and they may not. The law of supply and demand may meet every emergency, and it may not. But one thing is certain, that political economy is not always mental economy, for the reason that man is not a machine. The present age surpasses all others in making machines, and is fast reducing man himself to a machine. Fain would it apply the same methods to education. The graded school, the normal, the university, become vast machines which measure their success by numbers. What becomes of the individual in such aggregations? What of the value of the touch of mind upon mind, of teacher upon scholar, when the professor does not even know his own scholars, but lectures to a sea of faces which he cannot recognize afterward upon the street? Undoubtedly in education the individual training is the best. For teacher and pupil to sit side by side, and each to awaken and enkindle the mind of the other to an enthusiasm that readily imparts and readily receives,—this is the ideal. The nearer we approach to it in the schools, the better. The limitation of numbers must be such that the vitality of the teacher shall vitalize the scholar. An eminent professor in Yale said to me, "I have thirteen in my class. I would not add another. It is as many as I can know and teach well." I need not remind you that the Divine Teacher called but twelve disciples. And yet the term "small college" in many minds is a term of reproach. If it be small in other respects, it may be justly deserved. If it is small only in numbers, its limitations may be its special advantage. With good equip-

ment and good instructors the probability of good work on the part of the students is in favor of the small college; for in the large institution the pupil may do good work, in the small one he must.

The limited vicinage is another criticism of the American college. It is said there are too many, that fifty well-endowed colleges were better than five hundred. Viewed individually college by college they would be better; viewed practically in their influence, the five hundred may be better. For each is a luminous center that irradiates a dark circle. Each is an incentive to a higher education. Mark Hopkins, the ideal college president of a generation ago, bears testimony that he owed his education to the fact that his home was near to Williams College. Many such testimonies might be gathered. It is the glory of our republic that it has no radiant center that outshines all the rest, but that the light is so widely diffused. The presence of the American college everywhere is one of the radiant causes. It has reversed the law of demand and supply, and made the supply create the demand.

Still even more do the limitations of the small college promote the best social life. Viewed from the outside, this may seem improbable. By one seeking for the first time a genial college home, this may be doubted. But to one who knows by experience both the life of the large and that of the small institution, there is no mystery about it. To one who has sat again and again in alumni meetings and listened to the anxious fears of the graduates that the old-time social, democratic spirit, the most precious element in student life and memory, was passing away with the increase of numbers, the matter becomes one of serious import. There is an earnest effort in some of the overgrown colleges to preserve this democratic spirit of the early days. But wealth has made new distinctions. Cliques, clubs, fraternities, societies of all kinds, honeycomb the social

life of the college. Members often live in their own clubhouse, affiliate with each other and isolate themselves from the rest. There is a kind of social life under these conditions. To some it may be the ideal. But how different the good fellowship and the brotherhood that unites classes and societies and individuals in a common college spirit, that recognizes character and merit, and makes every man's life a blessing to every other! It is this good fellowship that greets the new-comer, and welcomes him to a place in the college home. It is neighborly, brotherly, democratic, Christian. There may be a better social life than this, but it has never yet been discovered.

The crowning limitation, and at the same time the crowning excellence, of the future American college will be the wise selection and limitation of its courses of study. It will not aim to teach everything, but to teach the best. It will be content to be a college, and not a university. It will be satisfied with the old motto, *Pro Christo et Humanitate*, and will not care which way you translate it, "For Christ and Consecrated Learning," as President Morrison intended it; or "For Christ and Humanity," as the world has always interpreted it. For he who knows Christ and the humanities has the essentials of a true education. He will be the ideal man and a brother to his fellow-men.

In its relations to the state, also, the college will remember and cherish the farewell words of Washington:—

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

These words are but a fair expression of the spirit of the founders of our government. These liberal-minded men,

whose fame grows brighter with the years, believed in religion. They opened Congress with prayer, they respected the oath in the courts of justice, they had their days of public fast and thanksgiving. They were truly tolerant in matters of religion. They separated church and state. No man was taxed to support a state religion. No man was debarred from office by his peculiar religious views. They were tolerant of all forms of religion. And yet they cherished religion in the schools. They had no other thought or desire. They never intended that their tolerance toward men should become intolerance of religion itself. It has been left to this age and to our own nation to give this new meaning to toleration. In the name of liberty we have placed this new limitation on education. In the name of toleration we have debarred the Bible and the teaching of religion from the schools. The fruits are already beginning to appear. A generation is growing up in ignorance of the Bible. The state must not teach it. The church does not. Of the nineteen million children of school age in our country, only nine and one-half millions are enrolled in our Sunday-schools. But figures are inadequate to paint that cloud of ignorance and indifference which is already brooding over the land. It will, however, appear in debased standards of literature, art, and morals; in empty churches and crowded jails. For to leave religion out of childhood is to leave man without hope and without God in the world. It is the earth without the sun, it is life without light.

In this, our sister Saxon nations, England and Germany, are wiser than we. They find it possible to be tolerant in the state, and yet to retain religion in the schools. The Bible is accorded a place in the course of study until the student reaches the university or the professional school. This was the policy of the Pilgrims and Puritans; the men of the Revolution and the framers of the Consti-

tution. That famous bill of rights has but two brief sentences on this vital subject: one forbids Congress' making any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; the other requires the oath of loyalty to the Constitution from every officer, and forbids any religious test as a qualification for any office or public trust under the United States. The wisdom of these provisions nobody questions.

The Constitution of Michigan also has two brief articles on the subject of religion. One reads:—

"The Legislature shall pass no law to prevent any person from worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience, or to compel any person to attend, erect, or support any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion."¹

I have no doubt that this section has reference wholly to freedom of worship, and that the last two phrases, "minister of the gospel" or "teacher of religion," are coördinate terms describing one and the same class of persons. And yet our judges have read between the lines a prohibition of religion in education, and, on the strength of this article, have swept the Bible from every public school in the State.

But that our constitution makers did not intend to banish religion absolutely from the State is apparent from another section, which reads:—

"The Legislature may authorize the employment of a chaplain for the state prison; but no money shall be appropriated for the payment of any religious services in either house of the Legislature."²

We then have three distinct groups of persons in Michigan who, as the Constitution is at present interpreted, are treated on different principles religiously. The first is a group of seven hundred and sixty-one men in Jackson, and five hundred and sixty-six at Ionia, who are supplied with chaplains at State expense; and in Ionia at least, "all the inmates are *required* to attend religious services on Sun-

¹ Art. iv. sect. 39.

² Art. iv. sect. 24.

day morning unless excused for cause."¹ We find the second group at Lansing—one hundred and thirty-two men—the lawmakers of the State, who *may* have a chaplain, if it costs the State nothing. The third group is scattered all over the commonwealth in our public schools—a half million and more, our children and youth, soon to be the leaders of the State, who *must not* have religious services. In a word, it is constitutional in Michigan to tax ourselves for the support of a chaplain in our prisons to pray for the recovery of criminals. We may have a free gospel in the Legislature, without money and without price. But a teacher of religion in our schools is prohibited. It is constitutional to teach religion to criminals, and Chaplain Mendenhall, of Ionia, testifies that "it has a powerful influence for good." But it is unconstitutional to teach religion to boys to prevent their becoming criminals! The State may teach religion in Jackson and Ionia, but not in Ann Arbor and Lansing!

Is it not apparent that there are not only perils, but even absurdities, in the state education of to-day? Is there not a place and a work for the college to train Christian leaders who shall create a better public sentiment, and show that not all the limitations and defects in modern education are to be found in the college; that our secular system is ignoring the eternal principles of true manhood and of Christian civilization? If we leave out of our training the Bible and Christian truth—our corner-stones in the past—then the individual must deteriorate, and the state must decline. There must be chaplains in the prisons, if there is no religion in the schools. If it is one of the limitations of the American college that it is Christian, then let us glory in our limitation. If it is our infirmity to hold fast to that which is good, then let us glory in our infirmity,

¹ Annual Report, 1901.

remembering that "God has chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty."

The American college appeals to-day to its alumni and friends as never before. It points to its illustrious founders, its unique history, and its splendid service. It asks of us renewed loyalty to its principles and unwavering devotion to its interests. For the sake of the church, the state, and the world, it bids us consecrate ourselves to its noble work, and thus in giving it an immortal life we shall become immortal ourselves.