

ARTICLE IV.

UNIVERSITIES AND SOCIAL ADVANCE.

BY THE REVEREND A. A. BERLE, D.D., SALEM, MASS.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM JAMES, addressing the Association of American Alumnae at Radcliffe College in 1907, near the close of his address made use of these words:—

“It would be a pity if any future historian were to have to write words like these: ‘By the middle of the twentieth century the higher institutions of learning had lost all influence over public opinion in the United States. But the mission of raising the tone of democracy which they had proved themselves so lamentably unfitted to exert, was assumed with rare enthusiasm and prosecuted with extraordinary skill and success by a new educational power, and for the clarification of their human sympathies and elevation of their human preferences the people at large acquired the habit of resorting exclusively to the guidance of certain private literary adventures, commonly designated in the market by the affectionate name of ten-cent magazines.’”

If almost anybody but the most gifted man who has inhabited the college precincts of Cambridge for many years had made this speech, there would have been a contemptuous shrugging of shoulders on the part of the illuminati who reside there and thereabouts, implying another appeal to the galleries. And some did actually thus shrug their cultivated shoulders and sniff that anything or anybody could or should destroy their influence. But William James has in these many years created so large and powerful an influence and following that recent utterances of the apostle of a superior class¹ seem like a belated survival of another age

¹For a classic example of the mixture of the trifling and social ignorance and diletantism which is rendering “university” opinion accursed to the thoughtful people of New England, see Professor Wendell’s “Privileged Classes,” Boston Transcript, February 5. The address was given at Chicago.

beside the sane and human utterances of the psychologist who has discovered and dared to proclaim that humanity has a soul and a heart as well as a head. But Professor James's utterance is itself a trifle late, and the historian of to-day, while not able to say just what this conjectural future historian might say, is able to affirm that the premier influence in the American mind is no longer that which springs from the universities and colleges, in spite of the enormous increase of their endowments and students. He is able to say that in the last fifteen years no single cherished American institution has lost much more in the public esteem than the university. He is able to say, that a distinct and growing chasm exists between the public mind and the university habit of mental approach which is sure to have lasting and determinate results in the development of American character and the democratization of American education; that sooner or later there will be a revolution of opinion on the subject of university education; and that the facts which are now uppermost and regnant in the public mind, and which are demanding the rigid application of democratic standards of judgment and approach to every other institution and practice, will also finally require that the university shall conform.

There is no idea which has had larger force with the American public in the past century than the idea of the value and power of education. The worship of the public school has amounted almost to fetichism and the naïve expectation that a trained mind will be able to do almost anything and bring the kingdom of God forthwith still lingers among the choice superstitions of the American intellect. Not that it has not had certain rude shocks, especially lately, and that gradually it is filtering into the common mind that educational training is only one kind of training, and that what is called an edu-

cated man is a man who has, as the case now stands, one point of view of life, and usually only one, and that a very narrow and very distorted one, crammed into his brain; that the so-called educated man has a bundle of prejudices which make him, as well as the uneducated man, an unfair dictator of the social life and purposes of the multitude. In other words, education so-called is seen to be merely one form of life, and that it may, under its most favorable conditions, not only not make for social advance, but may make for social deterioration; that it may destroy the activity and building up of the social conscience; that it may elevate false moral standards, and enthrone viewpoints which in their logical development forbid social advance; indeed, that the university may itself be the last stronghold of social injustice, and that every such institution not subject to popular control is a danger-spot in democratic life; in short, that a university which is not allied to the public educational system, and subject to public inspection and regulation, may be the worst kind of a social force in the community, and infinitely more dangerous to the moral health of the nation because it hides its real effects under the fair seeming name of education.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE CRIMINAL RICH.

One of the most interesting and suggestive symptoms of the possibilities in this direction may be found in the increasing natural alliance between the malefactors of great wealth so-called and their criminal associates and the universities of almost every name and kind throughout the land, except those under public direction and control. The almost continuous story of crime among the very wealthy men of the great corporate and other organizations of the country discloses also that these names are also those which figure largely and most

frequently in some form of endowment and giving to the great colleges of the land. In this way Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and others are at this moment using money which is known to have been amassed by thieves robbing in some instances the widows and the orphans. Some of these foundations actually bear the names of the thieves who thus sought to divide the proceeds with alma mater, and who, till they were discovered, were *persona grata* in all that was loveliest and best in the official university life. These are names we used to see at the official and social assemblages as among the men the university delighted to honor and put forth as the representative product of the college,—“sons of the college who had done well,” as a professor of Christian morals felicitously put it on one occasion. Since these “sons of the college who have done well” have been discovered to be among the most expert and abandoned criminals in the land, has the college hastened to disown her sons who had not only not done well but ill? No, indeed; she has serenely kept close to her other sons of great wealth who have not yet been discovered, and has deplored “savage attacks upon capital” and other frightful depredations against society. To this, however, one very notable and striking exception must be recorded. President Hyde of Bowdoin did bring to the attention of the undergraduates at that college the fact that a great criminal and exploiter had been a student there, and warned his young men against a similar career. A wonderful and marvelous exception to the rule.

Nor is this alliance of the criminal rich with the university accidental. The university itself has become a financial institution with a huge capital and with a huge fund which must be made and kept productive. It must buy stocks and bonds and make investments, and this of necessity allies it with the

financial interests. It does not require very clever thinking to see that the financial interests of the university lie along the pathway of the financially influential and prosperous. Under the most favorable conditions it is easy to see how the paramount influence in the university readily becomes a financial influence, and that the habit of deference to expert financial opinion (even though later it proves to have been the opinion of looters, thieves, railroad wreckers, and common gamblers) soon becomes the university habit. The very legitimate character of much of this intercourse opens the way for a constantly increasing power by the financial interests over the university authorities. Then, again, when the competition becomes stronger, and the universities enter, as they have entered, upon one of the fiercest contests ever known, namely, for size and endowment and equipment, and millions are needed, to whom shall they go but to the millionaire exponents of high finance? Now it happens that we have lately seen that high finance is for the most part corrupt. We have seen that men honored in church and university and academic council have exhibited a character status which differs in no way, except in degree, from that of the common thieves and burglars who fill the common jails. Some of them have had the strength of mind to get themselves out of the world, to the world's betterment. But their beneficiaries—the men who feted and dined and wined and honored them, and ate their dinners, and honored them with degrees—they are still in the universities, and they still stand as sponsors for the intellectual leadership of American youth. Can this continue? Obviously not. Nothing but the most absurd discrediting of the simplest abilities of the average man can hope that such an institution can have much influence with the public mind; while, as for “raising the tone of democracy,” such a sugges-

tion simply fills the air with laughter. Who shall it be that shall raise the tone of democracy,—the Harvard Hydes, the Yale Depews, or the Princeton Alexanders?

The apologist may come forward at this point, and say that the universities have no supernatural means of knowing who is honest and who is dishonest. Certainly not. But it seems they have no better powers of observation and judgment than the common mass of men either. It is their very specialty which is impeached, namely, to discern the tendencies and influences which are at work among men, and to guide the less illuminated multitude in the pathway of sound discrimination. Professor James says that "the best claim which a college education can possibly make on your respect, the best thing it can aspire to accomplish for you is this: *that it should help you to know a good man when you see him.*" The italics are his own. But have the universities shown any particular prescience in this respect? Have they known the good men of high finance from the bad men? Why then are so many of the most discredited names linked to university foundations and lectureships and other university functions and privileges? If Professor James is right, the universities have failed at the very heart to do the thing which he thinks is the one thing they should enable men to do. But they have not only failed in this, but they have given the high seats of honor to the corruptors and thieves who happened to be rich.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE POLITICALLY CORRUPT.

Leave now the sphere of financial alliance between the university and the criminal rich, and enter the political sphere and see what the relation is between the notorious beneficiaries and representatives of political corruption in municipality, state, and nation, and the colleges. Here again we are confronted with a state of affairs similar to that which prevails in

finance. The university, which ought "to know a good man when it sees him" and teach its students likewise, not only does not go behind the returns, but flies in the face of obvious common knowledge in bringing to its platform men who are known throughout the length and breadth of the state and nation as political corruptors. The influence behind this, however, it must be admitted, is that the corruptionists are such because they are allied to and usually representatives of the predatory interests also; and since these through their financial representatives have commanding influence in the university counsels, they easily and readily influence in the appearance, in honor, of their political agents, it may be in the United States Senate, it may be in the House of Representatives, or some lesser office. To gain the recognition of your university in public life you need only what you need with the lowest politicians and strikers, namely, win. How you win and what means you use are overlooked in the fact that you actually won. Probably if you win twice you will be a marshal at commencement parade, and if you win several times you may become an officer in the university. That you slaughtered the morals of a whole congressional district, and made bribery and drunkenness and debauchery the rule at the humblest cross-roads throughout the district, is of no consequence at all. The university should know a good man when it sees him, but apparently university morality, that is, official recognition morality, is made by winning, whether in a stock exchange gamble or a political debauch. Men who are now in middle life can recall the days when the great civil service reform revival called into being and utterance some of the finest political idealisms this country has ever known. How the university was stirred by them, and the undergraduate youth felt nothing so thoroughly, and longed for nothing so

steadily or finely, as to be allied with these majestic men whose note of civic purity was like a gospel in politics. It was a gospel in politics, and nothing less! Contrast that epoch with the march of the bribe-giving and perjured public officers throughout the academic halls. Compare it with the men who sit in the seats of the mighty at commencement and pass out platitudes to the undergraduates, men whose pathway in public life is one long streak of moral degradation and shame, but who, having the powers of finance behind them, were able to win. Why has the college man in politics become a hissing? Because the college man has been found to be like other men except that he brought exceptional talents to the work of political jobbery, and was able to avoid the dirtiest of the dirty work by hiring men to do it for him. Take, for example, the Essex district of Massachusetts, where these lines are written, and we have, as the representative in Congress, a son of Harvard College, who is there by the most shameless and demoralizing debauchery that could possibly prevail in any district in the land. Language cannot do justice to some of the results of this debauchery, which was open, shameless, confessed, has been denied by nobody, and is beyond refutation or apology. Yet in the last election this person was able to bring to his support, in his fight for reëlection, when decency was in revolt, an ex-governor of the Commonwealth, three attorneys-general of the Commonwealth, three congressmen, one United States Senator, a Justice-elect of the Supreme Court of the United States, and finally a letter from the President of the United States, though not a single one of this great aggregation of forces had one syllable to say in refutation of specific, detailed, and particular charges of debauchery and corruption which were brought on the platform every night against the man whom they were helping to

reflect. Probably no district in the United States had so great a force of notabilities sent into it. And the striking thing about it is, that they were all college men, from the President down. They were the college output as it operates in public life, and each and every one of them knew that the charges were true, and some of them in private admitted them to be true, but felt the pressure of political necessity, the shameless incumbent being the son-in-law of a United States senator, also a distinguished Harvard alumnus, and frequently honored by his alma mater. This was the one thing which university training and university influence ought to have made impossible. Yet it was university men who were assembled to maintain and perpetuate, as they did maintain and perpetuate, a situation which is as absolutely one of criminal prostitution as can be found in American public life. In other words, the university influence and environment acted here just as it did in the matter of the scoundrels of high finance. The bond was as strong, for this criminaloid congressman was also a rich man, and the social tie to the university that made the Hyde lectures also made the university influences rally to the support of the political corruptionist.

For twenty years the favorite public man at Yale University was the man who is now among the degraded public men of the nation, and who misrepresents New York in the Senate of the United States. But apparently Yale was no better able "to know a good man when it saw him" than Harvard. The speeches of this particular man were wont to be exploited by the university as among the finest type of the Yale product in public life. But just where does the discovery that he was not only a hypocrite, but a thoroughly corrupt and degraded man, leave the gentlemen and the institution, who were proud to put forth this particular man as the finest product of the

Yale theory of education in public service? If they say they did not know and had no supernatural means of information, then they must abdicate with the distinguished company at Cambridge all ability of knowing a good man when they see him or having any better powers in this direction than less educated people. The truth, however, is far simpler. He represented wealth. That was his open sesame. He represented power and high finance (stolen from widows and orphans too), but the university had to have its alliances with the powerful, and university investments must be kept productive. How ridiculous has the scholar in politics become! There is a favorite story among Tammany men of a college man who came to Tammany, and, till they knew him, they respected his supposed scruples against the lower forms of political procedure. When they knew him they felt differently, and one of them, speaking of this particular man, said, "By —, that fellow is the limit. He made a new record for *me*." And the present writer heard the man thus referred to say, with cynical indifference to the opinions of the college bred, when he was asked what they might think of his choice of means and alliances, "I don't care a d— what they think. All I need, to be cheered next commencement, when I go back, is to win." And right he was. And he went back, and was introduced as the victorious hero of many a hard-fought political battle, and cheered to the echo at the university. His name had been dragged through the mire, and he was guilty of political debaucheries without number, open and unconcealed, but his college honored him! Did the college know or had success made right? Every one knows, who has thought about it at all and has observed university practice in this regard in recent years, that the university has simply either shut its eyes entirely to the means by which its eminent graduates have become rich or has taken

their success as the measure of their moral status. And the university as an institution has been in alliance with political corruption in exactly the same way as it has been in alliance with corrupt finance.

UNIVERSITIES AND PROFESSIONAL IDEALS.

A distinguished New York lawyer, the Hon. Edward M. Shepard, addressing the Illinois Bar Association in 1907, began his address by saying:—

"We American lawyers who are not already moralists, as by virtue of our office all of us ought to be, must become moralists right soon if the profession is longer to hold the powerful place in American public life which has traditionally belonged to it for a century and a half. . . . We must frankly confess that the American lawyer has lost some of his preference and prestige in political life . . . the profession has to remember that its ability practically to influence the masses of men in their affairs of politics and state, depends upon the measure of popular belief in its devotion to the general welfare of those very masses and upon the measure of popular belief that lawyers are not, whether by money retainer or by ingrained habit of thought, dedicated to the service of narrow, special or selfish interests."

Here you have a restrained and careful statement, by a leader in his profession, of the status of his profession in the public mind from his point of view. It is entirely optimistic. If any one but a man of Mr. Shepard's standing and power were speaking, he would say that the American lawyer has well nigh lost his position as mentor to the American masses, except when they are forced to resort to him as a power by which they can meet the exactions of some other member of the same profession. It is no exaggeration to say that any assumption of ethical interest by lawyers in the practice of the profession, would in any club in the country produce a convulsion of derisive laughter. And it is even less subject to the charge of exaggeration to say, that the vast mass of the people outside

professional circles do not regard the mass of lawyers as honest men in the sense in which a clerk working for an employer has to be honest or lose his job. Now it is not necessary to affirm this to be the fact. The truth probably is, that honesty is just as certainly existent among lawyers as among clergymen, doctors, or business men, probably no more, no less. But that there has been a distinct decline in professional influence and standards Mr. Shepard has brought out, and many others have again and again stated the same thing. Of the decline in professional ideals among clergymen, many things have been written which need not be discussed here, as it is also not the purpose to discuss the decline of professional ideals among lawyers. The mere fact is the important thing in this discussion. And the distinguished barrister of New York puts his hand quickly upon the cause, namely, when he says that, popularly, legal powers are supposed to be for sale to the highest bidder, and legal abilities can be purchased for every kind of rascality for which legal abilities are employed. Nor is this now a matter of conjecture. Even the lay mind can easily see in the story of the traction frauds in New York City that they would have been impossible without the leadership and skillful manipulation of the leading lawyers of that city, names which figure among the foremost names in the nation's intellectual life. Now it is fair to say that the legal profession is among the most sensitive to university opinion. It is therefore also true to say that, if these gentlemen who represent the highest development of the legal profession had had the slightest intimation that their standing as lawyers and gentlemen would have suffered at the academic centers, by reason of their serving these scoundrels of high finance (they are the constant factors in the problem), and performing these acts which allied their brains

with the robberies, the trickeries, and the frauds, which these men committed, they would have hesitated to render these services. But they knew perfectly well that they stood in no such danger. They were cognizant of the fact that the university authorities were in intimate relationship with the same men for whom they were providing the legal means for duping thousands of innocent investors, and were thereby estopped from criticising them, the mere employees of the financial interests whom the universities were themselves courting. Every one connected with professional life knows that a few leaders make the standards for the whole profession, and that just as soon as it was seen that the leaders of the bar in every city had placed their talents at the command of the predatory corporations and other corrupt interests, the ideals of the profession began to sink, and they have been sinking in the legal profession for twenty years. Just at the present moment the prosecution of many of these interests, made necessary by the breakdown of the colossal framework of fraud which had become too topheavy to sustain its weight, has brought into the foreground a breed of men who seem to be differently fibered. But this, for the moment, is also the pathway to public recognition and preferment, and before its real value to the profession can be estimated it is worth while to wait. The outstanding fact, as the matter now stands, is, that the country has had before it the evidence that the profession upon which it has most to rely for the making and maintaining of its laws has been for the most part sold to the highest bidder, and has furnished to interests now known to be corrupt, vicious, and thoroughly dishonest its choicest intellects for the period of the last twenty years.

Now what was the relation of the university to all this? It was the relation which the academic center, which is the heart

of professional life, sustains to the ideals of the profession. If the profession had even in the slightest degree supposed that by accepting commissions to obfuscate the public and cheat the courts by such performances as characterized the handling of the traction roads in New York City it would incur academic condemnation, there would have been a pause instantly certainly by the men highest up in the profession. But did the heart of the professional life, did the mother of professional ideals, send out to her children any note whatever of how she felt about these things? Has she sent out any note, now that she has seen her learning prostituted to the service of scoundrels? Nobody has heard such a note. On the contrary, these lawyers have been the men she has called back to her halls to indicate what a successful lawyer is like. In other words, the custodian of the professional ideal gave over her custody to the same interest to whom she had given her material interest, and thus she completed the circle of her own shame. Having accepted the bounty of the corrupt, she was bound to condone the practices of those who served them. Many young lawyers have told the present writer that this fact of the purchasability of the best legal talent for any use whatever, was the most perplexing ethical question before them, and was constantly raising distressing questions of personal honor and uprightness.

Professional ideals are made in the university, and are as surely the product of university opinion as is the education which makes the professional life itself. It is therefore fairly chargeable to the want of sound opinion at the universities that the legal profession has steadily declined in power and usefulness and prestige as regards the higher forms of American life and social development. Indeed, as regards this particular profession, though *mutatis mutandis*, the same

thing is true of every other profession, the culpability is specially great, since the law has so much to do with social advance of every kind. The administration of the courts and the general attitude toward laws and law-making is itself one of the greatest of social forces, and its contamination may therefore be said to be a matter of particular importance. If the men who are to interpret the laws, and who are to make the public opinion which prevails in respect to its judgments of the relation between the administration of the law and the administration of justice, lose their sense of the social significance of these things, the loss is something almost too fearful to contemplate; and this, in fact, in some cases has actually happened. The insurance thieves, for example, had been so fortified by legal opinions and legal advice that it is not hard to believe that some of them thought they had a perfect right to do the things which they did. Indeed, in almost all the exposures of great corruption in recent years, the curious thing is, that step by step it was given legal basis, and, in the final acts of some of these cases, it was found that the tracks had been so carefully covered, that, while all the facts were known, skillful reservations and ambiguities made criminal incarceration and conviction impossible. And thus the public has seen the legal profession at its lowest, the highest talent employed for the purpose of enabling thieves in high finance to avoid the consequences of their crimes; while lesser men were unable to employ such talent, which they could not afford, and therefore went to jail. But partnership in this regard by the university cannot be avoided. The school had a duty and a voice in this matter. She uttered no voice, and she abandoned a duty, and she honored her abandoned children to the exclusion of honest men. Upon the university a large share of this riot of crime rests.

UNIVERSITIES AND THE SOCIAL UPRISING.

It will afford an interesting contrast, however, to turn from these attitudes and alliances of the university to the state of mind which has prevailed at the academic centers with reference to the general social advance as represented in the movement of the social body toward a larger and a finer life. It would be interesting to know what, if any, meliorating movement of the last twenty years has received the sponsorship of any university, especially one that affected any "interest" in any appreciable degree? The last twenty years have seen remarkable advances in the conditions of workmen, in the operations of charity and philanthropy. It has seen great movements toward larger liberty and toward the greater restraint of the strong in their grasp upon exclusive privileges; and, indeed, for twenty years the distinctive note of modern society has been the greater equalization of the opportunities and enjoyments of life. In other words, society has set itself to abolish privilege, by whatever name it calls itself, and has set to work resolutely to break down every form of injustice which it can lay hands upon. This has become so much the movement of the best spirits of the time that it constitutes a kind of chivalry of the period, and has enlisted more heart and soul and sacrifice than most people not a part of the movement can imagine. Out of the universities themselves it called a choice group of youth who bravely grappled with the *terra incognita* of the other half of the world, and undertook to know it and to serve it. It practically created a new profession. It injected a kind of poetry into modern life, and began a career of social discovery which is not ended yet. It began with an attitude of humility and self-abnegation which was itself a kind of romance, and simply gave itself to the careful observation and study of the masses of mankind, with a view

to serving them and helping them. Now as a matter of course many of these social pioneers were university men and women. But the university did not teach it to them, nor did the university encourage them until the thing had reached a stage where the imagination was appealed to, and each university had to have a pet social settlement to exploit as one of the evidences of "what our university does for the less favored," etc. But from its beginnings and its earliest developments, this was a human movement that began with passion, fire, and with love. It has grown until it has a thousand activities. It stimulated a thousand new forms of itself, and has overleaped all its original bounds, and is now operating in ways which the original promoters could not possibly have anticipated. In short it has created the modern social uprising, the insistent demand for real democracy. It is at this moment the most vital thing in life among Americans. It is the idealism of America reappearing in forms of social advance and social emergence. Now such movements in the olden times were the outcome of the university spirit and teaching. But synchronously with this movement what has the university as an institution been doing? It has been standing for conservatism, falsely so-called, it has been holding up the hands of the brigands of society, it has been accepting and growing on the endowments of public plunderers, and has made the university the bulwark of the predatory interest. It has excluded from its own halls almost every voice that spoke for the common interest. It had in its sacred desks the men who were the preachers for the most part under the pay of the heads of the special interests whom it sought to ally with its financial foundations. It has had in its chairs the representatives of the theories which denied the rights of the masses and fortified the interests of the few against the many. It made its special

bids to the millionaire, however crude or vulgar, and left many of its honest sons without the recognition or help of the academic friendship in the battles for justice where justice was obviously on their side. Indeed, in the last twenty years it has been the most effectual bar to academic recognition to stand for any popular interest, and the public and the university interest have practically become things ever against each other. In other words, the battles of democracy have gradually revealed, that, in so far as the universities had to be reckoned with, they had to be reckoned as on the side of the entrenched injustice and the moneyed brigandage of the land. That this is not violence in statement may be readily seen by looking over the names which have figured in the academic recognition of the last twenty years, and those which have figured in the discredited financial operations of the same period in so far as these have been laid open to the public. The Hyde dinner which finally brought the rupture which let in light on the Equitable Insurance scandals had university presidents, men of light and leading, present, giving the weight of their academic presence to what is now known to have been the wild orgy of a thief. Of course they did not know! But there stands the fact that the university dignitaries were present, and they did not apparently know a good man or a bad one when they saw him.

But even this could have been forgiven, if the university had not gone farther, and ventured to brand the men who looked for a larger life as enemies of public order, "anarchists," and other undesirable persons. They undertook to rebuke the men who cried out against the now acknowledged social injustice, and undertook to throttle the social conscience just as it was beginning to make itself felt in the wider public relationships of men. Was there a more anarchistic assembly held in the

last twenty years than the Hyde dinner with its luxury, its extravagance, and its wanton waste, while society was groaning with injustice and pain and shame, and millions were hungry and travailing over the ills of life? Every man who was at that dinner should have known, the university heads especially, that underneath that luxury there was groaning a mass of human misery, that should have shocked and awakened them. But the university, the stock exchange, the railroad clique, and the insurance gang of looters were all at one at that assembly. The social conscience there was non-existent. No wonder men held their breath! No wonder a shudder of fear ran through the country as thoughtful men began to contemplate the effect of these things upon the masses. And the uprising of these masses was stimulated even more. But there stood our alma mater smiling beside the looter and the grafter, and bestowing her fairest awards upon the successful enemies of the social whole. If this seems an overdrawn picture, let the reader just quietly go to the library, and look over the records of the past fifteen or twenty years, and see what has been happening, and see what the attitude of the university has been to the social uprising; and then let him wonder why the last place to which the masses turn, "for the clarification of their human sympathies or the elevation of their human preferences," is to the university.

UNIVERSITIES AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

President Eliot, in his address before the Connecticut State Teachers' Association, in 1902, on "More Money for the Public Schools because of the Failures and Shortcomings in American Education," enumerated a number of these shortcomings and the relation of public education to them. It was an interesting exhibit and the conclusions were for the most part fairly drawn, though allowances were not made for cer-

tain complexities and forces which inhere in the nature of public education which do not or ought not to affect education under private auspices and control. A private institution, for example, may, and in general does, prescribe the conditions and qualifications of those who seek its benefits. The public schools cannot make such distinctions. Barring known physical and moral defects which can be justifiably brought to the attention of a public tribunal, the public schools have absolutely no option as to whom they shall receive, and cannot go behind the returns as to antecedents, environment, or other conditions affecting character and habits. A private institution, on the other hand, can do all of these things; and, if it does not do them, it is because of neglect on its own part, not because it has not the powers for such control and inspection prior to the admission of any student. It will be interesting, therefore, to take President Eliot's arraignment of the public schools and, with this distinction in mind, raise the question as to just what difference exists, if any, in its effectiveness when applied to the universities as well as the public schools. In this connection, of course, the privately controlled universities are chiefly in mind. The great state universities are comparatively of so recent origin as, with rare exceptions, like the University of Michigan, not to be reckoned with the great privately controlled universities. Then, too, they, like the public schools, are subject to the distinction above noted.

President Eliot says:—

“For more than two generations we have been struggling with the barbarous vice of drunkenness, but have not yet discovered a successful method of dealing with it. . . . The public schools ought to have made it impossible that benevolence and devotion (in the form of wrong temperance teaching in the schools) should be so misdirected. The courts have failed to deal wisely with habitual drunkards as a class, both the theory and the practice of fines and short imprisonments as applied to drunkards being entirely futile.”

But what about the colleges? If there is a more disgraceful chapter in the college life than that which has to do with the drunken orgies of classes at annual dinners and other functions, the present writer, with fifteen years' careful observation of this particular phenomenon before him, does not know it. The very institution over which Dr. Eliot presides has furnished in Boston so many orgies of this character, that a number of the leading hotels in Boston will not now accept contracts to have class suppers held at their houses, because of the drunkenness and the general smash-ups which have followed these affairs. Others require heavy indemnity bonds before the affairs come off, to insure them against losses from such proceedings. But Harvard is not a sinner above all that dwell in Jerusalem. A recent Doctor of Philosophy of Yale states, that, at a recent class reunion of middle-aged men at New Haven, he saw drunken graduates of that university lying in the gutters on the college green. And this is not in the last century but within a very few years! Examples might be multiplied; but these are enumerated, that this statement may not be passed over as a glittering generality with nothing specific. It is safe to say that when the results are carefully examined, in proportion to its per centum of the population, the university men have contributed quite their share of drunkards, and are as much creators and disciples of the "barbarian vice" as any others. The indictment against the public schools holds with tenfold greater force against the colleges, because the latter represents a class of much greater selection.

Again he says:—

"The persistence of gambling in the United States is another disappointing thing to the advocates of popular education. . . . It is a prevalent vice among all savage people, but one which moderate cultivation of the intelligence—a very little foresight and the least

sense of responsibility—should be sufficient to eradicate. . . . The passion for gambling affects the market not only for stocks and bonds but for the great staples of commerce and the necessities of life.”

And here again how do the colleges compare with the public schools? The children play craps and other small gambling games, but President Eliot can see from his house a place where stock quotations are given daily in Cambridge, or used to be, for the students who gamble throughout their college course. A similar place is much frequented in New Haven, and the form of gambling which best suits the temperament and class in life of the students, finds as full and perhaps fuller expression among the university population as among any other; while the great stock gamblers of the country, the men who do the thing on the large scale which affects the masses of mankind, are, as previously stated, many of them, men actively allied to college endowments and benefactions and administration. If the case against the public schools is a bad one (and it is), the case against the colleges is vastly worse.

Again President Eliot alludes to the disappointment with reference to universal suffrage, and holds that popular education here has not done what we expected it to do. But here again, without leaving the boundaries of his own city or his own state, he can see university men allied to every form of corruption and misuse of public service that exists in the Commonwealth. He can see the State of Connecticut held in the leash of an obsolete and utterly unjust form of government at the behest and by the power of men trained in Yale University, who are in the dominant political machine of that State. He can go among the graduates of the universities of the land and he can find the conspicuous offenders against civic and social righteousness bearing degrees often honorary of the highest institutions of the land. The distinction be-

tween the university and the public schools cannot be found. If any exist, all the facts considered, the balance is against the university, especially when we consider that the non-voting, civic-indolent population is almost always the university bred. In New York it is an axiom among the reformers, that there is more conscience on the lower East Side than on the avenues, and the Back Bay of Boston rarely votes except in a great crisis, and then only because the money nerve drives it.

“ Since one invaluable result of education is a taste for good reading, the purchase by the people of thousands of tons of ephemeral reading matter which is not good in either form or substance, shows that one great end of popular education has not been attained. . . . From the point of view of the social philosopher or the ethical reformer this is the worst disappointment of all in regard to the results of common school education in the nineteenth century.”

But ask an honest undergraduate, or ask any honest graduate of fifteen years' standing, on this subject, and you will find that the mass of the university-bred men have as their chief literary diet the newspaper and these not always the best. The ten-cent magazine, which Professor James suggests as a possible supplanter of the university as a great educative force, stands next, and probably the vast majority of the men not actually in professions which require book reading, will frankly admit that they are not reading men. If this indictment is true and sound as to the public schools, and it appears to be, though President Eliot is not just to the masses in this respect, as in most things, it is a thousand times more condemnatory of the men who have been through college. In fact, the “ masses,” strictly speaking, are not the buyers of the ten-cent magazines. The advertisements show who make and support the ten-cent magazines. Here again, proportionately, the indictment holds equally against the college as well as the

public school. In fact, when the conditions are taken into account, the balance is again against the college.

And last among the things which we shall select in this contrast is the theater. President Eliot says: "If the public education had been mentally and morally adequate, surely the public theater would be very much better than it is to-day." Possibly the distinguished head of Harvard has not attended the chorus-girl shows and the claptrap stuff with which the theatrical trust has flooded the American stage and made it a scandal. But let any show peculiarly bad come to Boston or New Haven or any other university city, and he will see the college crowd conspicuously lined up in the front rows. In fact, the undergraduate support of such things is one of the things which have led to their exploiting so extensively. It is a curious ignorance of the facts that fixes on the public schools in this matter as the reprehensible influence. If there is a peculiar spot where the college lawlessness, the college rowdiness, the college want of breeding and taste, and the college lack of manliness and fairness have come to the surface with greater force than any other, it is in connection with the degraded shows of the modern theater. Evidently the colleges have not helped much in this matter.

Now in all this there is no want of recognition of the forces on the other side. The good men in the universities, the noble graduates who labor for the public good, and the minority who come out of the universities prepared to make some sacrifice for the public good commensurate with the privileges which they have enjoyed,—not one of them is overlooked. But, viewed from the same angle from which President Eliot views the public schools, and in the same spirit, the university-bred population have not justified their cost to the country, and the universities as social institutions have failed quite as

much as the public schools. In fact, their failure has been greater because they have furnished the leaders of the great predatory enterprises, they have furnished the stock gamblers and market manipulators, and they have not denied to these social pests academic recognition and fellowship. This fact is one reason which has in the Western States steadily caused the rising tide in favor of state universities. Democracy has seen higher education perverted to the use of an exploiting class, and has seen the institutions which should have been the liberators become the allies of those who have sought to make private gain of public necessity. It was probably this fact which led President Hadley some years ago to propose social ostracism as a punishment for these persons. But has Yale ostracised anybody except those who were actually caught with the "goods on"? Of course not. Nor has any university which has had to rely upon its alliance with the stock market and the clearing-house to keep its funds productive. Even the literary product of these institutions has, much of it, been of the same character, as will be shown in some subsequent discussion. The present outstanding fact is, that, as related to the struggle for social advance, the universities have, as of yore, been against the popular interest, and the privately controlled institution has steadily stood against the progress of democratic ideals and their realization. And it has done more. Many young men who came to it full of high and sacrificial notions of public service and devotion, it has weaned away from these passionate strivings of youth, and substantially bidden them first to put money in their purses and then strive to lift the body politic. And in this influence, the church, the state, and the social fabric alike have been weakened and made more subject to the social ills inherent in our gigantic experiment in universal suffrage and popular government.