
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

WHAT EDUCATION IS OF MOST WORTH?[1]

BY CHARLES FINNEY COX.

THESE are times when everything must be priced and tagged. The paramount question, on every one's lips, is as to values, and values are estimated by productiveness. We are all asking: what income will a thing yield; what pleasure or privilege will it buy? Utilitarianism and commercialism never had the universal sway they have to-day.

As the general store of human possessions—intellectual as well as physical—becomes larger and larger, the demand for an appraisement of each individual's share becomes stronger and stronger. Men and women are graded according to their available assets, mental, moral, or pecuniary. In what is colloquially known as "society" one is rather easily "sized up," for labeling is there reduced to an exact system. In that formally organized department of human activity, position is determined by the quality or quantity of clothes and jewels one wears, by the kind of vehicle he is carried about in, or by the location and costliness of his home and its contents, or the number of servants he maintains,—in brief, by the amount of money one is able to spend without apparent embarrassment. In political life the criterion of success is the attainment of office. Men still go into public life for what they can get out of it. "Practical" politics are by no means obsolete, and the word "spoils" has not yet wholly passed out of use as a technical term indicating compensation for

[1] Address at the alumni meeting, Oberlin, Ohio, June 18, 1907.

party service. Even those more or less justly accorded the name of "statesmen" are not entirely above looking for reward in popular applause and vulgar acclaim. In literature we may determine excellence, according to the book-reviews, by merely procuring a list of "the largest sellers," and in art success is most often measured by the price which a picture or statue will bring.

In the field of research and discovery it is *applied* science that carries off the palm, and what people most want to know about Hertzian waves or radio-activity is for what "useful" or money-making purpose they can be employed. The consequence of this is, that the mere inventor is elevated to the rank of "scientist," and the man who "promotes" a novelty and organizes a corporation for its exploitation is greater than the "impractical" student of nature who unselfishly works out an original generalization or formulates a previously hidden law. Thus it is an Edison and not a Kelvin, a Burbank rather than a Darwin, who receives immediate recognition and secures the material reward. Even in the domain of morals and theology we have not quite outgrown the principle of "enlightened self-interest" under which the future life of endless duration and all the attractions of heaven are the repayment for a brief period of renunciation and penance in this mortal existence,—like the oft-extolled enjoyment in old age of ease and luxury earned through poverty and privation in youth. There is a change going on in this matter, however, and the so-called "institutional church," with its clubs, guilds, schools, hospitals, savings and loan offices, and the like, is one of the evidences that the leaders of religious thought have come to the conclusion that we may as well get what good we can out of life as we go along. But this phase of the subject is itself a concession to

utilitarianism, since it recognizes and defers to the fact that men expect goodness to work to their advantage, and do not care for a system of life in which the rewards are distributed in the form of promissory notes maturing in another world. In fact almost every one desires and expects an immediate and material return for what he is and does.

Now, this commercial or calculating spirit has taken a strong hold upon educational affairs, particularly in this country, and I am afraid it will work great harm as time goes on; for, as the nation advances in age and wealth and power, there will be increasing need for the conservative influence of a large class of cultured people outside and independent of the materialistic activities of the times, and it will prove to be a great misfortune if the institutions of learning have been given over to the cultivation of mere bread-and-butter-getting abilities. There is, without doubt, a growing disposition to lay upon our colleges and universities more and more the duty of preparing men for what is called "practical life," and this demand is being responded to by the exaltation of narrow specialization and skill to an equality with broad learning and cultivation. Although the fact is not generally appreciated, this is really a sort of atavism, for the university had its origin in the mediæval idea that a knowledge of languages, of philosophy, of mathematics, of science, of theology, of law, and of medicine was not essentially different from proficiency in stone-cutting, in weaving, in iron-working, or in any other industrial pursuit.

Edgecombe Staley tells us that "the initiation of the University of Florence was accomplished in the same manner as that which called the Guilds into existence. It was a consequence of the great movement towards association which began to sweep over Europe early in the eleventh century." In the

words of Rev. H. H. Henson, "one of the most distinctive features of the middle age was the tendency to association which operated in every sphere of life; the existence of this tendency can be traced in the rise of religious orders, of orders of chivalry, of municipal corporations, of trade guilds, and craft-guilds, and also of universities; a university in fact was precisely a scholastic guild, whether of masters or students." And Paulsen goes so far as to assert that "the gradation into scholaris, baccalarius, and magister is apparently identical with that of apprentice, journeyman, and master which we find among the mediæval artisans."

The fact is that the useful trades were accorded equal dignity with the learned professions,—all were "arts," and any one trained to teach one of them was a "master." Practically all the titles and terms we use in our institutions of higher learning are borrowed from the vocabulary of the guilds. It is said that as far back as the time of Numa Pompilius a corporation of merchants and artisans existed in Rome and was called Collegium, and from this early type was evolved the guild system, which attained its greatest development in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries of our era. At that time every vocation was elaborately organized, and even the shoemakers had their university, that being the name for a federation of guilds, or of minor trades, which was ruled by a board of officers among whom was a chancellor. Rector was also an official title in the Italian guilds, and their universities sometimes employed professional instructors, corresponding to the faculties of modern institutions of learning. Most of the universities of Florence provided places of residence for their officers, and of assembly and conference for their members, which appear to have been called colleges, and this arrangement was undoubtedly the pattern of the English

university organization, in which the separate colleges are to this day living and meeting places like the ancient guild-halls.

As I have already intimated, during the period in which the guild system predominated, the priesthood and the legal and medical professions were not treated very differently from the various kinds of handicraft, but were considered as practically divisions of the all-inclusive proletariat. Accordingly, like the tanners, the silversmiths, the masons, and other craftsmen, the members of the learned professions gathered in their universities and organized on the general plan and with the usual titles and classifications. As they began, so have their successors usually continued, with four schools or faculties; viz. philosophy (or the arts), theology, law, and medicine. Students in the department of philosophy were generally those preparing for the teaching profession; for, as Paulsen remarks, "it was not until recent times that an academic education so rose in value that the old nobility could no longer do without it, and that its possession admitted one among the 'gentlemen.'"

After the middle of the sixteenth century the enlargement of the known world and changing trade conditions gradually put an end to the guild system, but the increasing appreciation of knowledge, due to the Renaissance, revivified the institutions of learning and caused their rapid development. The Protestant Reformation, the discovery of America, the invention of the telescope and of the microscope, and, above all, the introduction of type-printing, necessitated an entire rearrangement of the scale of human activity, and, at last, the things of the mind and the spirit were placed at the top of the list, and intellectual power became the criterion of social and political supremacy.

In Germany, according to Paulsen, the men who have gone through a university still constitute "a homogeneous social stratum," "a kind of official nobility," and Schmoller (as quoted by Paulsen) informs us that the German educational system "has created a distinct professional honor, fixed customs and practices with regard to professional duties, and has set definite limitations to money-making. . . . The families that turn their sons into the liberal callings have become a more or less distinct social class, a class characterized by personal qualities rather than by wealth," and "the liberal professions have inculcated into the entire middle class, otherwise largely devoted to business and financial gain, nobler habits of thought and loftier intellectual aims, thus supplying an ideal counterpoise to the bald egoistic class-interests of other circles."

Not only in Germany, but throughout nearly the whole educational world, the instruction afforded in the schools of arts and "letters" has lost most of its original utilitarian character. This change is particularly marked in the English universities. But France has deviated less radically from the mediæval model; and, although the cultured class is still, in that country, an honored and privileged class, Professor Barrett Wendell has very recently called our attention to the fact that "a faculty of letters," in a French university, "is looked upon not as a guardian of general culture, but as a body in all respects as professional as a faculty of law," so that "only students who contemplate literary careers—such as the writing or the teaching of literature, history, or philosophy—are apt to register themselves in the department of letters." In England, more than anywhere else, education has come to be the fundamental requisite and mark of good breeding, and Oxford and Cam-

bridge life have hitherto been almost wholly divorced from every form of commercialism. It is for this reason that one has been able to say that "to reside in Oxford was itself a liberal education." It shows how differently we view the matter in this country that almost any American will be shocked at reading, as he may read in a recent work on "Oxford and Oxford Life," that "as a rule the wealthly manufacturer does not send his son to Oxford unless he intends to 'make a gentleman of him.'"

But before allowing our democratic sensibilities to carry us on to indignation at this statement, we need to reflect that the word "gentleman" has a different connotation in Great Britain from what it has in the United States. Nevertheless I cannot refrain from expressing my individual opinion that it would be just as well if our "captains of industry" would send their sons to college with no other purpose than to make gentlemen of them; for, now that we have a large and increasing class of multi-millionaires, and shall by and by have, doubtless, even many billionaires, we shall, before long, need men of broad culture and refined manners more than anything else. The gentleman has not hitherto been particularly popular in our country. During our youthful and formative period as a nation there has been so much hard work to do that men of vigorous action have been more in demand than men of intellectual poise and dignified reserve. Even yet it is the "rough-rider" type that excites popular admiration and enthusiasm. But we shall not have attained to national maturity until the gentleman is the most valued and the most respected member of society.

If this end is to be reached, educational methods must aim primarily at the development of the individual, regardless of his possible employment in a commercial or a professional

calling. In other words, general culture must be recognized as holding a higher position than mere technical specialization. I have no fault to find with professional and technical schools in their proper sphere, but they must not be allowed to elbow aside the schools of arts, letters, and pure science, in which youths are to be trained solely to be the highest type of men. Speaking of this subject, President Nicholas Murray Butler deplores "the development and rapid growth of technical schools with low standards of entrance, in connection with universities," and calls attention to the danger in "allowing the claim that closely specialized work in a purely technical and professional branch, entered upon without any broad preparatory training whatever, is to be regarded as legitimate university work and entitled to the time-honored university recognition and rewards," and he intimates that such work is often fostered because of its mere popularity and because of its importance as a source of revenue.

Now, here we touch upon the weakest points in our educational system, which are naturally outgrowths of prominent national faults; namely, the adoption of anything that is popular, admiration for whatever has money in it, and approval of that crude form of liberty which allows every one to do what he likes. Out of these same defects of judgment has arisen the present abuse of the elective system, under which (as has been pointed out many times) a boy of seventeen or eighteen is expected, largely or wholly, to map out his own future intellectual development. It seems strange that, having placed physical training on a rational basis, by carefully prescribing gymnasium exercise according to individual needs, we have so readily fallen into the "go-as-you-please" method of mental training, or, as President Eliot has called it, the à-la-carte" plan. Obviously the value of any elective system depends

upon who does the electing. A raw youth has at his command, in this matter, at the very best, only that kind of experience which I believe Carlyle described as "a lamp placed in the stern of the boat, which illumines the path we have been over, but casts no light on the future." Very few parents, even, are qualified to lay out educational courses for their children.

If a college curriculum were anything like what it is generally supposed to be, it would be a matter of pure scientific pedagogy rigidly worked out and strictly applied to accomplish a definite purpose in each particular case, instead of being either a narrowing and dispiriting system inherited from the middle ages, or a lack of system under which the one who needs to be directed takes the business into his own hands. As it is now, educators are by no means agreed as to the ends they have in view, and are consequently always falling between the two stools of applying discipline and furnishing knowledge. The truth is, they do very little of either. What information a man picks up in college is of small intrinsic value, and nearly all real discipline he gets, after graduation, by contact with the world. What the colleges actually do is to point out the various roads which lead to genuine intellectual satisfaction and happiness, and encourage their students to enter upon them and to pursue them seriously and steadfastly.

It is well to remember, however, that no system of education can produce talent; it can only recognize and strengthen it. No college ever created a genius, and, unfortunately, few have greatly helped geniuses. In the last analysis, I suppose it may be said that no college ever really educates a man, for we are all, in the end, "self-made." Boys do not go to college to "get an education," but to get the seclusion, the atmosphere, and the help necessary for a start at one. The

best part of the college atmosphere is association with men of serious purpose, and the example and advice of those who have by experience learned the value of abstract truth. But in college, as out of it, a man develops from within. His force of character is inherent and centrifugal, and is brought out, not put into him by any process of cramming. As I have just said, no man at graduation is actually educated, although we speak of the process he has gone through as education. We therefore need to remember that in discussing educational methods we are dealing with the science of planning the intellectual life. All that is done for a youth in college is mapping out and making clear and interesting to him a procedure which he is to continue for himself as long as he lives. What we call a college education is therefore a purely preparatory process, and its worth depends upon the amount and kind of impetus it gives to the lives submitted to its influence.

But, on the assumption that the colleges supply their students not only with the beginnings of an intellectual life but also with a certain amount of equipment for worldly or business success, we have had endless discussion of the question "What knowledge is of most worth?" and, strange to say, Herbert Spencer has been the leader on that side of the debate which looks at the matter almost wholly from the utilitarian point of view. This seems all the more strange because he was particularly advocating scientific training, and men of science are generally believed to adhere to the doctrine of knowledge for the sake of knowledge. Spencer, however, seems to have entertained the idea that to prove the value of any form of education it was only necessary to show that it could be carried into the world's markets and would there command a fair price.

Now, it is undoubtedly true that intellectual acquisitions are not fully enjoyable unless they are in the form of something that passes current with our fellow-men. Knowledge, like other things, to become of the highest interest, should be accumulated with a purpose; but I cannot see that that purpose must necessarily be consciously and expressly objective. Self-development alone is a worthy aim, though I admit that an education is an investment and that, like other investments, it may be appraised, quite properly, according to the return it makes. But there are many kinds of investments which do not, and are not expected to, return a pecuniary or even a measurable income. A man's library, for example, need not be useful in his daily business in order to be profitable; neither does he look for dividends from his pictures and other art treasures, nor, in fact, from any of the things he has accumulated at cost of time, thought, and labor to minister to his æsthetic and intellectual enjoyment. Yet they are prominent among the possessions which really make life worth living; and if, by conducing to an ideal mode of existence, they also contribute to the general welfare, this contribution is, strictly speaking, incidental and secondary, since character is not producible in lump, but is essentially an individual matter; and the real objective point of any educational method is, not the turning out of good classes, but of excellent persons. Every one's intellectual, æsthetic, and moral acquisitions, however, are additions to the wealth of the community in which he lives or of the circle he reaches by his influence. Just as it is impossible for one to build a beautiful and artistic house without contributing to social improvement, so it is out of the question to be a person of refinement and mental culture without adding to the general store of happiness. Many men of quiet, even secluded, lives—men who have failed to "do

things," but who have cherished knowledge and practised "high thinking"—have exerted as strong an influence upon their fellow-men, and have done as much for human uplift as have most of the devotees of the strenuous life, just now so popular.

It is a very interesting thought that all human progress is in the direction of the divine attributes,—omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence, and all-embracing benevolence. The intellect of man covets all knowledge; the acquisition of wisdom leads to ever-increasing power; the understanding and control of natural forces results in a mental grasp of universal and even cosmic problems; and, finally, growth in knowledge and power is crowned by the quality of graciousness or condescension, which is the cardinal principle of the Christian religion. As to this quality, Dante speaks of God as "the Lord of Courtesy," thereby implying that to be a perfect gentleman is one of the elements in the imitation of the supreme pattern. A symmetrically developed man ought to combine in his personality knowledge, power, breadth of view, and kindliness or grace; and any system of education that aims at the formation of character should have all four of these in view. A curriculum which provides knowledge only—particularly if it is highly specialized, technical knowledge—is entitled to the name education, if at all, only in a restricted sense. Likewise, a course of study intended to develop merely brain power, or mental acuteness, has little relation to the production of a well-rounded individuality. The highest type of educational institution is that which aims to lay the foundations of broad, subjective culture and intellectual and moral rectitude, irrespective of the requirements of special vocations, or the demands of business life. It is certainly no part of the duty of a college or a university to equip men for mere money-

getting, and if it were attempted it could not be accomplished. But it is because we generally attribute purely utilitarian purposes to college or university education that we so commonly fail to satisfy the expectations of students.

It is a curious fact that a large majority of all so-called college-bred men have difficulty, within a few years after graduation, in determining exactly what benefit they derived from their four years of college or university life. They quickly forget the smattering of Latin and Greek and mathematics and other things they thought they had learned, and, measuring results by the lack of definite facts remembered, and by the want of any apparent connection between what they studied and their present daily occupations, they commonly vote their college course a failure as concerns its educational efficiency. Even those most eminent in literature, science, philosophy, and theology are found disparaging their collegiate experiences, or doubtfully admitting that their chief value was in the contact they afforded with stimulating men of learning or with encouraging companions and classmates. A long catalogue of such cases is given in President Thwing's book on "The American College in American Life," and the thing that strikes one most forcibly in his citations and quotations is the small number of men who can testify that they got at college what they expected to get or what they now wish they had got. I think, however, that the trouble in such cases is that the wrong criterion is applied, or that the truth of the matter is obscured by the antiquated fallacy that the necessary object of an education is to fit a person for a profession, or for some other definite occupation.

Charles Darwin is a good example of a man misled and misdirected by this erroneous opinion. He declared, in his autobiography, that the years he had spent in the universities

of Edinburgh and Cambridge were actually wasted; and yet, strange to say, he pronounced them the happiest of his life. What he meant, I suppose, was that the routine of formal study to which he was compelled to conform was not in the line of his natural tastes and endowments, and that therefore those studies were not, in his case, developmental; but that, on the other hand, his voluntary, and as it were surreptitious, pursuit of science at that time gave him lasting satisfaction and enjoyment, and could be looked back to as formative upon his life. His is a particularly flagrant case of misguidance, for at Edinburgh they were trying to make a doctor of him, and at Cambridge they were attempting to turn him into a clergyman. No wonder he thought time and effort thrown away at both institutions. And yet at Cambridge he came under the personal influence of two wise men,—Henslow and Sedgwick,—who approved and confirmed his native bent and helped him to escape the irksome curriculum, and one of whom finally procured his appointment to the Beagle expedition, which settled his career and insured his extraordinary success as a naturalist. In spite of the faults of the system under which he was intended to be educated, and under which we are still disadvantageously laboring, I have no doubt that Mr. Darwin really did derive benefit from his unwilling sojourns at Edinburgh and Cambridge, and we must remember that his adverse judgment on the question was pronounced long after his memory of details must have become indistinct. At any rate, it is clear, from the comparative mildness of his animadversions, that his undergraduate life was not as distressing as was that of Thomas Carlyle, who has declared, in his autobiographical "Sartor Resartus," that he spent that period of his existence in "a desert, waste and howling with savage monsters,"—a not very flattering tribute to his in-

structors!

The existence of such sentiments as these among the alumni of institutions of what we call "higher learning" seems to me to indicate plainly that students are invited to our colleges and universities with wrong expectations of the benefits they are to obtain. The inevitable result is that, in their subsequent disappointment, they underestimate or forget the good they really did receive in the years of their quiet residence in an intellectual atmosphere and in the company of men who, at least, valued culture above everything else. In part, this failure to have tangible results answer anticipations is due to an erroneous or inconsistent classification of educational institutions; and I think confusion of thought, as well as depression of spirits, would be avoided if we should keep distinctly in mind the idea that in the primary and grammar schools we dispense *knowledge*, that in the secondary school we seek to add to knowledge perception and *judgment*, that in the technical and professional schools we develop specialized *skill*, and that in the college we promote *culture*. The information obtained in the elementary school is sufficient for simple human existence. The discipline of the secondary school is adequate to the demands of ordinary life and good citizenship, and is hence the limit of what the state is bound to supply. The training of the technical and professional schools is distinctly utilitarian and practical. But the cultivation aimed at in college is essentially personal and subjective, and conduces to happiness as distinguished from mere usefulness. To my mind, the professional schools are higher institutions of learning, but the colleges (by which I mean the institutions or departments whose nucleus is the faculty of philosophy or the arts) are highest.

Here I must pause to express my profound belief in the disciplining and elevating power of the study of pure science, and my gratification at the fact that it is now generally recognized as entitled to a prominent place in the non-utilitarian curriculum. I rejoice that the name of the historic faculty of philosophy or the arts has been enlarged to the faculty of arts and sciences. Of this faculty, President Butler of Columbia says, it "must not only be preserved in its integrity, but its spirit must dominate the whole university," for "this faculty is at once the essence of a university and its true glory." If this is a correct statement of the case, and I think it is, I cannot see why we are not entitled to consider a college like Oberlin, which makes no claim to the university name, as occupying as dignified a position as it would occupy if it had numerous technical schools attached to it; for it already possesses all that President Butler declares to be the essence and glory of an educational institution. This is an encouraging and stimulating view of the subject for the sometimes despised "small colleges," which, if they are thoroughly equipped as colleges, need not aspire to university form in order to justify their title to the highest rank.

We have the word of Professor Von Holst for it, that "there is in the United States as yet not a single university in the sense attached to the word by Europeans." All the American institutions bearing this name, he tells us, "are either compounds of college and university,—the university, as an aftergrowth, figuring still to some extent as a kind of annex or excrescence of the college,—or hybrids of college and university, or, finally, a torso of a university." Now I have already called your attention to the fact that the university system of education originated in the Guild idea of the middle ages, and was, at first, simply a coöperative movement among

the professional classes. My understanding is, as I have before stated, that German and French universities have departed less from the original type than have the similar institutions of Great Britain. The German universities are still essentially federations of professional schools, but the English are primarily groups of brotherhoods or households. The American institution which we rather loosely call a university, —although we evolved it from the English type,—is, as Professor Von Holst says, a hybrid or intermediate form, since it is usually a college having technical and professional schools associated with it; consequently, as the German institutions turn out mainly carefully educated scholars, and the English exist primarily for the purpose of polishing off born gentlemen, we have a right to expect our college graduates to be both gentlemen *and* scholars. Perhaps not gentlemen in the English sense, nor quite scholars in the German sense, but good, all-round, men of culture, fitted for life under American conditions.

In what I have thus far said I have largely repeated in substance what was said, in much more finished sentences, by President King in his admirable inaugural address on "The Primacy of the Person in College Education." He has set forth, in language upon which it is impossible to improve, the fact that "the utilities have been over-insistent," and that "specialism has claimed too much"; that "the college does not look beyond to the technical or professional school, or to the university proper, for its justification, but rather is itself the culmination of the work begun in the elementary and secondary schools"; that education "has no primary reference to the earning of a living," but that the function of the college is "to bring a man steadily to the test of the work of his naked personality," supplying, as far as possible, "the

greatest needs of the individual man," namely, "character, happiness, and social service"; in short, by liberal training, producing "the man of culture."

President King has done us all a service by so clearly expounding the doctrine that the highest form of education is devoid of any utilitarian purpose, but has for its immediate aim the development of the individual and the promotion of happiness. There can be no greater fallacy than the belief that a college education fits a man for the making of money. Culture is not a marketable commodity, and statistics furnish no support to the notion that great fortunes have generally been made by college alumni, or even by men of less formal cultivation and mental training. Some college alumni and many graduates of technical schools have applied their specialized knowledge to inventions which have proved to be very profitable, but I have yet to hear of the man who has managed to capitalize a broad understanding and appreciation of different departments of knowledge, a keen sympathy with, and love of, the beautiful in all its forms, an unselfish deference to the feelings and rights of others, and a tender regard for moral rectitude and religious sentiment,—all of which are qualities involved in culture. The very fact that the cultivated gentleman is preëminently a person of delicate sensibilities usually precludes his success as a money-getter. It is not true that all great accumulations of wealth have been secured at the cost of a direct sacrifice of rectitude; but my experience in the business world leads me to think that it is an exceptional case in which a very large fortune is made by a person thoroughly possessed of the qualities which President King advocates as the essentials of a liberally educated man. This experience confirms me in the idea that the highest form of education has little or no commercial value. Its worth is of

an entirely different kind. Looking upon education merely as a preparation for business success is practically the same thing as regarding the possession of money as an end in itself. In fact, this low view of the matter seems to prevail in some technical schools, where the criterion of efficiency in training is the amount of salary a student can command at graduation. No one has more vehemently protested against this trailing of the educational standard than has Charles Francis Adams. He has said: "I am no believer in that narrow scientific and technological training which now and again we hear extolled. A practical, and too often a mere vulgar, money-making utility seems to be its natural outcome. On the contrary, the whole experience and observation of my life lead me to look with greater admiration, and an envy ever increasing, on the broadened culture which is the true end and aim of the university."

Considering the subject from this point of view, and appreciating, as I trust I do, those attainments which have nothing to do with business and affairs, I find myself regarding (as I am sure many others do) with less and less respect everything that is purely useful. The endless complications of life growing out of the practical applications of scientific knowledge, and the terrible turmoil occasioned by the ever-increasing competition for the means of subsistence, make me doubt whether much that we call material progress is, after all, desirable or admirable; and I am disposed to place a higher and higher estimate upon everything connected with the maintenance, growth, and happiness of what President King calls "the naked personality." At the same time I am not oblivious to the fact that we are not disembodied spirits, and cannot escape the necessity of wearing clothes, living in houses, and consuming food. I feel strongly, however, that

the most pressing and perplexing question before any conscientious man is how to maintain such a proportion between the labor devoted to the necessities of the body and the attention bestowed upon the needs of the mind as will permit of both comfortable existence and healthful mental and moral development.

I see no satisfactory solution to this problem, except in the suppression of all pride of position, the reduction of our material requirements to a modest level, and the absolute abandonment of the race with our neighbors for the extrinsic signs of prosperity. The general scale of living, however, has a constantly rising tendency in this country, and the securing of a mere livelihood is becoming a heavier and heavier burden upon every individual. The great mass of people are laboring under the delusion that this is a desirable condition of things, and even applaud as they see the index of their social subjugation marking higher and higher figures. "The simple life" is preached by a few; but by the many it is seldom referred to, except in derision. Business slavery having left us no leisure, we are deprived of all incentive to the attainment of things which go with leisure, among which cultivation and scholarship stand highest. The average man has no time to be even moderately refined; and, as to the getting of knowledge, he has all he can do to keep up with the record of calamities and crimes that comes to him in his daily newspaper. He rushes down the current of conventionality and mediocrity, out into the ocean of eternity, and is gone, leaving hardly a trace behind. I do not pretend that the colleges can turn back the torrent, and compel men to lead less hurried and more rational lives; but what I wish to insist upon is that they need not contribute to the popular demoralization by surrendering to what are spoken of as "the demands of modern life."

I understand perfectly well that we must have mechanics and engineers and lawyers and the like, and that their efficiency depends upon training; but I am contending that, while it is entirely proper that they should have schools of instruction, the most important schools of all are those which do not turn out artisans and professional men, but which are devoted simply and solely to the strengthening of personal character, the rounding out of men of intrinsic worth and the development of a capacity for the real enjoyment of life. The nation needs to have the colleges maintain themselves on this basis, and if, by so doing, they have less patronage and stand forth a little less prominently before the people, so be it; it would be better to have fewer students than a lower standard. The colleges may not be able to stem the tide of commercialism and venality, but they can at least stand as lighthouses pointing, through the gloom, to the solid rock of learning and the quiet haven of culture. It is their duty to keep steadily before the people the fact that the kinds of education which are designed to be turned into money are not the kinds that leave the greatest impression upon the world.

The preaching of this doctrine is particularly needed in the United States, and never as much as at the present time; for we are, in the mass, a nation of materialists. We bend the knee to wealth, but to nothing else. We have national pride and patriotism, but it is too apt to take the form of a glorification of bigness and strength. We do not habitually remember that the imperishable and only really precious part of any nation's civilization is its immaterial resources,—in short, the sum of the mental, æsthetic, and moral character of its individuals; and so we are prone to measure all success according to the goods and chattels or the landed estates accumulated by the citizens or controlled by the republic. As

a people, we are disposed to look upon business activity and success as the most desirable manifestations of human energy and ability, and to consider the money-getting life as the most important life that young men can be prepared for. If it were commonly agreed that the education obtained at college or university was a detriment to a man intending subsequently to engage in mercantile pursuits, still more than at present fathers would begrudge the time devoted by their sons to such an education. As it is, the question is frequently debated whether a youth destined to a business career might not best enter upon that career as early as possible, ignoring wholly the consideration whether, if practicable, a man might not well acquire some cultivation even if he is to be a merchant.

If it were not for the bias given to every subject by the prevalent spirit of utilitarianism, the first question a parent would ask concerning a son would be how much mental equipment he could manage to bestow upon him as a personal heritage before the son should be compelled to go down into the treadmill of commercial life. But in the present attitude of society such matters as this are looked at from exactly the wrong direction and, as a rule, the worldly-wise father asks himself how much time he can afford to suffer his son to steal from his income-making period to devote to the pursuit of a little pseudo-intellectual polish. In some other cases, however, the considerations are balanced between an education that has direct relation to a subsequent professional calling and an education that cannot be seen to have any distinct connection with anything unless it is a few years of freedom, sociability, and athletics. The idea that any really valuable form of education makes for the establishment of character and conduces to life-long satisfaction and pleasure, does not generally enter into the calculations of those who have chil-

dren to direct and provide for. They oftenest ask merely, Will it pay? and the college authorities too often encourage, explicitly or tacitly, the belief that the kind of education they are prepared to supply will produce the much-desired pecuniary return. It is against this mercenary spirit that I am protesting to-day. The idea I have had in mind in what I have said is, that the education of most worth both to the man and to his fellow-men is that which is adapted to a broad cultivation and development of the individual, and the promotion of personal happiness, without reference to its application to any gainful purpose; but the moral of my discourse is: Take care lest even our institutions of learning become compromised with the present-day apotheosis of greed.