THE RELATIONS OF CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONS TO COLLEGES

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH, AT ATLANTA, GA., MAY 20 1908, BY *HENRY S. PRITCHETT*

PRINTED AT NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

The Relations of Christian Denominations to Colleges

By Henry S. Pritchett
President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

An Address before the Conference on Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Atlanta, Ga, May 20, 1908

The Relations of Christian Denominations to Colleges

In beginning a paper which concerns the relations of religious organizations to institutions of higher learning, I may perhaps be allowed a word in regard to the work and scope of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This new institution, but recently endowed by Mr. Andrew Carnegie with fifteen millions of dollars, is not a charitable institution, but an educational agency. It deals with colleges, universities, and technical schools in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland, and is the only institution at the present moment which is directly concerned with the educational interests of the whole of English-speaking North America.

The purpose of the Foundation is the service of higher education by strengthening and dignifying the calling of the teacher. It does this, directly, by the establishment of a retiring allowance system in such colleges and universities as may become eligible to its benefits. The professor in such an institution receives his retired pay through his college just as he receives his salary, in accordance with definite rules, as a right, not as a favor. In case of his death, his widow receives as a pension the half of the retiring salary to which her husband was entitled.

Indirectly, the Foundation seeks to serve higher education and the cause of the teacher by insisting on the maintenance of reasonable and honest college standards in the institutions with which it deals, by publishing specific information concerning colleges and universities, by the discussion of educational questions, and in general by serving the part of a central agency in relation to educational interests in the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland.

In making this gift, Mr. Carnegie imposed upon his trustees the condition that the retiring allowance system should not be extended to teachers in institutions which are under the control of a sect, or which require their trustees, officers, or teachers to belong to a specified denomination.

In making this condition, Mr. Carnegie has, however, sought to make clear both to his trustees and to the public that he has no hostility to denominations. Least of all does he desire to hamper in any way the cause of religion. His purpose was to serve primarily the cause of education, and as a matter of educational administration it has seemed to him unwise to place a college under the control of another organization of whatever character; nor has he been able to convince himself that the imposition upon a college of a condition which limited the choice of trustees, officers, or teachers to a stated denomination was calculated to advance the larger interests of education.

The trustees of the Foundation have endeavored to administer their trust in a liberal spirit, but without losing sight of the conditions which the charter imposed. Colleges having friendly and intimate relations with various denominations have been welcomed to the benefits of the retiring allowance system, so long as these relations did not involve control of the college by a denominational body or the limitation of the choice of trustees, officers, or teachers.

The obligation of the trustees to administer the Foundation in accordance with the terms of its charter has, however, necessarily involved a careful examination of the relation of colleges to religious bodies, the nature of the organization which this relation brings about, and its effect upon the standards and educational efficiency of such institutions.

The inquiries started by the gift of Mr. Carnegie have raised certain fundamental questions in education which have for some years been pressing for consideration in all three of the countries interested in this gift. A fair consideration of them at this time will go far to clarify the educational conceptions of those in and out of the denominations, to fix the responsibility for the support of higher education, and in the end to advance the causes for which religious organizations and colleges exist.

The fundamental questions which present themselves are these: What is meant by Christian education as applied to a college? What are the motives of the various Christian denominations (and in this administrative sense all Churches are denominations) in undertaking the support and control of colleges and universi-

ties? Is it a part of the legitimate work of every religious body to control a certain number of institutions of learning? Can a denomination exert a religious influence upon colleges without exercising legal control or without imposing restrictions in the choice of officers and teachers? These questions are of primary importance alike to the Churches and the colleges.

Much confusion has heretofore existed as to just what is meant by Christian education—a confusion which arises partly out of the almost universal failure to discriminate between religion and Church membership, and partly out of a lack of appreciation of the intellectual strivings of the college and university student.

The essentials of religion are the same whether men belong to one religious organization or another. Religion is a life springing up in the human soul which blossoms into forgetfulness of self and in service of God and of men. This life exists without any reference to the denominational or ecclesiastical definition of it. It has, in fact, to this formal expression much the same relation that the stars have to the science of astronomy, or that the flowers have to botany, or that the chemical reactions have to the text-books in chemistry. Now shall Christian education mean the effort to bring into the minds and into the lives of students the conception of religion as a life, or shall it mean the presentation of the forms of worship of a particular denomination and the claims of a particular view of truth? And shall the methods by which these elemental relations are to be brought to the attention of college boys be those of the congregation, of the Sunday school, of the revival, or shall they take account of the intellectual processes through which the student is developing? Shall they be planned to appeal more directly to the emotions or to the reason?

For the teaching of religion in a college cannot be divorced from educational consistency. Methods which contravene the intellectual ideals of trained students, or which fail to meet their honest inquiries, have a doubtful effect in the development of their characters. No member of society sets a higher value on intellectual sincerity than the youth who is beginning to enjoy the processes of thinking. For this reason the religious ideals which will permanently affect his life are not likely to be created

by any other methods than those which take hold of the fundamental truths of religion, and which at the same time respect the student's intellectual aspirations. It may be entirely right to desire that a youth be converted to a certain experience of religious life, but to turn the college into an agency for such conversion is a very different matter. In a word, there is a clear distinction between education which is religious and that which is denominational. The one can be developed by personal religious leadership; the other can be promoted by an organization.

The motives which influence Christian organizations in undertaking the support and control of colleges in the New World have been varied. In the early days of the American Union and of Canada the representatives of Churches were the pioneers for education as well as for religion. As the country developed and communities became larger, the influences making toward denominational control of colleges have become more complex, and have not always been recognized by the general membership of these bodies. In fact, nothing is more striking than the confusion of mind which exists in the Protestant denominations as to the relations of their respective organizations to their colleges. The denominational yearbooks make little or no distinction between institutions under legal control of the denomination and those remotely related to it by traditional ties.

The strongest motive which has operated in inducing denominations to undertake the support and control of colleges is unquestionably the desire to propagate the faith for which the denomination stands. This motive is one which is not put forward so directly nor so distinctly as it was in the earlier days of American education, when colleges were devoted more generally to the training of ministers. In American colleges to-day there are no denominational tests imposed upon students who seek an education. A student may enter a college, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, of any religious faith or of no faith. The attitude of the Church which controls the college varies, however, in different institutions and in different denominations. In many colleges the legal control which the denomination possesses is practically outgrown. In a very large number, however, there runs through the college teaching and the college life the effort to

present to the student as religious truth the doctrinal view for which the denomination itself stands; and although with many denominations this motive has become less prominent than it was a generation ago, I think it is still fair to say that, in a large proportion of colleges and universities which are under actual denominational control, the purpose of the denomination in maintaining its relation with the college is the advancement of the denomination, the increase of its influence, the spread of its belief. This motive is none the less powerful because in many cases it is not consciously expressed or admitted.

Another motive which has operated strongly with denominations in bringing under their control colleges and universities is the need which has been felt for trained denominational leaders. Our earliest American colleges were founded for the training of preachers. Education at that day meant generally a preparation for only a few learned professions, of which the ministry was the most influential. Denominations still feel the need to maintain institutions which shall bring up from generation to generation leaders trained in their own ideals.

Both of these motives are denominational, and both rest upon the desire of a denomination to maintain its own prestige, to increase its own power, and to extend in the world its particular view of religious truth. A college which is controlled under either of these conceptions is truly a denominational college, whether it is admittedly so or not, and must in the long run be supported by the religious organization which controls it. With neither of these motives is the average American citizen of religious life and religious aspirations wholly in sympathy.

The wish to bring religious influences into college life is also one which has played a part in inducing organized bodies of Christians to undertake the control and support of colleges. How far this motive has had influence, it is difficult to say.

There are various other influences which, while insignificant in themselves, have nevertheless operated to increase greatly the number of denominational institutions. Of these, the most evident is denominational rivalry. This weakness of the denominational relation to education has been taken advantage of by the children of the world to impose upon the children of light many

educational ventures which are sometimes little better than real estate schemes. It has not infrequently happened that an ambitious promoter has induced an unsuspecting denomination to assume the responsibility for a new college, which has proved in the end to be not only unnecessary but a weary load to carry. The offer of an attractive piece of real estate for educational purposes is one which few denominations have the strength to resist. The Presbyterians, for example, have very recently accepted the patronage of a newly fledged college in Denver (called a university!), in a region already well supplied with colleges and in a city where a representative of Christian education was already in existence and having difficulty in finding sustenance. A large proportion of Protestant colleges are children by adoption.

The reasons which have influenced the colleges to seek alliances with denominations are simpler. They are to be found in nearly all cases in the denominational ties of founders or in the desire of those who control colleges to secure a constituency whence students may be drawn. The second of these influences has been the more common, and in various instances colleges have been offered first to one and then to another denomination in the expectation that, once a denomination was committed to the college, the sons and daughters of those in the denomination could be counted upon as a source of supply for students. In no country outside of America does one see exactly the same aspect of college development which this custom has brought about. In the older countries a new institution of higher learning is founded only in response to the evident pressure for additional facilities as shown by the overcrowding of existing institutions. In the United States we found a college for all sorts of reasons, and then look about for a supply of students to fill its halls. Only too often the process follows the example of the rich man in the parable whose dinner invitations were not accepted, and who finally sent out into the highways and haled in the halt, the lame, and the blind—in other words, those who were not prepared to pass the entrance examinations.

No one who studies the history of American education will withhold from the Christian denominations a large measure of praise for the work in higher education which has been done in

the past, either through them or through men who represent them. In the pioneer days Christian ministers were in the main those who raised up such institutions. They were the men who interested the public in the cause of education; and as one traces this movement through the decades of our national history, he will give due credit to this spirit. It has served not only to build many institutions which otherwise would never have been begun, but also through it there have been interested in education a great number of men and women who otherwise would never have felt the educational stir. All these things one concedes gladly. It is necessary, however, to remember that the pioneer days are past; that to-day education is being supported with increasing generosity by most of the great States of the Union and of Canada;* that we need now not more colleges, but colleges that shall be sincere and honest and thorough. In a word, we have come to an older stage of our educational activity, and what might have been entirely justifiable fifty or even twenty-five years ago may require to-day serious revision.

When the religious organizations of America first undertook to found colleges and to control them, the support of such institutions involved no serious draft on the energy of a denomination. The subjects taught were of a character which required little expenditure for libraries, laboratories, or experiment stations; the number of teachers needed was comparatively small. These teachers were in many cases ministers who obtained at least a part of their support by preaching. To-day, if a college is to be supported as a genuine college, the expense is large; while the cost of maintaining a true university is out of all proportion to such obligations as were originally contemplated when the Churches undertook their support. In the last two decades Christian denominations have found increasing difficulty in meeting those obligations, and the colleges controlled by them have, with few

*The educational situation in Newfoundland is unique. Its educational policy has been to hand over education to the various denominations, the State appropriations for education being distributed among the Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, and the Church of England. There are in St. John's several colleges, all under denominational control; but these institutions are in effect high schools as compared with the colleges of Canada and the United States.

exceptions, received a meager and inadequate support. All these considerations—the widespread diffusion of general education, the increased support given higher education by States and individuals, the cost of modern methods of education—seem to mark the present time as one when Christian denominations may well consider afresh their obligations and relations to higher education; when they should gain clear conceptions of what the Churches are to do for education and what that service involves, and should have for the future a clearly thought out and consistent plan for educational work which will commend itself to thoughtful men and which shall lead somewhither.

Those who undertake such an inquiry meet at the threshold the fundamental question: Is the organization and support of colleges one of the agencies to which a Christian Church should direct part of its energy? This question is for those to answer who direct these organizations. Generally, the answer has been assumed without any very definite effort to examine it; but it is clear that the effect of denominational activity in colleges is one thing and the question whether this activity might more profitably be given in other directions is quite another.

In any case it is not likely, under the conditions which govern human society, that the discussion of this question at this moment will go beyond the academic stage. The Christian denominations are already involved with higher education. Their relations with colleges and universities vary, it is true, from a relation of complete ownership to a relation of sympathetic coöperation, from one of legal control to one of traditional friendship. The practical question, therefore, is: What relation may a Christian Church have with an institution of higher learning which shall serve most effectively the cause of religion and the cause of education? For whatever serves these two causes will serve the true interests of the two organizations, the Church and the college.

There seem to me but three positions which a denomination may take toward a college which are entirely honest and consistent, and no other solution of this relation than an entirely frank and consistent one will be accepted by the world or is likely to bear fruit.

A Church may frankly say that, in order to carry out its legiti-

mate work and advance its cause, it must control and direct a certain number of institutions of higher learning in which men may grow up trained in its ideals and devoted to its service.

Secondly, a Christian organization may claim that it has both a right and a duty to control and conduct colleges on the ground of its fitness and efficiency as an educational agency. This claim of the Church was based in the past on the assumption of superior scholarly fitness; in our day it is based on the ground of greater religious efficiency.

Finally, a Christian organization may take the position that all colleges and universities, being influential agents in the training of men, are also agencies for moral and religious influence, and therefore the Church will seek by friendly coöperation, by sympathetic fellowship, by all the means of Christian activity, to make itself a religious influence in all institutions of the higher learning without assuming their control or support.

Any denomination which takes a part in higher education will, either consciously or unconsciously, proceed in conformity to some one of these theories of action or a combination of them.

Universities arose originally in response to a deep need of the time when the awakened scientific spirit of Europe began to stir among the people. They consisted at first of free associations of learned men and aspiring youths, held together by their common interest in learning. They arose independently of both Church and State, but the organization which represented the Christian Church of that day was quick to appreciate the value of the university as a part of the Church machinery.

The conception of a college as an effective agency for continuing and extending the influence and power of a religious organization is at least clear-cut and consistent. It is frankly accepted by some Churches to-day, and the theory is practiced by many others.

It seems clear that any Church which, either under this theory or some other, assumes control of a college must expect to be responsible for its support. Authority to control will more and more in the future be held to carry with it the obligation to support.

That Christian denominations will find this burden a more and

more difficult one to carry seems also clear. For unless the denominational college can offer adequate educational facilities, it will lose in power and influence, and will inevitably drop behind in standards. The education offered by such a college will fall below the measure of other strong colleges.

There is another side to this responsibility which is seldom thought of, and that is the burden which college begging puts upon the shoulders of an already overworked pastor. One sees in America somewhat diverse efforts to support higher education, but nothing more sincerely rouses one's sympathies than the sight of a Methodist pastor, on meager salary, upon whose shoulders has been officially laid the obligation to beg money for the Church college. This is a very different effort from the struggle of the pioneer preacher to sow the seeds of educational interest. I question the wisdom or the justice of imposing this load. I should be far more pleased in this day to see an effort inaugurated to give to such a pastor the protection of a retiring salary, such as is now offered to college teachers, to the end that, by lifting from his shoulders the uncertainty of old age and want, there may be attracted into a noble calling in increasing numbers men of the highest ability and of the ripest religious and educational development.

Those who urge upon denominations the policy of founding and adopting colleges will need in the future to reckon more closely with the economic side of college support, and particularly with the relation of cost to good teaching. The calling of the college professor, like that of the preacher, has suffered in late years by the relatively large attractions of other professions. However true it may be that the altruistic motive must influence the man who chooses the life of the teacher, it is still true that one cannot consider the calling of the teacher apart from its economic function. The financial recompense of the best teachers cannot be made comparable to that of the best lawyers, but it can be raised to what might be called the line of comfort; and in addition, the teacher's position is greatly strengthened by the protection of a retiring allowance system which provides for his own old age and for his widow. This strengthening of the teacher's calling by better pay and a retiring allowance is absolutely

necessary, if the best men are to be drawn into that profession. Denominations which conduct and control colleges will find it quite as necessary to raise salaries and to provide retiring allowances as other colleges. The following table, made up from data furnished by American and Canadian colleges, shows that at the present time denominational colleges are far behind other institutions in these respects. The table presents comparative statistics for three groups of institutions. *Group A* includes institutions under control of a denomination, or which require denominational tests in the choice of trustees, officers, or teachers; *Group B* includes institutions which are tax-supported and controlled by State or provincial governments, such as State universities and land-grant colleges; *Group C* includes institutions having no legal connection with denominations or State governments. These three groups include nearly all of the institutions in the United States and Canada* whose work is strictly of college grade. The teachers for whom salary schedules are given are college teachers. Teachers in professional departments of universities are not included.

TABLE OF THE AVERAGE SALARIES OF FULL PROFESSORS IN THE COLLEGE DEPARTMENTS OF AMERICAN AND CANADIAN DEGREE-CONFERRING INSTITUTIONS OF COLLEGIATE GRADE.

Grouped According to Methods of Government.

	Number of Institutions.	Number of Full Professors.	Average Salary of Full Professor.
Group A.....	127	1,447	$1,534
Group B.....	73	1,403	2,167
Group C.....	95	1,609	2,441

This table gives a comparison far more favorable to denominational colleges than would be had by the inclusion of the great number of institutions with lower standards.

In more than one hundred of the denominational colleges which have furnished statistical information the average salary of a teacher is less than $1,000 a year, and in seventeen of these the

*Of the whole number, 286 are American and 9 are Canadian.

average salary is $500 or less. A large proportion of the weaker denominational colleges have failed to furnish the statistical information asked for by the Foundation.

The table is notably defective in one respect: it omits entirely the statistics for the Roman Catholic colleges and universities. This omission, however, is unavoidable, since it is impossible to compare the cost of teaching in institutions where teaching is an economic function with that in institutions where the teachers serve in the main without salary. But this fact itself is one of great significance in the discussion of this question. The Roman Catholic Church has in education, as in other fields, a well-thought-out policy. It has met the problem of educational administration with full appreciation of the fact that, if it meant to control colleges and to use them as agencies for propagation of the faith, it must secure teachers who were independent of the ordinary financial obligations. Its college professors are, therefore, recruited from priests or from members of celibate religious orders. These teachers could, however, not be drafted for this service if they were compelled to face the possibility of being turned out in old age upon the tender mercies of an indifferent world.

The experience of Protestant and Catholic colleges alike goes to show that when a denomination controls a college it must sooner or later assume responsibility for its support without any large amount of outside assistance. No denomination can in the future expect to control a college and at the same time call on the public to support it.

To one who seeks to study education from the standpoint of the educational problems and needs of a State, a province, or a continent, the theory which requires each Church to control its quota of colleges has serious educational faults unless denominations are willing to act in harmony in carrying out a common educational policy—a result apparently not to be anticipated in the near future. The primary objection lies in the multiplication of colleges and the consequent lowering of standards which such a policy must bring about. If every denomination must have its share of colleges in order to accomplish its own ends, denominational competition will inevitably produce the educational evils to

which I have just referred. In fact, this is exactly what has occurred in the United States, and to a less extent in Canada.

There are in the United States alone nearly one thousand institutions calling themselves colleges. Of these, over one-half are colleges in name only, and in many cases are doing the work of elementary or secondary schools under the name of college. In a similar way weak colleges assume the name university.

This has come about primarily from the local, State, and denominational rivalries in college-building and the lack of coöperation among them. It is due in the United States in part to the entire absence of educational supervision of higher education. In most States of the Union any association of men can incorporate under the general law and organize a "college" or a "university," maintaining such standards as their inclinations and interests may suggest. Such institutions have the legal power to confer all the degrees which the most honored and most scrupulous university can offer.

In Canada the degree-giving power is much more carefully guarded. In the new province of Manitoba, for example, colleges may be formed under the general law, but degrees can be conferred only through the Provincial University, which is an educational board somewhat similar to the University of the State of New York. The degrees for all colleges in the province, whether they be denominational or not, are conferred through this Board. Under the Board are organized at present a Roman Catholic college, a Presbyterian college, a Methodist college, and a college of the Church of England. Such a policy tends toward maintenance of the accepted standards by all colleges, and takes away any possibility to traffic in degrees. It also tends to adjust the number of colleges to the needs and resources of the State or province.

A general belief exists among the people of the United States that the founding of a new college is always a gain to education; that the more colleges, the more education. No other organized bodies have pushed this theory so far as the religious bodies. The denominations compete not only with other denominations in education, but in many cases a denomination in a given State competes with itself. Thus the State of Iowa contains six institutions

of higher education in organic connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church. The combined revenues of these six institutions equal approximately that of Vanderbilt University. It is apparent that here has been a great dissipation of educational energy. A strong denomination may, by a united effort, build up a great college in a given State or region, which, by the excellence of its teachers and the completeness of its facilities, may not only serve its students well, but may also, by its standing and prestige, touch the imagination of many youths who otherwise would not look toward the college life. When, however, the denomination allows local and personal rivalries to divide its effort among a number of enterprises, the opportunity for leadership vanishes and educational mediocrity is accepted.

Mr. Bryce, in "The American Commonwealth," has very justly paid a high tribute to the small American college. There can be no doubt that the small college, set down in many communities, has been a powerful factor in American progress. This does not, however, affect the truth of the statement that the multiplication of colleges without due regard to educational needs and support means dilution of education and superficiality of standards. There could be no greater mistake than to assume that the enormous growth in so-called colleges during the past three decades is an unmixed good. Educational sincerity has been hurt, not helped, in many localities when a good academy or high school is made impossible by the effort to conduct a sham college; or when a good college is sacrificed in the attempt to sustain an imitation university. While it is true that the college, under right conditions, is the most effective agency hitherto established for the moral and intellectual training of youth, it is also true that there is no other agency in which stones may be more successfully fed to human souls instead of bread. No publications, unless they be those of life insurance companies, have been more misleading than American college catalogues. If any man doubt this, let him visit a number of colleges and compare the claims of the catalogues with the realities.

No one who looks into the history of our own country and of other countries can doubt that, while it is desirable to bring to each individual in the body politic the appreciation of higher edu-

cation, and to instill in him a desire to obtain its advantages, that object is attained not by the indiscriminate multiplicaton of colleges, but by the development of a reasonable number of strong colleges, and perhaps more than all else in a great State by the development of an institution which by its dignity, its traditions, and its influence as a moral and educational center affects the imagination and invites the aspirations of youth. There is no part of our own country in which education has taken such a hold upon the ideals and the strivings of its citizens as in New England, and yet there are fewer colleges in New England than in any other part of the Union having an equal population. Many a Western or Southern State has more colleges than Massachusetts, and Ohio has more colleges than all the New England States combined.

For the future, therefore, it seems clear that any religious body which proceeds on the theory that the college is a necessary part of its own machinery must give study to the economic side of educational administration, must avoid dissipation of its resources, and above all must conduct an educational institution under its control with regard to the general system of education of the State and of the nation.

The second reason for control of colleges to which I have referred is the one generally given by Protestant denominations for entering the field of higher education, although usually somewhat differently worded. The duty to provide religious education, in whatever form that may be expressed, involves, however, the assumption that a denomination believes itself to have educational efficiency; otherwise there would be no duty to embark in educational work. In order that the world should accept this claim, it will be necessary to show that the real interest of religious organizations in college development is religious, not denominational, and that officers and teachers selected under denominational authority or sectarian choice are on the whole more efficient educational and religious leaders. I have no question that every Christian denomination is sincere in believing that it seeks to promote a religious, not a denominational, college. The actual administration of colleges has, however, been conducted in entire contravention of this theory. The Methodists of a given neighborhood do

not turn to and build up a Presbyterian college already established and which is ample for the educational needs of the region, notwithstanding the fact that it stands for Christian education. They go to work generally to secure a competing college of their own. One of the most common objections urged against the abandonment of legal denominational control of colleges is fear lest they fall into the hands of competing denominations.

One college president writes that his trustees would be glad to drop formal legal denominational relations, already practically obsolete, but fear another enterprising denomination may "steal" the college. Another brother, speaking in the breezy language of the Southwest, says: "When a college down here gets loose, some denomination ropes it and puts its brand on. We don't have any educational mavericks in this part of the world."

The truth is, the world is not ready to accept the theory that control of a college by a denomination means religious rather than denominational influence, until Christian denominations have themselves so far developed in religious spirit that they are willing to coöperate in founding and supporting colleges.

Can scholars who are at the same time religious leaders be secured more surely for college places by placing the college under the control of a denomination or by requiring officers and teachers to be members of a stated religious body?

This question goes back to the fundamental question as to the meaning of Christian education, and it reaches out to touch the further question whether it is wise administration for an organization like a college to be controlled by another organization. The world cannot forget one long and costly experiment, that of turning over to the Church civil power on the ground that this power ought to be in the hands of religious men. No one questions that this is true: the difficulty was in supplying men who would govern from the standpoint of religion, not from the standpoint of the organization which they represented. The outcome of this experiment was demoralization for both State and Church.

The fundamental objection to such a method of selecting men for college officers or teachers lies in the fact that the criterion is repugnant alike to the religious and to the educational standards of our age. Men who are religious in the best and deepest

sense—the sense which qualifies for educational leadership—are not segregated in conformity with denominational lines. They belong to the Church invisible and universal.

For similar reasons it goes against the very spirit of intellectual freedom for which a college or a university stands to put into its charter denominational tests in the choice of officers or teachers.

It would be difficult to show from the experience of the past that the factor of denominational selection has any relation to the religious and educational betterment of the colleges. To bring to the head of a college, or as a teacher in it, a man of high scholarship who is at the same time a truly religious man, is to bring into the college the best educational factor possible. No endowment, no laboratory, no building, however noble or useful, can equal the value of such a president or such a teacher. Unfortunately, we have no specifics by which such a man can be obtained. No organization among men is able to guarantee that its members shall be either religious men or scholars.

In one respect, at least, it is clear that denominational control has not justified itself in educational institutions. This is in the lack of any relation between denominational control and educational righteousness. Denominations have been slow to realize the effect upon the world of the realization of this fact.

A true college, whether it be administered by one set of men or another, must be first of all educationally sincere. It will not have one standard of admission in its catalogue and practice a lower one in admitting students to its classes; it will not announce high-sounding courses of study in order to attract students and put the conduct of such courses into the hands of incompetent boys; it will not preach honesty to the world and fail to pay its teachers the salaries it has agreed to pay. In a word, the world judges the quality of the religious influence of a denomination by the educational sincerity of the college which is put forward to represent it. And neither the sermons preached to students nor the quality of the official college piety will be accepted as an excuse for educational unrighteousness. And this is just.

It is one of the weaknesses of the denominational connection that the influence of the organization has rarely been thrown in the direction of increasing the sincerity of the college standards;

and where good standards have been set up in denominational colleges, they mark in nearly every case the work of an individual, not the influence of the organization. It is not too much to say that sectarianism in education has flourished generally where college standards were low, and as a college has raised its educational standards it has almost invariably dropped sectarian tests. This is true not only of colleges controlled by religious sects, but it is equally true of sectarian colleges controlled by organizations making no claim to religious purpose. Medical education in this country is in a low state, and this is due in large measure to the rivalries of the various medical sects, each clamoring for a separate medical school and for special privileges in each State. New York has solved this question by refusing to recognize any sect in medicine and requiring all medical schools to maintain the same standard. Just as soon as the same educational standard is required of all medical schools, it becomes a matter of small moment whether they call themselves allopaths, homeopaths, osteopaths, or adopt some other name from medical sectarianism. The Council of the American Medical Association has most wisely taken the position that so long as a medical college will hold high standards the Council will recognize it without regard to the particular name it chooses to take. It is an encouraging thing to see a conference like this, gathered by a great denomination, casting its influence for better college standards. And I venture to repeat the statement that true college standards do not mean necessarily the highest possible academic requirements as printed in the catalogue. They mean reasonable standards, honestly lived up to. If a Church connection does not help toward this end, the connection is not worth much to the college and does little honor to the Church.

The temptation to secure students at the sacrifice of educational virtue is common to all American colleges; but a denomination, when it goes into educational competition with a rival denomination or dissipates its energy among competing institutions, lays in the path of its colleges extraordinary temptations to educational unfaithfulness.

Most denominational colleges make discriminations in the payment of college fees in favor of certain classes of students—for

example, students who announce their intention to study for the ministry. Any man who has had to do with the distribution of trust funds to young men knows how quickly such discriminations affect the point of view of the student body and how difficult it is to favor certain students by financial assistance without doing more harm than good. If there is any one man who needs to learn to stand on his own feet throughout his whole life, it is he who aspires to the calling of the minister.

Throughout many colleges in the West and South—both denominational and State institutions—the rivalry for students has led to a most undignified system of student solicitation. Not only are students sought out and urged to go to this or that college, but tuition fees are shaded until a sharp parent can often secure a large reduction in the first year's tuition, if not its entire remission. This whole process is thoroughly demoralizing, and there is nothing in American education comparable to it, except that form of college graft which has prevailed in a number of institutions in all parts of the Union, under which successful athletes are safely steered into college and university athletic teams.

With the financial side of such transactions the ministers of a given denomination have little to do. They are expected, however, in many cases to solicit students—a situation which is not always the most helpful for a minister to occupy, and which limits in certain directions his influence.

It is a fine thing to find in any community a pastor so cultured that he becomes an influence for the higher education and is rightly consulted by parents as to the college which their sons and daughters ought to attend. Such a man will advise a boy to go whither he may find the most fruitful place for his own spiritual and intellectual development. In such a relation, as an impartial educational adviser, the minister stands on a plane consistent with his high calling. He comes before the people in a very different light when he becomes an agent for securing funds or for soliciting students for a particular college. The incongruity is all the greater if the minister is himself a man of limited education and lacking in scholarly qualities.

Speaking generally, therefore, it may be said that when the Church—as represented by any religious organization—under-

takes the work of education, it gives new hostages to public judgment. The world will judge the quality of the religion for which it stands by the educational efficiency of the colleges by which it is represented. It is not enough that the officers of a Church college should be good Church members, or even pious men in the ordinary meaning of the term. They must show in the conduct of their institutions that the religion which they represent is able not simply to give a religious flavor to ordinary college courses, but that it serves also the cause of educational righteousness and educational efficiency.

Can a Christian denomination exert an influence for true religion upon the higher institutions without legal control over them and without undertaking their support?

To my thinking, not only is this possible, but in a relation of coöperation, of friendliness, and of sympathy to all institutions of the higher learning, the Christian denominations will find a far wider field for the association of religion with education than can be found in the control of the limited number of institutions which they can efficiently support.

Christian denominations are organized bodies, in which the purpose of the organization contemplates the common good of its members and an organized effort for others. In carrying out this effort, the organization called a Church has to deal with many other organizations in the world—governments, parties, corporations, labor unions, colleges, schools, societies for benevolent purposes, and many others. It desires to exert upon the men embraced in all these organizations a religious influence, to bring home to them the obligations and the opportunities of the religious life. It is just as desirable for the members of a Christian Church to hold up Christian ideals to those who are in government relations, or who belong to great corporations or to labor unions, as it is to bring these ideals to college students. And yet the Churches will not consider it desirable, in order to accomplish this object, to control governments or corporations or labor unions. It will seek to accomplish its purpose by helpful coöperation, by Christian friendliness, by sympathetic fellowship. Is there any stronger reason why a Christian organization should control a college, if its purpose is religious, not denominational?

Under this conception the way is open to influence all colleges and all universities, not those alone which are labeled with the name of some denomination. Nothing could be more short-sighted than to assume that the Churches are to have relations only with those institutions which have denominational labels. The attitude of the denominations toward the State universities has been in the past oftentimes unfriendly, not to say unchristian; and yet in these great institutions are to be found to-day the largest groups of students from Christian homes. In my native State, Missouri, if one wished to meet the greatest number of students from Methodist or Presbyterian homes, he would not go to the Methodist college at Fayette or the Presbyterian college at Fulton, but to the State University at Columbia. Are the Christian Churches to sit down and assume that they have no relations with the great groups of students at the State universities because they cannot prescribe the forms of worship? There is no reason why Christian education should not be as characteristic of a State college as of any other, if by Christian education one means instruction in the underlying fundamental truths of religion. In truth, there are State institutions which maintain about them a religious atmosphere both sincere and inspiring. The State draws a line, and rightly, at religious instruction which means denominational instruction; and one reason for its precaution is the fact that institutions of learning have for so many centuries been used by Christian Churches for the purpose of their own organizations. To-day in America the question as to whether the Churches can reach students in the colleges hangs largely on the ability of these bodies to work along religious rather than denominational lines, to influence by moral power, not by legal control.

There are many who claim, and most sincerely, that this is impossible; that a certain amount of partisanship is necessary to the vitality of any organization, whether it be religious, political, or educational.

It is true that partisanship plays a part in leadership, but it plays a smaller and smaller part in proportion as he who seeks to lead and those whom he seeks to influence rise in the scale of intelligence and virtue. Partisanship will count less as religion and

right thinking are more widespread. But if we are still not sufficiently advanced to dispense with a large measure of partisanship in the effort to advance religion, this fact would form the best possible argument why the partisans of one organization should not control another.

The fundamental objections, therefore, to the control of a college by a denomination seem to me to lie in the very conditions of our human nature and in the facts of our human experience. Whatever one's faith may be as to the origin and nature of the Christian Church, he must recognize that both the denomination and the college are human organizations. Long experience has proved that it is rarely wise to give over the conduct of any institution to an organization whose purpose in conducting the institution is a secondary one, no matter how admirable the motives or purposes of the organization be.

The policies which are likely to be pursued in the future seem, therefore, to lie along two clearly marked paths.

A religious organization may say frankly that it finds the college a necessary part of its machinery. It, therefore, will assume both control and support of such colleges as it needs.

On the other hand, a religious organization may say: "Our purpose in dealing with a college arises out of an interest in religion, not out of our desire to advance our organization. We will, therefore, have fellowship with as many colleges as possible without seeking their control or undertaking the responsibility of their support."

Whatever else may be the Church's duty, whether it ought to give its energy to the support and control of colleges or not, this much seems clear: the Church needs to-day to appropriate to its own use, in the training of its own men, the facilities for general education provided in colleges. The world needs to-day efficient religious leadership. The man who aspires to such leadership—whether he deal with wage-earners or millionaires, with business men or college students—must be educated in the highest and largest sense. If any branch of the Christian Church is to grow in the efficiency of its religious leadership, it must draw into its service in increasing proportions men whose education is sincere, thorough, and broad. That end is the more likely to be gained,

to my thinking, in proportion as the bodies of organized Christianity succeed in relating themselves to all institutions of learning along the lines of religious rather than denominational sympathy.

The question as to the best form of relation between a college and a denomination has become, under the conditions which have recently arisen, a very practical one for the colleges as well as for the denominations. However the question may be settled in the case of any particular college, it is above all to be desired that it be settled in full consideration of all the obligations which have been assumed. No gain in college support can compensate for a loss in college integrity.

On the other hand, denominations owe it to their own work and to these colleges to face the situation squarely and in full view of what is involved. It is no part of Christian education to hold control of a college and leave it to starve.

Nor ought this question, in my judgment, whether settled in the one way or the other, to disturb the friendly relations between a denomination and a college which has grown up under its nurture and been inspired by its spirit. The situation is somewhat analogous to that of the youth who, in his minority, has been controlled and supported by his father, but who, when he comes to the years of maturity, assumes the obligations and responsibilities which go with citizenship. When that time comes, the father may well say to him: "Through all these years I have nourished and supported you and controlled you. The time has now come when you must control yourself, and with that control you will naturally assume your own support. The time can never come when you can go beyond my sympathy, my coöperation, and, so far as possible, my aid. The bonds between us shall be as sympathetic, as friendly, as full of affection as you will allow them to be; but you have now come into the freedom and into the responsibilities of a man. I can help you best by giving you frankly that freedom and asking of you only such allegiance as affection may suggest."

In some such way, as it seems to me, the denomination which desires that its college shall not be a field for propaganda, but rather an opportunity for a larger educational life, will give to it

the freedom of self-control and trust to the influences of its traditional friendship and affection for the ties which shall keep college and denomination in touch. Under such a relation, the denomination is likely to affect the college life in just such proportion as its spirit is religious rather than sectarian; and from this standpoint the interests of education and of religion lie along the same path.

I venture to express the hope that the discussion of this question may lead toward clearer conceptions of the true work of a denomination and of a college; that the outcome may tend to a wider appreciation of the fundamental truths of religion and to a greater educational efficiency. Toward these ends all earnest and right-thinking men are working in common, whether they deal with education from the one side or the other. And in such measure as they are sincere and are clear thinkers, they are likely to come to common ground, if not to a single view of truth.

In the fourteenth century was founded a brotherhood devoted to the work of education among the poor and known as the Brethren of the Common Life. Above all, the brotherhood devoted itself to religious education. By the fine and self-sacrificing life of its members it grew in favor and in influence. Gradually the order extended its work to higher education, and counted among its pupils Erasmus and Luther. Eventually, having served its purpose, it blended with the general educational movement which brought about the revival of learning and the rise of the universities.

Education on this new continent is a common work. Neither nations nor colleges nor men live to themselves. Every college, if it be a true college, must relate itself to the general problem of education of its State and of its nation. Every man who works sincerely in education must make the cause of education the primary one. So long as we work sincerely, heartily, intelligently in this spirit, we are all partakers in a common work, we are all Brethren of the Common Life, willing that our individual efforts shall fuse into the great current of educational power, so long as that power works to the upbuilding of men.