

**Not Less Education,  
But  
More of the Right Sort.**



**By W. A. Candier, D.D., LL.D.**

---

**Nashville, Tenn.:**  
**Printed by Barbee & Smith, Agents.**  
**1897.**



## Not Less Education, but More of the Right Sort.

---

Some years ago the Emperor William of Germany declared that there was too much education among the Germans.

Emperor William  
and Prof. Peck  
on Too Much  
Education.

Somewhat to the same purpose is a recent utterance of Prof. Harry Thurston Peck, of Columbia Univer-

sity. Writing upon the defects of "Modern Education," he deprecates the idea, "almost universal among our people, that education in itself and for all human beings is a good and thoroughly desirable possession." Contending that this idea is fraught with "social and political peril," he says: "Education means ambition, and ambition means discontent. . . . We see on every hand

great masses of men stirred by a vague dissatisfaction with their lot, their brains addled and confused by doctrine that is only half the truth and vaguely understood, yet thoroughly adapted to make them ripe for the work of the agitator and the enemy of public order. . . .

Such education as these possess can never qualify for any serious *rôle*; it only makes for grievous disappointment and a final heart-break. Nor is there any moral safeguard in a limited degree of education. Quite the contrary. It only makes the naturally criminal person far more dangerous, converting the potential sneak-thief into the actual forger and embezzler, and the barroom brawler into the anarchist bomb-thrower. Statistics lately sent to Congress in a veto message show the fact that in our prisons the proportion of the fairly educated

to the uneducated is far larger than among an equal number of ordinary citizens."

The Kaiser and the Professor agree that education, to be safe and useful, must be confined to the few, and ignorance must rest on the masses. As the Romanists believe concerning the Bible that it is not to be trusted in the hands of the vulgar herd, so these hierarchs of culture would reserve education to an aristocracy, lest the common people be blasted and blighted by too much light.

If their conclusions were sound, it would still be of no value. It comes too late. The common people of Christendom have too much education to be content with less. They will demand and receive more. No decrees of Kaisers nor wails of illuminati will avail to keep knowledge from them. Romanistic views with regard to both education and religion are spent forces. Education may be a Pandora's box from which, curiosity having opened, all blessings have irrecoverably escaped, hope alone being left to men; but the deed is done, and, truth to speak, the masses of men do not regret the opening of the box, whatever may be the results. Men do not care to live in a paradise if it is to be a "Paradise of Fools."

And yet there is truth in the conclusion of the Emperor William and Prof. Peck. A man or a nation may have too much education by having the wrong sort of education. Sir Archibald Alison, the author of the "History of Europe During the French Revolution," noting the increase of depravity with the spread of knowledge in France, said: "It

is not simply knowledge, it is knowledge detached from religion, that produces this fatal result. The reason of its corrupting tendency in morals is evident—when so detached it multiplies the desires and passions of the heart without an increase to its regulating principles; it augments the attacking forces without strengthening the resisting powers, and thence the disorder and license it spreads through society. The invariable characteristic of a declining and corrupt state of society is a progressive increase in the force of passion and a progressive decline in the influence of duty.”

Doubtless throughout the United States—throughout Christendom—during the century now nearing its close, there has been too much education of the sort which “multiplies the desires and passions of the heart without an increase to its regulating principles,”

<b>Multiplied</b>	out an increase to its regulating principles,”
<b>Desires</b>	which augments the forces which attack virtue without strengthening the powers which resist evil, and thereby much disorder and license have been engendered. Hence the
<b>Need a</b>	
<b>Regulating</b>	
<b>Principle.</b>	

belief of many wise and good people that our civilization is marked by the characteristic feature of a “declining and corrupt state of society”—“a progressive increase of the force of passion and progressive decline in the influence of duty.” When were men more passionately tenacious of their rights and more indifferent to their duties? When was the idea of liberty more warmly asserted and the idea of self-sacrifice more tepidly accepted?

But the remedy is not less knowledge, but nobler knowledge; not less education, but a higher kind. A poultice of ignorance will not draw out the dangerous inflammations which afflict and imperil the social system,

## 6 *Not Less Education, but More of the Right Sort.*

even if the patient were disposed to submit to its application. The cure will be found, if found at all, in Christian culture. Christendom must choose between the education which casts down every high thing which "exalteth itself against the knowledge of God" and brings "into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," and the education which imparts simply the knowledge which "puffeth up" and which results in that anarchic wisdom which knows not God and loves not man. And this choice can not be long delayed.

Sometimes one fears the American people have already made choice, preferring secular to Christian learning.

The common schools, being institutions of the state, are necessarily neutral in religion. So also are the thirty-four state universities. The state can not answer any of the following questions which are fundamental to our religion: Has God made a revelation; and if so, is it found in the Bible? Who was Christ? Was the work of Martin Luther and his companions the work of reformers restoring the true faith, or the misdoings of renegades destroying that faith?

Besides the state schools, there are many secular institutions founded by individuals. The greatest gifts to colleges and universities yet made in America have been by men who have preferred to propagate secular rather than Christian culture. Witness the gifts made and institutions founded by such men as Stephen Girard and Leland Stanford. Are men of the world willing to put more money into

The  
Remedy.

Questions  
the State  
Can Not  
Answer.

Nor Can Private  
Foundations  
Other Than  
Christian.

their unbeliefs than Christian men are willing to put into their beliefs?

There is one cheering sign. If the Christian colleges of the United States are not the richest, they are the most numerous and influential. Christian colleges hold about seventy-five per cent of all the college instructors and college students in the country.

No Church in America undertakes to get along without its own colleges, except a Cuckoo sect which accomplishes the same end by occupying as far as it is able institutions originally founded by other Churches.

The people called Methodists have from the first founded schools, and to-day in the number of their educational institutions they lead all other denominations in the United States. The birth year of Methodism was 1789, and in that year John Wesley laid the corner-stone of the Kingswood school. From that institution came Adam Clarke—in himself fruit enough to justify its planting. In 1784 American Methodism was organized at the Christmas Conference in Baltimore, and at that Conference steps were taken to establish Cokesbury College.

The General Conference of 1796 introduced into the Book of Discipline "a plan of education recommended to all our seminaries of learning." It is evident the schools of the Church had so multiplied during the twelve years which had elapsed from the projection of Cokesbury—the years of poverty and hardship which followed the War of Revolution—as to require some uniform system or "plan." The same General Conference deprecated "the separation of the two greatest ornaments of intelligent beings: deep learning and genuine

Methodism  
and Schools.

Correlation  
Sought in  
1796.

piety.' Every General Conference from 1796 to 1894 has avowed the educational function of the Church and insisted on its vigorous exercise.

Mr. Wesley and his followers, in undertaking the work of education, brought no innovation into the Church of

The Church  
in This Field  
from Its  
Foundation.

God, nor did they propose a temporary expedient to meet the passing needs of an ignorant class from which they had gathered followers. From the very earliest times the Church has engaged in the work of education. In the schools of the primitive Church the most illustrious of the Fathers saw service. The Sixth General Council at Constantinople directed the presbyters to establish schools in all towns and villages.

Has the Church followed a folly through the centuries? Has a work been undertaken which might as well

Schools of  
Wesleyan  
Methodists.

have been left to other hands? Was Mr. Wesley, whose "genius for organization," it has been said, "was equal to that of Richelieu," laying upon his poor followers an unnecessary burden when he established the Kingswood school? Have all the General Conferences for a century repeated his blunder by enjoining upon the Methodists educational tasks required by no necessity of the Church, no duty to the world, and no principle of the gospel? Are the eight hundred and seventy-five day-schools of the Wesleyan Methodists in England, with all their colleges and theological institutions, monuments to sectarian bigotry and pride? Are the sixty-five Methodist colleges in the United States, not to speak of our two hundred Methodist schools for secondary instruction, the product of priestcraft and the instruments of partizanship?



What would be the effect on our civilization if all these schools were closed? What would be our condition to day if they had never been opened? Let men who decry them consider these questions. Let Christian men who neglect them reflect upon these things.

Not to maintain these schools suitably is much the same as closing them. If the schools of the Church remain weak and poor while secular institutions are being strengthened and enriched, Christian education will be first belittled, and then abandoned. It is no good sign of the times that the Leland Stanford University, with its scoffing head, is richer than all the Christian colleges west of the Mississippi River combined. Thus entrenched, no wonder its President rails at denominational colleges through the columns of the *Popular Science Monthly*, while all the hosts of the secularists rejoice and the Philistines shout their applause.

If this work of Christian education can be done as well by any other agent as by the Church, if the state or private persons can do it as well, let the Church come out of it. She has plenty to do that nobody else can do. Let her sell her educational plants and put the money in Foreign Missions, for example.

But, if, on the contrary, no one can do the work of Christian education as well as the Church, if no one can impart the spiritual quality to education by which alone it can be saved from becoming a malign and dangerous force, let the Church be up and about this urgent busi-

## 10 *Not Less Education, but More of the Right Sort.*

ness. It is a matter which can not wait. The secular forces are not waiting, and unchristian education means ruin to both Church and State. Very little is too much of it.

Christian men must thoroughly equip genuinely Christian institutions. This will require much money in a country in which unchristian schools (not to say anti-christian) count their possessions by millions and their incomes by hundreds of thousands.

All the schools of the Church must be in fact, as in name, genuinely Christian. This matter is too great and too grave to be trifled with. There is no room here for shams. The Church must not permit any institution not genuinely Christian to live upon its treasury and fatten upon its patronage. For a school

**A Great and  
Grave Matter.**

to wear the garb of the Church that it may secure the gifts of the consecrated is a species of Simony far worse than all sins of secularism. For the Church to allow such a sin in its name is to approve the crime of getting money under false pretenses, and wink at an offense as profane as the gluttony and covetousness of Hophni and Phinehas. Every one of our schools must be able to stand up and in the name of the Lord give a Christian's account of itself when men demand of it "What do you more than others?" The times call for Christian culture, not ecclesiastical establishments.

Long as the Church has neglected her duty by delay about this great and urgent interest, there is time yet to retrieve much that has been lost and save all that is now imperiled. The great common-school system can be saved from secularism by pouring through

**What Christian  
Men Have in  
Their Purses.**

all its veins and arteries the religious influences of our Christian colleges if we will only make these colleges strong enough. Christian men have it in their power (in their purses) to make our colleges thus strong.

The young life of the republic to-day lies in the lap of the Church. Will she dare say to any secular agent whatsoever: "Take this child and nurse it for me?" It is this the Lord says to her. It is a high trust. It can not be delegated to another without disobedience to her King.

## President E. Benjamin Andrews, of Brown University, on “Denominational vs. State Colleges.”

---

During the “seventies” certain “educational reformers,” connected with State colleges, took upon themselves the task of decrying, that they might destroy, the denominational colleges of the country. For these beneficent institutions they proposed that higher education by the State be substituted. Pending the controversy, which they carried into the newspapers and the magazines, Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews, at present the distinguished head of Brown University, was inaugurated President of Denison University in Ohio, December 21, 1875. President Andrews, in view of the pending debate, chose for the subject of his inaugural address “Denominational vs. State Colleges.” His masterly argument for Christian colleges has never been successfully answered, and its conclusions so strongly confirm and enforce the views presented in the foregoing pages that the writer of this pamphlet has made liberal extracts from Dr. Andrews’ inaugural, and appends them here. The entire address, if carefully studied, would instruct the foes and edify the friends of our Christian colleges. After a graceful exordium, and a clear statement of the question, Dr. Andrews proceeded to say:

I BELIEVE that governmental management of higher education is, in America, impracticable in fact, and everywhere wrong in principle. These two things I shall seek to show in their order, viewing the subject first as it regards policy or the question what *can* be done, and then as it regards principle or the question what *ought* to be done.

To proceed, then: State control of liberal education is incompatible with our republican conditions. The exigencies of a free and generous government, the refuge of oppressed ones from every clime—refuge where the very air rusts off every shackle, as well of thought as of limb—the exigencies of such a government force us, whether we will or not, to de-

pend on private corporations for liberal school training. Religionists must have their seminaries of learning, and freethinkers theirs, if they want them. A state system, the very best you can devise, will fail.

For one thing, such a system would work unhearable hardship. If government assumes charge of our public instruction, what will it do with such colleges as already exist? To suppress them, or to frustrate their primary design by converting them into state concerns neutral in religion—a

An Unbearable  
Hardship upon  
Religious  
People.

course gravely proposed by some—would be monstrously wrong. The men who laid these foundations did so with the express purpose and condition that upon them learning and religion should hold eternal alliance. Those who support them now are moved to such sacrifice by the conscientious conviction of duty to God. They believe a divinely arranged harmony to subsist between learning and religion, between the culture of the mind and the culture of the heart. Men who feel thus would regard it a sin, having it in their power, not to furnish the means to their own children, and to all others willing to profit by them, of cultivating philosophy, literature, and science, in closest connection with Christian faith. I am not now arguing that these people are right in their views of duty and propriety, but only that they are very conscientious. A strong sense of duty to God impels them to provide and to sustain Christian colleges, and it would be religious intolerance, unparalleled at least in American history, to deny them that privilege. Who can believe that the people will ever allow government to undertake so violent a measure?

Very few, of course, have any such wild dream. All these schools, the most of the agitators tell us, will, to be sure, be suffered to continue in their present character. Then, are the supporters of them to be taxed like other citizens to build and furnish with fuel the educational engines of the state? Here would be a hardship of another kind—not so grievous as the first, still too real and palpable to make it likely even to be imposed upon us. It requires vast sums of money to set up and equip good colleges, and whatever it costs the consciences of Christ's followers will prompt them to provide. We may depend upon it that, however large the expense, unless suppressed by law, there are going to be noble and fully equipped Christian universities in this land, not supported out of the public purse; and unless it can be shown that costly state universities besides, erected and maintained by taxation, are absolutely indispensable to the *life* of our republic, it will be unfair in the extreme to lay upon Christian shoulders the gratuitous second burden of helping to support these. To be sure we tax Catholics for common schools, but we do it because such schools are necessary to our life as a nation. It would be cruelly wrong to do this on any other plea. So it would to do it merely as a "hopeful experiment," for *fear* that common ignorance might be harmful. We tax the whole people for lower education, because the deadliness of popular ignorance to popular government is certain, as certain as a wide induction of historical instances can make it.

But can any one soberly argue that liberal intellectual culture, such as colleges and universities are designed to give, holds any such intimate relation to the life of the

government? Such a view could not be defended by the shadow of evidence. Writers fall into strange misconceptions on this point. Because liberal culture is necessary to the sovereign welfare and perfection of a *people*, it is alleged to be vital to the *state*. The two things are plainly distinct. Religion, and the Christian religion too, is essential to a people's supreme weal. "Blessed," in the highest sense, "is that nation" alone "whose God is Jehovah." But a state, a government, can exist without the people's being all, or any of them, Christians. Common morality is enough; and so, for this other necessity, common intelligence among the masses is all that really *must* be had. And such intelligence it is the sacred duty of good government, for the sake of its own conservation, to secure, by an efficient system of common schools, with compulsory attendance; and firstater-normal schools for the adequate training of teachers. I do not say that higher culture would be of no advantage to our republic. It would, by making the people better and easier to govern. So would universal piety; but the government can do without either; it can endure though every college and university die.

But such institutions will not die. As we have seen, unless put down by law, seminaries of learning are sure to flourish. True, they may not do their work to the satisfaction of all; but while they stand, even should their effectiveness never be any greater than now, American intellectual life will continue, and no plea for state colleges, on the ground of their being vital to the government, can present the remotest sem-

State  
Colleges,  
not Like  
the Common  
Schools,  
Necessary to  
the Life of  
the Nation.

Doubling the  
Burdens of  
Good Men.

blance of propriety. Hence, to double the educational burden that good men must carry, by making them help support unnecessary institutions, that they can not patronize, and do not believe in, would be the extreme of injustice. Whether the now existing colleges be swept away, or perverted to non-religious uses, or left as they are, the erection and support by general taxation of new institutions of this character would be a grievous wrong to a large and worthy portion of the American public. We may safely depend upon the sense of justice in the people at large to forbid such a proceeding.

I argue next that the general public is not competent to have the charge of higher education. The case is not

State Colleges  
Enter Politics,  
and Are Thereby  
Hampered.

with us as with Germany, whence our educational iconoclasts get their notions. There the sovereign power is central, and, fortunately or unfortunately, views of government prevail different from those which find favor here. The minister of education there is not as directly responsible to the people as such a functionary would be in the United States. He can give direction to that interest according to his own intelligent will. On this side of the Atlantic, the people, if they supply the funds for advanced learning, must direct the expenditure of the same. In other words, state colleges must be in politics, and be subject to all the vicissitudes of politics. You can not set them upon any career of certain permanent progress. You can not keep them under any fixed and definite policy. Some stubborn and ignorant Legislature will be sure, sooner or later, to overturn the plans of the wisest educators. A timid Legislature, frightened by the



people's cry of too heavy taxation, will withhold the funds absolutely needful for proper college work. Is it said that this danger is only theoretical? Look at the history of state efforts in the direction of higher education. In how many instances have educational funds been squandered by reckless legislators! In how many cases have the people, in some moment of frenzy for retrenchment, most harmfully reduced the teaching force of a high school, or curtailed salaries beyond the possibility of retaining good teachers, or in some other way equally insane broken hopelessly in pieces an educational policy of long standing and exceeding worth! How have political complications, from the very first, crippled the work of Girard College, and rendered that magnificent foundation almost profitless to those for whom it was laid! Take the University of Michigan, even. Is she beyond the reach of harm from popular ignorance and intractableness? One may almost say that she stands in jeopardy every hour. The people elect the Regents directly, and nothing is to prevent them, at any time, from filling that office with incompetent men, and pledging them to a policy that shall be fatal to the legitimate activity of that noble seat of learning. In at least one instance already, according to Prof. Ten Brook's history, has that university tottered on the very *brink of ruin through the people's interference*. Nor is the possibility of such meddling confined to pecuniary measures alone. It is at the option of the polls to-day to exclude Greek from all the high schools in that state, as has already been done in Detroit. Suppose that this exclusion of Greek be made general, and that Latin shares the same fate with Greek; or that the Supreme Court by and by reverse its old decision, and ordain that

the people need not be taxed for the support of high schools at all? Will not the university be hampered in her work? \* \* \* \* \*

In view of these facts, I say it is quite unlikely that in this land, where people are so impatient of taxation,

Christian  
Colleges  
More  
Certain of  
Support.

state institutions will ever be pecuniarily as well cared for as the truly representative ones among those supported by Christian wealth. And it is still more certain that the state concerns will not, in the long run, do their work any better than the others. President White argues as if denominational colleges, by making up their faculties for the most part out of Christian men, excluded all truly accomplished and thoroughgoing professors from their chairs. He brings forward in illustration of this infelicity the fact that Brown University was, of late, some time without a head, when "there were scholars, jurists, and statesmen in that commonwealth who would have done honor to the position." But did that college lose anything by insisting that her President must be a Christian and a Baptist? No one can say so who has had the least acquaintance with the present incumbent of that office. There is not a state university in America that would not count itself happy to secure him for President. The fact is that the great denominations are not poor in distinguished savants and thinkers. If any colleges have taken up with inferior teaching talent from the mere necessity of employing Christian instructors, they have been inexcusably stupid.

Christian colleges are, then, sure, on the whole, to stand equal with any in the respects of endowment and professorial ability. There is another item in which they

can not but be superior: It is in the Christian conscientiousness with which their instruction will be given. That preceptor who looks upon his pupils as immortal beings—who feels that his teaching will be potent with results everlastingly blessed, both to the learners themselves and to an unnumbered ulterior public whom they will influence—that preceptor, I submit, can not help being, on the whole, superior in zeal, assiduity, and impressiveness to one who instructs, in considerable part, to display his own attainments, ridicules theistic ideas, and regards the intellects that he is fashioning as only the momentary scintillations of the great “all,” destined, after a few breaths, to go out in darkness. . . . As a last consideration against the feasibility of state higher education, I urge the religious complication which it would involve. Christian men are jealous of their faith. Others are equally earnest that nothing shall oppose the free course of unbelief. High education must have to do with religion, and I do not believe that a great state institution of liberal learning can maintain any attitude toward religion that will not so exasperate some party or other as to make trouble at the ballot-box. President White speaks of this problem as already “wrought out;” but, in fact, we are only just beginning to confront it. Till of late, Christian thinking has been overwhelmingly predominant in our country. It is so no longer. Anti-Christians are numbered by the millions, and the practise of paying state moneys for the inculcation of theistic and Christian notions, depend upon it, will not much longer remain unchallenged.

The  
Conscientiousness  
of Their Work.

State  
Colleges  
Can Not  
Impart  
Religious  
Instruction.

The point to consider here is not that these two or three millions who reject Christianity have rights, but that they have ballots, and that their prejudices against true theism are as forcible as those of Christians in favor of the same.

Now the instructions of a numerous and learned faculty must be either theistic or non-theistic, or partly one and partly the other. There is no realm of thought above the merest rudiments, such as are taught in common schools, where you can avoid hearing the obtrusive echoes of the great controversy regarding theism and religion. Is the study ethics? You must decide upon an ultimate basis of right. Is it psychology? Declare whether or not thought is a secretion of the brain. Is it metaphysics? Tell me what is the authority of the causal judgment. Is it history? I ask whether there is a philosophy of history. Is it science? I must know whether matter and force are ultimate things in human thought. Education can not be neutral on these issues without belittling itself to the character of drivel. It simply *can not* be neutral, however hard it may try. Suppose, first, that each professor presents his subject from a theistic standpoint—the ethical doctor finding morality intuitive, and its ultimate rule God's will; the occupant of the metaphysical chair teaching that the conception of law implies a person; and so on with all the others? Will not the great multitude of Jews, freethinkers, atheists, pantheists, and the rest, find fault when taxes are called for to sustain such instruction? Let the overturnings which these people have already wrought in the old order of things be our reply. Unbelievers have the ballot as well as Christians. That is the stubborn fact of the matter; and whether we

deplore it or not, they will never consent to pay their money for the promulgation of Christian ideas.

But suppose *them* to be in the majority, and to fill the chairs of the state university with unbelieving doctors—  
 What John Fisk at the head, teaching metaphysics  
 Would the and ethics after Bain, Spencer, and Mill ;  
 Infidels John C. Draper and Youmans dividing nat-  
 Do? ural science between them; prelections upon  
 history delivered by a disciple of Buckle; and Auguste  
 Comte *redevivus*, dean of all the faculties. Is it likely  
 that Christian men will submit to paying taxes for such  
 instruction?

Now it is not beyond belief that, should the govern-  
 ment enter the domain of higher education, both these  
 embroglios might, in different states, be-  
 come part of history within half a century.  
 Mosaic and Bewildered Students. Not, however, while your system of state  
 Faculties colleges is new. At the outset it would be  
 and imperative to conciliate all parties by com-  
 pounding boards of instruction out of *all* seats and be-  
 liefs. Every faculty must be a religious mosaic. All at-  
 titudes to religion must be represented in it, in order  
 that none may predominate. And now see the result.  
 In studying the classics the pupil is taught by contrast  
 the superiority of theistic and Christian notions of  
 life. In physics, the very foundations of Christianity,  
 and of theism too, are gnawed away by the cankerous  
 doctrines that matter and force are ultimate, and that  
 man is a developed brute, a mere automaton. In one  
 study the student is taught that induction rests on in-  
 tuition; in another, that intuition is itself a product of  
 induction; in ethies, that man is free and responsible; in  
 history and political economy, that man is only a ma-

chine—nay, that his being a machine is the very reason why the sciences of history and political economy are possible. But who wants youthful minds trained in this most mischievous way? Such teaching would uproot in them the very idea of truth, and there are as yet none quite so radical as not to regard that a misfortune. Such misnamed education would offend believers and unbelievers alike, and a system of it could never be permanently supported by general taxation. Perhaps people are very foolish. That, I repeat, is not the question now. The point is, that people vote. We have committed ourselves to a republic, with its blessings and its ills. If the consignment of higher education to private hands is an ill, we must abide it. Right or wrong, wise or foolish, the great body of citizens will never, till the millennium at least, so agree in religion as to allow higher intellectual training to be administered by government.

But I said that to put higher education into political hands is not only impracticable, but also wrong in principle; and to this second point I request you now to attend. Denominational higher education, or higher education on private foundations, will prevail in our land, because the people will see that this, and this alone, is right. What is the business of the state? Is its function unlimited? May it do whatever a majority says it may do? Are majorities infallible? Are there not some things which even *they* have no right to do? It is high time that the attention of legislators was held to such queries as these. Much of our lawmaking is shockingly reckless of minority rights, and regardless of principles in general. If a measure will only pass, that fact, according to the regnant political philosophy of our time, is proof positive of

Wrong in  
Principle.

its rightness. I believe that many advocates of state higher education are carried sheer away by the brilliancy and grandeur of the plan, not thinking or caring, perhaps, to ask whether there is legitimacy in it; inquiring only if it is possible. I am aware, however, that the ablest pleaders for state establishments are careful to advance their grounds, and they generally affirm that the state must furnish this high culture in order to live. But for this, as I have said, they furnish not the remotest vestige of proof. I have sought for proof through all their writings to which I have had access, but to no avail. When we regard the number of great men, educators, jurists, lawmakers, statesmen, editors, and writers, who have glorified our history without any college breeding, it is vain to deny that the government might survive and fulfil successfully all its real functions, though every college and university from Maine to California were razed level with the ground. Nor is the relation of colleges to common schools at all more essential. The normal school, and not the college, is the proper complement to the common school. And normal schools it is the duty of the state to furnish. It is not true that the state will die without seeing to higher education.

Just here there is a chance for an *argumentum ad hominem*. As observed already, government may abide without

If State Colleges, Why Not a State Church and a State Religion?	Christianity, or high learning either. Of the two, however, Christianity is infinitely the nearer to its life; for Christianity is now practically the only religion offerable to men, and no state ever yet endured long without religion, while many have stood centuries with low intellectual culture. Here, then, is religion with some appearance, at
---	---

least, of being vital to governmental stability. Here is higher education with confessedly less of such appearance. The reformers would deny the government's right to take charge of religion. They urge it to take charge of higher education. Their position is illogical. The government's attitude toward religion in this country is right, and it ought to hold the same attitude toward all those other such matters, which, though important enough to the highest weal of the people, and remotely so, perhaps, even to the nation's very existence, are, after all, *not vital* to the nation's existence. \* \* \* \* \*

But it is not the function of the government to busy itself about the compassing of such ends as these. Its function is to protect the people in the exercise of their natural rights. It transcends its sphere in putting band to every scheme that can in any way advantage the people. It is none of the government's business how high or low a degree of literary culture the people possess, or what the nation's literary reputation is abroad, or to further discoveries in science, or to see to it that our national intelligence does not lag behind that of the age. Leave these things to individuals and to private societies, moved by their own tastes and convictions and by the spirit of the times. Education in this higher aspect of it is too sacred a thing for the state to touch with its great, coarse, hard hands. Turn it over to those who have affinity for it, and will cultivate and foster it out of love. It is the only way in which learning can flourish in a republic like ours, and it leaves the government free to perform its only legitimate work: protecting the people in their natural rights.

This is one reason why I pronounce state meddling with higher education wrong, because this interest



is utterly outside of the government's legitimate activity.

Another point deserves to be considered. Religion is essential to the perfection of culture and intelligence, and the state can not teach religion. If the people are unable to attain the desirable development without culture—and I am as earnest as any living man in maintaining that they are—then it is of prime consequence that their culture be of the choicest kind, and to be this it must have the religious element. That the state can not impart this religious element so indispensable to true culture is generally admitted, but the full breadth and bearing of the admission is not so generally understood. The government must be strictly, scrupulously, impartial in religion. So says the constitution of the United States. So also says precedent, extending back over half a century of our national history; and so, better than all, says the only true, abstract, theory of statecraft. Disciples of Mohammed, of Confucius, of Buddha, devotees of every pagan cult, are as true citizens as Christians are. They are not to be *tolerated* on condition of conforming to all the Christian observances which we please to impose, but to be accorded their own inalienable, God-given right of practising religion as they see fit. It follows from this principle not only that the state may not teach Christianity as such, but that it may not even teach morality on Christian grounds. The farthest it can legitimately go in any religious direction is to inculcate those common ideas of morality in which all agree, steadfastly refusing to decide upon their grounds. Should the state in its public instructions go beyond this, and found morality in the

The State  
Can Not  
Teach  
Religion.

nature or in the will of God, it would discriminate against a large class of citizens who do not so believe, and who have rights as well as Christians have. Often it is argued as if the government were not bound to respect the religious views of such, but only to be neutral among the various sects of Christians. In reality, however, it is as criminally intolerant to discriminate against idolaters in favor of monotheists, as it would be to discriminate against Methodists in favor of Baptists. A man's creed has nothing whatever to do with his *status* as a citizen according to the American theory of government, and so instruction given by the state can not go beyond the simplest unsupported elements of morality without invading some citizen's rights.

The state laboring under such a restriction can not be the provider of the best intellectual pabulum; it can not furnish the inspiration needful for the highest intellectual attainments. Religion must be invoked; and the only religion worth invoking is Christianity.

Christianity is the native ally of intelligence. That Christian men should ever oppose intellectual progress, or that real unbelievers should ever attain preeminence in the same, are both very strange and anomalous facts. That they are facts, I will not deny; but they are abnormal, the outcome of peculiar conditions. Genuine and unadulterated Christianity cheers when science advances its standards. History presents to us the religion of the cross marching at the very head and front of the world's educational forces. Civilization has never seen the like of it, in power, first, of creating in men a mental appetite, and then of filling their hungry minds with

the most nutritious intellectual food. It is surprising and instructive to observe how soon the early Christians outstripped their pagan relatives and neighbors in the intellectual race. A love of letters seemed to be born in them at the same time with their faith. That whole age was one of research, of light. Nor did this light grow dim till Christianity became corrupted and the genuine preacher found a grave.

The renaissance came with the preacher's resurrection. Even the infidel historian will tell you that intellectual quickening, as well as spiritual, waited upon the ministries of St. Francis and St. Dominic, and Tauler, and Huss, and Luther. Luther is remembered with as much honor to-day in his character of father to free thought as he is in that of religious reformer. Rationalists, as well as Christians, love him. And with reason. To no other one man is Germany so much indebted for her present intellectual preeminence as to him; and it is well known that his bias in favor of active thought was the outcome of his faith. Nor is his influence, as a promoter of thinking, strange. Any man filled with the true spirit of the Christian religion will be a freethinker in the better sense of the term; a lover of the truth, a searcher after it, an advocate of progress in thinking and knowledge. So of nations. It is the nations where Christianity has been least disseminated, where the preacher's voice has been longest and oftenest hushed, which have remained most backward mentally. Compare Germany with Italy, England with Spain, the United States with South America. The same is seen in heathen lands. No sooner have the seeds of religious truth sprung up there than those people raise a clamor for schools. China and Japan in the same instant open their ears

to hear the gospel, and their mouths to cry to Christian lands for teachers. It is not accidental that the great repositories of learning the world over are of religious origin, and that scarcely a single broad and deep educational foundation has been laid in Christendom except by the hands of Christian piety. And it is still worthier of remark, that it has been Christian people, stirred up by their faith to appreciate learning, who have demanded these institutions, and whose sons have filled them when erected. \* \* \* \* \*

It is not religion alone that has occasion to weep over the monistic tendencies of these times. Literature, philosophy, art—all culture, are equally concerned. Let the belief gain general prevalence that there is no spiritual world, no living God, no immortality, and those who will then regard intellectual attainment worth its cost will be few indeed. Religion will not depart from this world alone. When you compose her form in death, prepare tears for other objects of love, many and dear. Art, literature, culture, and religion have taken oath to die and be buried as they have lived, locked in each other's arms.

I need not pursue this thought. I protest against divorcing education from religion. They are the proper complements of each other. To education without religion that dignified title does not belong. It is the form without the power. A state system of education, into which religion can not enter, is wrong in principle. It deserves as little the support of those who are interested in the intellectual as of those who are interested in the religious welfare of the people.

But, if secular education can not adequately form the mind, still less—and this is my last reason for calling it wrong in theory—can it yield character.

The Deepest Need of the American People. The principle is general, but its application is especially striking in our own land and time. A strong moral character is the deepest need of the American people to-day; and every one knows that the intellectual class has a mighty power in fixing the character of society at large. The religious tone of our college teaching is almost as important in this regard as that of our preaching itself. If the great mass of our American college graduates can go forth to their life-work, each possessed of an iron moral principle begotten and matured in four years of theistic teaching, the power of these institutions for moral good will pass all reckoning. They will be to our people like perpetual smiles from on high. If the same amount of intelligence enters public life, purely secular, with only such ideas of morals as it can imbibe with the state for its preceptor, it can hardly avoid being a curse. Thus far, college instruction, with its pronounced theistic bent, has stood in the front rank of agencies for conserving and advancing morality. We can not spare so salubrious an influence now. We are seeing enough of the ill that results from secularism in the common schools. It is the painful conviction, I believe, of every morally thoughtful man that these schools are not producers of high character. Theoretically the Catholics are right, that even here education should not be non-religious. Government, however, being indispensable, and these schools being indispensable to government, and it being impossible in a free republic for them to teach religion, the theory must suffer, and

we must do our best to preserve the symmetry of lower education by diligent Sunday-school and home instruction.

But a further divorce between education and religion is not necessary, and should be fought against to the last. Besides the minor infelicities always arising from a weak state of the public conscience, there are several towering evils which torment us now, that can only be remedied by a better moral sense in the great public breast. An earnest cry is rising from all quarters for a higher sense of honor in society. The demand is just. It is to be feared that honor is less a living force among us than in any other civilized people. Now the dulness of this feeling is an evil sign in respect to our morality. It indicates that even such of our conduct as does accord with the moral law may not be moral. For "honor is not something beside and above morality, but belongs to it most intimately. Its field lies between the coarser and more obvious requirements of justice and the self-forgetting impulses of love."\* Honor is only morality's "consummate flower." Would we have more of it? Assuredly we need more. Let us cultivate morality more assiduously, and urge it forward to ripeness. Weakness in moral conviction can never be cured by mere exhortation and appeal. The moral sense must be trained. Any agency that can aid in effecting this is beyond price.

There are more conspicuous evils which, so far as I can see, are out of the reach of all other remedies than this of which I speak. They are only to be crushed by the

---

\* President Woolsey in his address at Harvard College in 1875.

weight of the people's moral conviction uttered against them. I instance the incorporate avarice that so largely controls legislation, and makes laws by which the people are defrauded. Yes, even if each lawmaker is a Solon for wisdom and an Aristides for justice, the evil remains. Laws can not be specific; and cases must often arise under the best of laws where adroit corporations, without breaking any fiat written upon statute books, can get the people at a disadvantage and rob them. Where is the remedy? The ballot-box says: "It is not in me." The Legislature says: "It is not in me." The courts say: "We have heard the fame thereof with our ears, but we possess not the cure." There is no cure but in a toning up of the public conscience. Let the members of corporations know that all the people, empaneled as a jury and sworn upon the Bible by a stern conscience, will try them individually, and bring them in guilty whenever they step over the bounds of equity, and even a corporation of fiends will be cautious. There is something awfully commanding in the rebuke of a nation's conscience. Men can not brave it. Devils can not. We saw its power when congress wrongly voted to enrich itself at our expense, and when corruption grew fat in the high places of New York City by feeding upon the people's wealth. Hero is our security—our only security against such abuses—a better conscience in the popular bosom.

Intemperance is another of these dreadful demons that law can not exorcise, but a Herculean conscience can. There are still others, and their name is legion. It is of indescribable consequence to our proper development as a people ~~that everything~~ possible be done to

elevate public morals; and when I reflect upon the commanding position of intelligence among the social forces I have no words to express my anxiety that all the intelligence in our country may be of such a character as to prove an ally to morality. Let light be made the medium of warmth; let the two fall upon men in blended rays as they come forth from God, the eternal Sun and Source of both. For this saving admixture of light and heat there can be no better conductor to the souls of this or of any other nation than sanctified collegiate instruction.

Christian  
Education  
the Ally of  
Morality.



