

Dangerous Donations

AND

Degrading Doles,

OR

A Vast Scheme for Capturing and Controlling the Colleges and Universities of the Country

BY

Bishop Warren A. Candler of the
Methodist Episcopal Church South.

“Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight
of any bird ” Proverbs i:17.

A Prefatory Word

The articles which compose this pamphlet were prepared for publication in the *Atlanta Journal*, and the first two were printed in its columns.

The editor of the *Journal* withheld the last two from publication out of a consideration of courtesy to the meeting of the "Conference for Education in the South" in the City of Atlanta, explaining to the writer that he agreed with the position of the writer on the general subject and would print the two papers after the "Conference" adjourned. As is evident on the face of the articles they are entirely courteous, and it does not appear that the "Conference" should be exempted from courteous criticism because of the place at which it happens to meet this year, especially when it is remembered that the articles were prepared before the writer of them knew where or when its session would be held, and that he had no part in inviting the body to meet in Atlanta. "The Conference" bears but a secondary and tributary relation to the "General Board of Education," and the emphasis of these papers does not fall on it. It can not, however, escape entirely criticism of the "General Board of Education" which was originated in the "Conference," and which in turn makes appropriations to the "Conference,"

and it is entitled to no exemption from criticism while it is thus inseparably related to the "General Education Board."

And besides all this, when a great danger threatens the country there is no time for standing on mere ceremony. It is time to cause the people to understand the peril which menaces their institutions of learning and their civilization.

To the four papers which were prepared for the Journal are appended an article from the New Orleans "*Times-Democrat*," and an extract from an article from the "*Manufacturer's Record*," of Baltimore, which will serve to confirm the conclusions reached by the writer and to show that other sober-minded men view with alarm the situation which confronts us. I add also extracts from the columns of the New York *Journal of Commerce* and *Springfield Republican*, of weighty import.

It is hoped that this discussion may contribute in some measure to arousing our people to action in time to save our colleges and universities from being captured and controlled by alien authorities, and to save them also from being crushed for lack of adequate support and endowment. Our institutions of higher learning must be free from domination from without, and they must be made strong enough to maintain their freedom and do their work well.

W. A. CANDLER.

Atlanta, Ga., April 2nd, 1909.

THE POWER OF OUR COLLEGES AND A PERIL WHICH THREATENS THEM.

It is to be feared that the most of our people do not justly estimate the influence and value of our institutions of higher learning. In this statement reference is not intended to our negligence in properly equipping and adequately endowing our colleges and universities, although there is much in that direction deserving of censure.

Our people do not seem to understand the effect of an educational institution on the general welfare of the community whom it serves. Its work is done so silently, gradually, and invisibly, while railroads, banks, factories and the like, are so bulky and tangible, that most men among us regard with comparative indifference a school of higher learning. Nevertheless that which they esteem so lightly may be doing a work which will seriously affect for good or ill every commercial enterprise in the land, not to speak of the interests of higher value than material things.

The nations of Europe understand all this better than do our people. They have experimented with educational institutions for centuries, and they know what comes of such influential plants.

When England wished to insure her dominion in Normandy she founded the University of Caen in 1436, and achieved by it vastly more than it cost her.

When Spain desired to consolidate the Netherlands she established the University of Douay in 1572, and with it she achieved results that still abide notwithstanding all the political changes and social mutations which have come to pass in the course of more than three centuries.

After the battle of Jena, Germany set about healing the political bruises and military wounds inflicted upon her in that disastrous defeat by founding the University of Berlin in 1810. M. Ernest Lavisse has related most interestingly the story of its foundation. He says the King of Prussia, Frederick William, declared as the reason for its establishment, "it is necessary that the State supply by its intellectual forces the physical powers which it has lost." The great Schleiermacher supported the project enthusiastically and most clearly forecast its future. He said, "When that scientific organization is founded, it will have no equal; thanks to its interior force, it will exercise its benevolent rule to the borders of the Prussian monarchy. Berlin will become the center of the entire intellectual activity of Northern and Protestant Germany, and a solid foundation will be prepared for the accomplishment of the mission assigned to the Prussian government." His words were most accurately fulfilled. The University of Berlin more than any other one thing united and invigorated the new Germany with which Napoleon III had to settle in 1870.

Think of the proposition! To elevate the Kingdom of Prussia and unify the German Empire by establishing a school! Our "practical men" would laugh at such an idea: but the more practical German authorities knew what they were doing. The event has justified the wisdom of their far-sighted proposal. Berlin has become the scientific and political center of the German people. With its great University it is the very heart of the nation's life, and its influence is felt throughout the world. Our own educational institutions have not escaped the influence of the University of Berlin.

Again after the overwhelming defeat of Napoleon III in 1870 by the unified and renovated German nation, Bismarck undertook the Germanizing of Alsace-Lorraine by completely reconstructing the University of Strasbourg.

We thus see that both to retrieve a defeat and to confirm a victory long-headed Germany established a new educational plant. And in both instances she has not been disappointed in the outcome.

When the great Liberal party in Belgium in 1834 sought to battle successfully with its foes, who were operating so aggressively through the Universities of Liege and Gand (or Ghent, as the city is called in English), it founded the University of Brussels.

Oxford University has been the breeding ground of Tories and Toryism for generations, and the Whigs in 1828 set up the University

of London with the purpose of offsetting if possible the political influence of Oxford.

In our own country a history was enacted towards the close of the eighteenth century which emphasizes in a striking manner the power of the colleges. The institutions of learning then existing in the young Republic were few and comparatively feeble; but becoming infected with infidelity they threatened the religious life of the whole country. Bishop Meade, of Virginia, declared with reference to their effects, "I can truly say that then, and for some years after, in every educated young man in Virginia whom I met I expected to find a skeptic, if not an avowed unbeliever." He affirmed that the College of William and Mary, which had been founded in religious motives and for Christian ends as its first charter showed, had become "the hot bed of French politics and infidelity." Yale College had succumbed to the same evil influence, and when in 1795 the great Timothy Dwight came to the presidency of the institution he found it in the most wretched condition as to both faith and morals. Dr. Lyman Beecher who entered the college as a student about that time said it "was in a most ungodly state." and he adds, "most of the class before me were infidels, and called each other Voltaire. Rousseau, D'Alembert, etc." Our nation can never pay the debt it owes to Dr. Dwight for the warfare he waged against infidelity in Yale College during all the years of his pres-

idency. He drove it from Yale and his saving influence extended to other institutions. He might be called in some sense the saviour of his country in that perilous hour. The poorer Yale of Dr. Dwight's day did more for the country than does the richer Yale of to-day.

Washington also in his "Farewell Address" lamented the moral conditions which he saw around him, and he warned his countrymen against the dangers of irreligion and infidelity. Manifestly he was aiming his words at current conditions, then so threatening to all that was good, when he said, "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who would labor to subvert these greatest pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with both private and public felicity. Let it be simply asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in our courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds

of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious liberty."

It is not surprising that the Father of his country was alarmed. Some of the most conspicuous leaders of the political thought of that period were most aggressive in their opposition to all things religious. General Dearborn, who was the Secretary of War in the administration of President Jefferson, on one occasion in alluding to the churches said, "So long as these temples stand, we can not hope for order and good government." Washington in his "Farewell Address" traversed with purpose and emphasis such vicious sentiments because he saw the need of sounding a note of alarm.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1798 bemoaned the situation in these words: "We perceive with pain and fearful apprehension a general dereliction of religious principles and practice among our fellow-citizens, a visible and prevailing impiety and contempt for the laws and institutions of religion, and an abounding infidelity, which in many instances tends to atheism itself. The profligacy and corruption of the public morals have advanced with a progress proportionate to our declension in religion. Profaneness, pride, luxury, injustice, intemperance, lewdness and every species of de-

bauchery and loose indulgence greatly abound."

Behold to what length the evil leaven which was working among the educated classes operated to the corruption of private and public morals among all classes! It affected the whole life of the nation and threatened even the stability of all its social and political institutions.

I have dwelt at length upon the effect of educational institutions in order that I might warn our people against a powerful effort which certain very astute men, backed by millions of money, are now making to capture and control our colleges and universities. While we sleep they work.

An educational trust has been formed, and it is operating to control the institutions of higher learning in the United States, and to dominate especially the colleges and universities of the South.

When the war was over General Lee exhorted the troops to go home and cultivate the virtues of their ancestors. It is the last privilege of a conquered people to cultivate their own peculiar excellencies and gifts.

Our people have risen up out of the desolation of war and the greater desolation of reconstruction, and by sheer strength of manhood they have recovered their fallen fortunes, made the waste places to bloom again, and wrought out on the old foundations a splendid structure of civilization. For many

years they have been lectured by their conquerors in season and out of season. They have been given any amount of advice if nothing else. But now at last the effort to manage them takes a new direction. It is proposed to change their political thinking, religious beliefs, and social organization by a scheme to dominate their colleges and universities. I can not in this paper go into details, but must reserve all that for my next communication and subsequent articles.

In the meantime I close this letter by saying, "Let us beware of the Greeks when they bring gifts."

SEEKING TO CAPTURE AND CONTROL THE COLLEGES OF THE COUNTRY.

In my last article it was suggested that certain astute men, backed by millions of money, were making an effort to capture and control the colleges and universities of the country, especially the institutions of the South. The movement to which reference is intended is what is called "The General Education Board," and certain concomitant organizations.—chiefly, however, "The General Education Board."

This Board was incorporated by an act of the Congress of the United States approved January 12, 1903, and endowed by Mr. John Rockefeller, Sr. Its endowment was increased to about \$43,000,000 by the gift of \$32,000,000 on February 5, 1907, "one-third to be added

to the permanent endowment of the Board, two-thirds to be applied to such specific objects within the corporate purposes of the Board" as might be directed by Mr. Rockefeller or his son from time to time. Previously he had given \$1,000,000 on March 1st, 1902, and \$10,000,000 on October 1st, 1905.

The charter of the "General Education Board" gives it very extensive powers, as is indicated in these words: "The said corporation shall have power to build, improve, enlarge, or equip, or to aid others to build, improve, enlarge or equip, buildings for elementary or primary schools, industrial schools, technical schools, normal schools, training schools for teachers, or schools of any grade, or for higher institutions of learning, or, in connection therewith, libraries, workshops, gardens, kitchens, or other educational accessories; to establish, maintain, or endow, or aid others to establish, maintain, or endow, elementary or primary schools, industrial schools, technical schools, normal schools, training schools for teachers, or schools of any grade, or higher institutions of learning; to employ or aid others to employ teachers and lecturers; to aid, co-operate with, or endow associations or other corporations engaged in educational work within the United States of America, or to donate to any such association or corporation any property or moneys which shall at any time be held by the said corporation hereby constituted; to collect educational

statistics and information, and to publish and distribute documents and reports containing the same, and in general to do and perform all things necessary and convenient for the promotion of the object of the corporation."

It will be noted that this Board is authorized to do almost every conceivable thing which is in any wise related to education, from opening a kitchen to establishing a university, and its power to connect itself with the work of every sort of educational plant or enterprise conceivable will be especially observed. This power to project its influence over other corporations is at once the greatest and most dangerous power it has.

The stupendous scheme is one to enthrall the imagination. Its large powers and immense endowment when proclaimed to the public impressed many with the idea that it was the harbinger of an educational millennium. It seemed to promise all manner of good without any admixture of evil. Very naturally, therefore, good men in every part of the country looked with favor upon it. The authorities of struggling colleges saw in it relief for the institutions for which they were giving their lives. Trustees and faculties watched its coming as they, who wait for the morning. The friends of education everywhere, and especially in the South, gave it warm welcome and cordial approval. These all, and others, are not to be blamed that they had no suspicions of the "General Education

Board," for its promises on the surface seemed fair and its proposals generous.

It was not strange that many applications for aid came very quickly to the Board from all sorts of schools. There was nothing on the surface to provoke distrust or to suggest ulterior purposes. Even now multitudes see nothing to give rise to fear, and some may think that I am needlessly alarmed. It is perhaps true that some members of the Board itself do not yet perceive what some others in the huge corporation really intend, and even those members of the Board who are most resolute and definite in the purpose to capture and control the colleges of the country doubtless persuade themselves that their purpose is entirely wise, pure, and patriotic. If they mean to dominate the institutions upon which they bestow their donations, they doubtless applaud their plans as a scheme of "benevolent assimilation."

But it is not safe for the educational institutions of the country to be under the virtual dominion of fifteen men, however pure they may imagine their intentions to be, even though their purposes may be as pure in fact as they themselves fancy. It is not a question of motives, but a question of whether it is good for the country to have its educational work determined by a Board of fifteen men, responsible to no authority civil or ecclesiastical in the land. On this question my mind is perfectly clear; such a centralized edu-

cational system is perilous in the extreme. It is such a concentration of power in the matter of the highest interests of the nation as no fifteen men, however wise and virtuous, can be trusted to exercise without abusing it to the furtherance of their own views and interests and to the injury of those who do not agree with them in interest or opinion.

There is evidence at hand already that some person, or persons, connected with this Board are conscious of the power in the Board's hands, and that they have very definite if not worthy, ends in view. To draw attention to that evidence this paper is printed.

I give first two extracts from the columns of two leading daily papers published in New York, extracts which are so nearly identical in language as to leave no room to doubt that they were written for those papers by some one person who was intimately acquainted with the inmost purposes of the most inner circle of the "General Education Board."

Shortly after Mr. Rockefeller's last gift of \$32,000,000 the New York *Tribune* said:

"No gift from this great fund is intended to be given to State educational institutions. While certain colleges will be selected for contributions or endowments, forming a chain of educational institutions across the continent, others not so favoured will be left to their fate by the Rockefeller Fund, and many of them, it is expected, will be forced to close their doors in the face of such strong support to their fortunate rivals. It will become a question of the survival of the fittest, it is said, from which

it is believed a better and higher standard of education will result, and on the maps of the Williams street office of the Rockefeller Fund the little coloured pins will probably seal the fate of many a college and work out the destiny of other to prosperous ends."

The New York *Evening World* said:

"No gift from this great fund is intended to be given to State educational institutions. While certain colleges will be selected for donations or endowments, forming a chain across the continent, others not so favored will be left to their fate, as it were, and many of them will be, it is expected, forced to close their doors in the face of such strong support of their fortunate rivals."

Can any one doubt that these two extracts were written by the same hand and that the hand which wrote them was the hand of some one perfectly acquainted with the ultimate ends of Mr. Rockefeller and his Board? How thoughtful was the writer in that he put forth the matter in the leading Republican paper and the leading Democratic paper of the metropolis. He meant that men of all parties should see and understand it. And mark what is proposed by this writer.

(1) There is to be "a chain" of Board-supported colleges stretching "across the continent." (2) That these Board-supported colleges will force others to close their doors. In other words the 'General Education Board' proposes to both kill and make alive, to make and unmake colleges at will.

Is any man so simple as not to see that the Board will be able to influence the character of the instruction given in the Board-fed insti-

tutions? Is it not clear that it will have colleges to its own notion, teaching what it directs both as to the matter and manner of instruction?

And as to the rest of the colleges it is expected the "little coloured pins on the maps in the office of the Rockefeller Fund will probably seal their fate," and that they will be "forced to close their doors."

That this is no strained view of what is proposed and expected, will appear from the following extract from the *Outlook* Dr. Lyman Abbott's periodical,—a magazine which would not mistake the object of the Rockefeller Fund nor write of its purposes and plans in any unfriendly way. The *Outlook* said:

With this financial power in its control, the general board is in position to do what no body in this country can at present, even attempt. It can determine largely what institutions shall grow, and in some measure what shall stand still or decay. It can look over the territory of the nation, note the places where there is a famine of learning, and start new educational plants of any species it chooses, or revive old ones. It can do in many ways what the government does for education in France and Germany. Its power will be enormous: it seems as if it might be able to determine the character of American education. The funds it holds represent only a fraction of the amounts which it will control: by giving a sum to an institution on condition that the institution raise an equal or greater amount, it will be able to direct much larger amounts than it possesses."

Now note two things in this passage from the columns of the *Outlook*:

- (1) This Board may be able to "determine"

the character of American education," that is, it may be able to do in our country what the government does in France or Germany, but without the government's responsibility to the people. Could anything be more dangerous?

(2) This Board will be able to control not only the millions of Mr. Rockefeller's gift, but the greater millions which others have given, or others may give, to the institutions which seek and obtain its aid. What an enormous power for fifteen men to wield over a nation! It is startling to think of it! It is alarming!

That it may be clear how this Board proposes to control the colleges which it seems to aid, and to control the funds which such institutions may obtain in the future from others, I give the conditions which were outlined for acceptance by a Southern institution to which the "General Education Board" proposed to give \$37,500 if that institution would raise \$112,500, and thereby increase its endowment to \$150,000. The conditions as outlined by an executive officer of the Board were as follows:

"First. That the amount so contributed by this Board, together with the supplemental sum of one hundred and twelve thousand five hundred dollars (\$112,500), aforesaid, will be safely invested and forever preserved inviolably as endowment for the said College, the income only to be available for its uses.

"Second. That no part of the income from the fund so contributed by this Board shall ever be used for specifically theological instruction.

"Third. That in case the said College shall ever

divert any part of the endowment funds which it now has or which it may hereafter acquire, then and in that case the said sum which shall have been so contributed by this Board, pursuant to the terms of this pledge, shall at the option of this Board revert to it.

"Fourth. That the accredited representative of this Board shall at all reasonable times have the right to inspect the books, accounts and securities of said College.

Fifth. That the sum so contributed by this Board shall be forever held as a separate fund and be separately invested, so that its identity shall be at all times preserved, and that this Board shall forever have and retain a specific lien on said fund and on the securities in which it shall from time to time be invested, as security for the faithful observance by the College of the terms of this agreement."

Here are rights of inspection and power of control demanded which no self-respecting institution should consent for one moment to submit to. The Board's little wad of the pitiful sum of \$32,500 is expected to draw after it all the endowment which the college has or may hereafter acquire. It is set up as the prime fund, and the larger amount of \$112,500 given by others is only "a supplemental sum!" In order that the Board may preserve a handle by which to swing the institution as it may wish, its little conditional gift is to be "held as a separate fund and be separately invested, so that its identity shall at all times be preserved."

With what threats of litigation or with what threats of the withdrawal of funds, might not this Board control under one pretext or an-

other the whole management and policy of such a college!

How must self-respecting trustees feel who from year to year should be forced to look up to this coterie of fifteen men, asking leave of this little Board with reference to investments and everything else about the college with which the fifteen men might choose to meddle. Such methods must pauperize every one connected with such a Board-fed and Board-controlled college, from the wisest member of the board of trustees to the most callow freshman.

Now, it may be said with reference to all this that Mr. Rockefeller, or the Board which represents him, has the right to determine what he will do with his own, and to fix the conditions upon which a part of what he owns will be given to others, (if indeed we may call these doles to hungry colleges gifts at all). No one will deny this right. It is equally true that the people, or any part of the people, have a right to say what sort of educational institutions they will support and countenance. Of course, if a college seeks and obtains these gratuities, with the Rockefeller strings to them, it must consent to be guided by the rein with which these fifteen men will drive it. But may we not have enough people left who will say, we want institutions freer than the Board-fed kind can be, and we mean to have them, and to put them where the Board's "chain of colleges across the con-

continent" can not in any wise overcome them or make them afraid. May we not have some institutions whose doors can not be closed by "the little coloured pins" in the office of the Rockefeller Fund in New York?

Our colleges must be something more than the caged birds of the "General Education Board," fed by its hand and made to sing at its bidding. American education can not be safely entrusted to fifteen men without any responsibility to the people whose education they assume to supervise.

It should be added that the Board does not leave State institutions as severely alone as might be inferred from its purposes as expressed at first and as stated in the extracts quoted above from the columns of the *New York Tribune* and the *New York Evening World*.

It now undertakes to support professors of secondary education in State Universities, and to maintain some sort of demonstration farms and a system of agricultural lecturing of a somewhat spectacular sort in the Southern states. It thus undertakes to lay its hand on the high schools and to get hold of the farmers.

Something of the spirit and purpose of the Board concerning the latter work among the farmers may be gathered from the following utterance which is said to have emanated in the form of an interview from Mr. Frederick

T. Gates, President of the "General Education Board:"

"The work of spreading the study and application of agricultural improvements in three or four of the Southern States, which the Board began when the first \$1,000,000 was received from Mr. Rockefeller," said Mr. Gates, "can now be enlarged, so that information about better farming methods can be spread throughout the entire South. Only the interest of the first \$1,000,000 could be devoted to this agricultural work because of the higher education clause in the second or \$10,000,000 donation. Where the work has been carried on the improvements in farming have been so marked that Southern bankers will not lend money to men who do not follow the methods taught by the Board's instructors."

Of course the statement with reference to the conditions on which Southern bankers lend money to farmers is preposterous nonsense, but the object at which that sentence was aimed can hardly be mistaken.

In conclusion I ask attention to the following from that ably conducted paper, *The New York Journal of Commerce*, which says:

"A system of giving which has its own rules and customs, which is governed by principles of selection laid down in the beginning, which ramifies throughout the country and embraces especially those smaller institutions that are hampered by narrow means, is an infinitely more powerful force in the shaping of opinion than any single capitalist who makes separate and often unconditional gifts to be controlled and invested by the institutions themselves could ever be. As a mechanism for controlling academic opinion there has, perhaps, never been anything in the history of education that would compare with the Board system of subsidizing learning."

For one I venture to express the wish that the fewest number of our Southern colleges will ever be captured and controlled by this "General Education Board." We can have good colleges, though they be poor; for there always have been, and there always will be, heroic men in the South who will sacrifice themselves to this high interest. But we can make nothing but slaves and slavery out of colleges which have ceased to be free, however rich they may become.

Moreover, we owe something to our ancestors, who founded and maintained our older institutions of learning. We have no right to bind up the offerings which they laid upon the altar of higher education in the enslaving conditions prescribed by the Rockefeller Board for institutions to which it grants its humiliating doles.

In another communication I will undertake to show how this Board is interlaced with other bodies and associations, and I will endeavor to make manifest that its connections do not diminish, but do rather increase the perils arising from it. The movement to control the higher education of the nation, especially the South, is far advanced and has more than one corporation to further its ends. And they have millions back of them; but they can do nothing with their millions if the people awake to what is on hand and refuse to be bought.

THE ACTIVE ALLIES AND ULTIMATE AIMS OF "THE GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD."

Among the very extensive powers granted to the "General Education Board" by its charter is the power "to aid, co-operate with, or endow associations or other corporations engaged in educational work within the United States of America, or to donate to any such association or corporation any money or moneys" which at any time may be held by the Board. This gives it the power to do through others any thing which for any reason it might not find it convenient to do directly in its own name.

This provision was doubtless inserted in the charter to enable it to assist and use certain allied bodies already in existence and closely connected with it in history, purpose and personal composition; and to subsidize other bodies also, as occasion may require.

Very intimately related to the "General Education Board" is a rather indefinite body called the "Conference for Education in the South," which body however, can not be called a "Conference" in the strictest sense of the word; for in its proceedings there is usually small room for conferring. In its annual sessions it is mainly occupied with the hearing of addresses by selected speakers on specific topics in the fulfillment of a fixed programme, which in the very nature of the case excludes anything akin to free conference, and brings

forward only what is desired by the programme-makers. This "Conference" (if it may be called such by courtesy) has passed through a process of development since its first session at Capon Springs in 1898. It was then composed of thirty-four members, twenty of whom were ministers of the gospel, and it was called "The Conference for Christian Education in the South," being concerned primarily for the advancement of the mission schools of certain Northern Churches for the education of the negroes in the Southern states. At its second session the word "Christian" was dropped from the name, and it was called thereafter "The Conference for Education in the South," and its scope was enlarged to take hold of education for all races in the South. It began to consider Southern education as a national problem at that time. At that session or the one next following, Mr. William H. Baldwin, Jr., suggested a General Board for the strengthening of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes for the education of negroes. This seems to have been the first suggestion of a "General Education Board," when what is now called "The General Education Board" was organized, Mr. Baldwin was elected as its first president. Mr. Baldwin advocated also government aid for the education of the negroes through the medium of the General Board, and at its next session "The Conference for Education in the South" adopted a resolution calling upon the Federal

government to assist the Southern states in the work of educating the negroes and the "poorer whites" of the South. In those early sessions of the Conference such men as William L. Wilson, eagerly desiring to do everything possible for the education of our people, were present, and that very able and incorruptible statesmen opposed the resolution concerning Federal aid to education, which was in effect a proposal to revive the old "Blair Bill." On account of Mr. Wilson's opposition to it, the resolution was reconsidered and referred to an executive committee, which has never reported favorably or unfavorably upon it.

Out of the "Conference for Education in the South" has emerged also what is called "The Southern Board of Education," and "the Conference" may be regarded as the popular assembly through which it is sought to make sentiment in furtherance of the two "Boards" which have thus issued from it,—"The General Education Board" and "The Southern Education Board."

The co-operation of these two Boards was insured at the first by the appointment of seven men to membership in both, and at this time the treasurer of both Boards is the same man, and four members of the "General Board" are members of the "Southern Education Board," and Mr. Robert C. Ogden, who is the president of the "Conference for Education in the South," is chairman of the "South-

ern Board of Education" and also an influential member of the "General Education Board."

The work of the "Southern Education Board" is that of a propaganda to influence public opinion and to influence legislation with reference to the public school systems of the several states. The object of the "General Education Board," as published, is "to promote education in the United States without distinction of race, sex, or creed, and especially to promote, systematize, and make effective various forms of educational benevolence." "The General Education Board" is the heavy weight among these allied bodies; for it has the power of the purse with all that fact implies. It can make appropriations for the "Conference for education in the South" and for "The Southern Education Board." and has done so; but they have nothing to give to it except the aid of the propaganda which they constitute. This return for the Board's help, however, may mean very much on occasion. The names of leading educators of the South among the officers of these bodies, and the presence of other Southern leaders at the Conferences and on its programmes, might go a long way to forestall criticism and allay distrust while the "General Education Board" is advancing its plans to "determine the character of American education."

It is known also that the officers of "The General Education Board" and the officers of

“The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of teaching co-operate with a very good understanding between them. Mr. Carnegie is now a member of the “General Education Board,” and the comment of Mr. Rockefeller on the fact of Mr. Carnegie’s entrance into the Board is strikingly suggestive both as to the idea underlying “The General Education Board” which is endowed with the oil magnate’s gifts amounting to \$43,000,000, and the expected alliance and co-operation of the “Carnegie Foundation” which rests on some \$15,000,000 of Mr. Carnegie’s money. Mr. Rockefeller said,, “If a combination to do business is effective in saving waste and in getting better results, why is not combination far more important in philanthropic work? The general idea of co-operation in giving for education, I have felt scored a real step in advance when Mr. Andrew Carnegie consented to become a member of the “General Education Board.”

The country knows what Mr. Rockefeller means by “a combination to do business.” In the Standard Oil Co.’s dialect that phrase has meant to destroy all others engaged in the oil business, and then do as you please with the oil market. Shall we have that sort of method in educations. Dr. Washington Gladden considers Standard Oil money tainted. Shall we have tainted education also?

“The General Education Board refuses to make gifts to State educational institutions

except in the matter of professors of secondary education in certain state universities, the main function of such professors being not so much with the state universities as with high schools in various parts of the several states. This fact sufficiently evinces the aim and clearly foreshadows the ultimate results of the efforts of the "General Education Board," in so far as State universities are concerned. The Board also conducts its system of agricultural lectures in some sort of quasi-relation to State schools. Beyond these two small items, no gifts of "The General Education Board" are "intended to be given to State educational institutions."

But they do not expect to be limited to the the millions of these two magnates of the steel and oil trusts, They expect millions more. Did not Mr. Rockefeller invite others to join them when he said, "The general idea of co-operation in giving for education scores a real step in advance when Mr. Andrew Carnegie consented to become a member of the General Education Boards." Was there not here a sly hint to philanthropists? The hint might be expressed thus, "Mr. Carnegie and I have combined in the work of giving to education. Now, if anybody else in the United States is disposed to give to educational institutions and wishes to put his money where it will do the most good, let all such persons join our educational combination." What is the expressed object of the "General Educa-

cation Board?" Is it not "for the receipt and disbursement of money for educational purposes?" Mr. Robert C. Ogden in May, 1902, discussing the "Conference for Education in the South," the "Southern Education Board," and the "General Education Board", together, said, "But a million dollars for that purpose! Why, it is a mere trifle! A hundred millions could be used, and a hundred millions will be used before the work is done." Whether he was just prophesying in general, or speaking concerning purposes then in the formative and unpublished condition, but of which he had knowledge, I do not surmise. I am sure, however, that Mr. Rockefeller and his Board expect to influence other gifts to higher education, as well as to expend where they may choose the income from the huge fund which is now in their own control. In 1904 Mr. Ogden said "it is already quite important to every worthy institution seeking private aid to be registered in the office of the General Education Board." The natural inference from this is that the Board's "little coloured pins" will determine even "private aid," as well as its own gifts to a college, according as that college may or may not be "registered in the office of the Board." Can any one overstate the significance of such a menacing intimation?

And let us recall again what the *Outlook* said about the ability of the Board to control college funds which have been given by others

in the past. The *Outlook* said, "The funds it holds represents only a fraction of the amounts which it will really control; by giving a sum to an institution on condition that the institution raise an equal or greater amount, it will be able to direct much larger amounts than it possesses."

Think of what is evidently proposed! To direct its own funds, to "control" funds given in the past, and to dominate funds that may yet be raised! Here is dominion over the offerings of the dead and the gifts of the living, authority over the donations and bequests of the past, the present and the future! Truly said the *Outlook*, "Its power will be enormous; it seems as if it might be able to determine the character of American education."

Let us not imagine that the "General Education Board" will stop with controlling the colleges. Through its allied body "The Southern Education Board" it seeks to influence public opinion and direct legislation concerning the common schools. With its professorship of secondary education, tacked on the State universities, it will project its influence into the high schools of the country. With its agricultural lectureships, it will lay hold of the farmers. Then after a time, when its "Conferences for Education in the South," together with its other schemes of propagandism, have done their work, we may reasonably expect to see the old "Blair Bill" for Federal aid to education revived,—the thing that

the lamented William L. Wilson drove to cover so soon as it showed its head in one of the earlier and less rigidly programmed "Conferences."

While the "General Education Board" declines to make gifts to State colleges, Mr. Carnegie's "Foundation" equally refuses its teachers pensions to the faculties of colleges and universities under denominational control. As an "educational agency" its president proclaims that "its policy is not to pass on the merits of individuals but of colleges." It is manifest that by picking certain institutions whose professors may receive pensions from the "Carnegie Foundation" it will give great advantage to the accepted colleges over the rejected institutions, and the only way of escape for the institutions not on its list of accepted institutions will be to revise their charters and get rid of control by the churches which founded them or to make a square fight for their lives. Some colleges have been willing to deny the church parentage which gave them birth in order to get at Mr. Carnegie's fund. For example, Bowdoin college, in Maine, received years ago the endowment of one of its professorships on condition that the fund should be forfeited to another institution whenever a majority of the board of overseers ceased to be in sympathy with the Orthodox Congregational Church, and for this cause the authorities of the Carnegie Foundation held that Bowdoin was ineligible for a

place on the Carnegie pension roll. And Bowdoin has forfeited the endowment given by former friends in order to get a chance at pensions for its professors from the "Carnegie Foundation." Other colleges may follow in such a course. Still others, which will not renounce their faith, may have their professors carried off to accepted colleges by the temptation of a pension in their old age. So disestablishment may be the fate of some institutions, and death, perhaps, the fate of others.

Of course, the "General Education Board's" denial of its gifts to state educational institutions will work a disadvantage to them somewhat like that which the "Carnegie Foundation" lays on church schools, and some of the State schools may be led to seek disestablishment and disconnection from all state control in order to get the aid of "The General Board," as Bowdoin surrendered church connection to get on the "Carnegie Foundation."

Suppose now, that eventually, after many colleges have died and others have been wrested from any responsibility to state or church, "The General Education Board" and the "Carnegie Foundation" should unite on a "chain of colleges across the continent" independent of all authority or influence, except the control and influence of those two corporations endowed with the millions of Rockefeller and Carnegie; what then would

be the "character of American education" as thus "determined?"

After Federal aid to education is secured, we may expect to see started a movement to make the National Commissioner of Education a cabinet officer. Mr. Ogden, one of the leading spirits in all this movement,—who is a member of the "General Education Board," chairman of the "Southern Education Board," and for many years president of "The Conference for Education in the South," and the only man who is a member of all these three bodies,—favors Federal aid to education in the South.

Of course, with Federal aid we must submit to Federal supervision, and with that subjection accepted, why not raise the Bureau of Education at Washington to an executive department and make the Commissioner of Education a cabinet officer? Probably in such an event "The General Education Board," with its multiplied millions and national following, would have something to say about who should be chosen for the position of Secretary of Education. It could then fulfill the Outlook's forecast when that periodical said of this "General Education Board," "It can do in many ways what the government does for education in France and Germany."

"The General Education Board" in the final outcome may adopt the suggestion of Mr. Charles A. Gardiner, of New York, which is really the logical conclusion from the premise

of Federal aid to education. He advocates endowing "The National Bureau of Education with supervisory powers so that it can make education compulsory, fix the courses of study, and direct instruction in any channel—industrial, intellectual, moral, or religious—that the citizenship of any locality may particularly require."

Then, too, the school question in California with reference to the Japanese, as well as that of the South with reference to its race question, could be dealt with nationally—which I dare say many of the educational agitators, who look at the South as missionary ground calling for their altruistic evangelism, would be glad to see.

(By the way the "General Education Board" has reason to look after that Japanese issue in California; for in the published lists of its securities, as reported to the Department of the Interior at Washington under the requirement of its Federal charter, it appears that the Board holds over \$500,000 of "Imperial Japanese Government Bonds." In that list of securities also appears over \$4,500,000 of the bonds of the Steel Trust" and other interesting stocks and bonds.)

It is manifest that there is a clearly defined purpose to centralize the educational work of the country under a huge "educational system," of which "The General Education Board" will be both the author and the finisher. Such a scheme is full of perils to the

ration, and especially to the South, a section upon which the gaze of this Board is fixed as upon a helpless minor needing its guidance or a benighted sinner needing its missionary efforts. It has been by some considered unfortunate, (to state the case mildly) that Mr. Rockefeller's "Standard Oil Company" controls the character and cost of the light for the poor man's body; but that is as nothing compared with an effort to control the education of the country, which is the light for the minds of both present and future generations.

We have already concentrated wealth and a tendency to centralize the government. If now education be centralized also, and directed by a coterie of fifteen men called a "General Education Board," we may prepare to see the entire character of the American civilization, as well as the character of American education, determined for us by our masters, the trust magnates and their followers. They may consider that it is all for our good, and that they are very wise and benevolent masters, better able to direct and control the American people than are the people themselves; but one may be permitted yet to doubt that such is the case without laying one's self liable to indictment for treason.

But some will say, "What are we going to do about it? The thing is already done. Tell us how to make the best of a bad situation, which has developed before we knew it, and

in which we seem to be helplessly and hopelessly involved."

Of that phase of the subject I will speak in my next communication. For the present it is enough to say our case is not hopeless, unless our colleges can be bought with a mendicant's dole and our people can be misled by "Conference" declamations and dazzling promises of possible donations from the office in New York in which "the little coloured pins" mark the rise or fall, the life or death of colleges according as they please or displease the executive officers of the General Executive Board.

WHAT CAN BE DONE AND WILL BE

DONE

The adversities which our Southern colleges suffered during the war and the reverses they met during desolating years of the period of reconstruction have put our institutions of learning relatively far behind those of other sections in the matter of financial strength. The South has, therefore, many of the smaller institutions of the country which are hampered by narrow means, and for this cause our colleges and universities can be more easily dominated by the methods and gifts of "The General Education Board." Such universities as Harvard and Yale can not be so easily tempted with promised gifts because they are already very rich.

But while such is the case with our insti-

tutions of learning, their condition is not so nearly hopeless as to justify despair concerning them, or to excuse a mendicant attitude towards this "General Education Board" to save them. They are quite able to maintain themselves in an attitude of serene independence of "The General Education Board," "the Carnegie Foundation," and all their allies.

In the South the colleges and universities for white students, not to mention our secondary schools and the colleges for negroes, are worth above \$36,000,000. This large sum has been accumulated in the main since the war, and it has come from the contributions made by our own people struggling with their poverty, and from the gifts of such noble men as Geo. I. Seney and others of like mind, who came to our help without attaching humiliating conditions to their generous donations, or seeking to dominate our institutions by the methods of their giving. We can not hope to receive from this "General Education Board" any amount comparable with what we now have in our own right and which we administer without impertinent direction from without. Why should we allow the smaller investment of "The General Education Board" to determine the direction of the larger amount which we already have? Shall a minority stock-holder assume airs of superiority and undertake to tell us what course shall be followed in the administration of our educational funds? Shall we not say to one

who approaches us with a little wad of money and a big amount of authority, "Your money perish with you. We are abundantly able to take care of our own affairs?"

The whole attitude of "The General Education Board" towards the authorities of our colleges and universities is one of distrust. Trustees and faculties are not to be trusted "to insure the best application of money," and hence the Board's complex conditions and complicated requirements are fixed to its gifts. They can not be trusted so much as to determine the final locations upon which colleges are to stand; the Board is to "look over the whole territory of the nation" and settle where institutions shall live and where others shall die. These fifteen sages who are its managers, running over the lines described by "the little coloured pins" in the Board's office in New York, it is assumed will know better what should be done in this matter than all the boards of trustees and other college authorities in the land. They have also made up their unerring minds to the effect that the imparting of theological instruction in colleges is to be discouraged, discounted, and discredited, and that no money furnished by the Board, or raised under the stimulation of its conditional gifts, shall be used for any such unworthy purpose. Such an assumption of superior wisdom is positively sublime if it were not ridiculous.

That representatives of Southern colleges

are looked upon as a mendicant lot has been but thinly concealed by the leading spirits in this movement. Perhaps some of our college men have justified by their posture the depreciatory view entertained concerning them by their Northern patrons. One of the ardent supporters of this educational movement thus described some who flocked to the meeting of "The Conference for Education in the South" which met at Athens, Ga., a few years ago:

"Unfortunately for Southern reputation for good breeding, there was at the Athens Conference, for example, a swarm of educational and institutional mendicants who seemed to imagine that every Northern man was a millionaire philanthropist waiting to be informed about the pressing needs of the South. They disgraced themselves at the time."

If there were at Athens any considerable number of men who thus disgraced our section, the fact is a symptom of a disease among our educational authorities which can not be cauterized and cured too quickly. What must be the degrading influence upon the students of our colleges if teachers and trustees thus prostrate themselves at the feet of supercilious wealth and arrogant opulence? No degree of poverty can excuse such mendicancy. We do not need money for our colleges so badly that we can descend to such methods to obtain it.

In truth we do not need to beg anybody to pay for the education of our sons and daughters. We are quite able to attend to that matter ourselves. We have not as many rich

men and women among us as other sections have; but we have some people of means and they owe it to themselves and to their section to take the lead in endowing and equipping our colleges so as to enable them to do their work well without coming under obligations to strangers. I would not have our people of wealth to do all that is needed; it is not best for the freedom and independence of a college to come under too heavy obligations to any one man or woman. If the late Jay Gould had founded or endowed a college it would have been next to impossible to have warned successfully the students of such an institution against the evils of stock-gambling, just as the institutions which draw their support from the funds of "General Education Board" will be impotent to condemn effectively the iniquities of the Standard Oil Company or the enormities of the protective tariff from which the Steel Trust has drawn its countless millions. In the case of Prof. Bemis at the University of Chicago a few years ago the country had a sample case of what becomes of a professor of political economy whose teaching fails to agree with the views and interest of the man who founds and maintains a college all by himself. We want no such institution in the South. We want our colleges to be dependent upon the people whom they serve, and under no commanding obligation to any one man however wise and virtuous he may be.

While, therefore, our rich men and women must lead in the work of endowing and equipping our institutions of higher learning, the bulk of the great work must be accomplished by the generous co-operation of all the people. Our people of moderate means by a multitude of smaller gifts must follow the lead of our wealthier people with their larger donations in putting our colleges beyond want and beyond the temptation to mendicant subjection to the ambitious "General Education Board" striving to "determine the character of American education."

In truth it would not be best for our colleges to grow in wealth faster than the people whom they are set to serve. If one of our institutions should be made suddenly as rich as Harvard or Yale the scale of living at such a college would so quickly rise as that its benefits would be put beyond the reach of most of the people among us who seek college training for their sons. Free tuition would not offset the rise in the price of board and the increased social expense which would instantly spring from such sudden enrichment. Our colleges need help and much help, but they do not need to get above our people.

In addition to all these considerations must be enumerated another asset which we have by which our case is greatly relieved. We have self-sacrificing educators among us upon whom we may rely with confidence to spurn

all seductions which lead in the direction of enslaving our institutions of learning to the dictatorial domination of "The General Education Board." They can not be bought. Many of them are in the colleges of the churches which the methods of both "The General Education Board" and the "Carnegie Foundation" tend to depreciate and discredit. Here is a force which millions can neither buy nor vanquish.

The New York Commercial of March 8th, in commenting on the ineffectual effort of the heads of Brown University, Vanderbilt University, Kenyon College, and a dozen other institutions which were trying to get the restrictions of the Carnegie Foundation so relaxed with reference to denominational disabilities as to get on that pension fund, said, "It is significant that no Catholic-college president is among those who now seek to have the denominational restriction ignored." The explanation of this significant fact is found in a note written by the Prefect of Studies of St. John's College, Brooklyn, to the President of the 'Carnegie Foundation," in which he said:

"You will not be able to understand how this institution is maintained almost without revenue. The explanation is the self-sacrifice of twenty men who devote their lives to the work without remuneration. These men do not, as far as I know, expect any assistance from the 'Carnegie Foundation. Whether they will be eligible or not will be a matter for you to determine. In any case they will prob-

ably never accept any assistance from the Foundation."

Certainly the colleges of the Roman Catholic Church will not come under the dominion of any secular board whatsoever, however great may be its proffered gifts or however glowing may be its golden promises. Protestant institutions and the institutions of the States should note the basis of the independence of Catholic institutions and pluck up courage for the contest with the Board which seeks to "determine the character of American education." Their faculties are as rich in self-sacrifice as the faculties of Roman Catholic colleges, and with such an asset in their possession they may bid defiance to all opposition.

The hope of the country at last will be found in the small colleges which the people whom they serve support. The over-rich institutions, which have become independent of all civil and ecclesiastical oversight, are not doing the best educational work now, and they never have done it. The denominational college which these plutocratic boards so depreciate has done more for the country than all the obese and apoplectic institutions which assume to look down upon them. Of the seventeen presidents of the United States who were college men, twelve were graduates of denominational schools. So were six of the eight college men who have been chief justices on the Supreme bench of the United States.

Webster came out of Dartmouth college when it was denominational to its core, and Longfellow came out of Bowdoin before that institution renounced its faith in order to get on the "Carnegie Foundation." Hawthorne, Sydney Lanier, John Hay, Elihu Root, John C. Calhoun, Alfred H. Colquitt, L. Q. C. Lamar, and the present Secretary of State, all came from church schools. The denominational college can safely compare products with the output of any secularized or subsidized institution.

Moreover, the small colleges of both the States and the Churches have endowments in the annual gifts of their constituencies which the endowments offered by "The General Education Board" can in no wise equal. For example, the Methodists of Georgia give to Emory college annually about \$5,000, which is equivalent to the interest on an endowment of \$100,000. The State of Georgia appropriates to the University at Athens far more than this. Why should these gifts of our own people be subjected to the domination of any outside authority? Why should our educators stand like mendicants with hats in hand for small gifts from alien sources when they have such constituencies behind them. Why should we despair of our colleges, and ignobly surrender our educational independence and academic freedom for a conditional gift from the "General Education Board" or a professor's pension from the "Carnegie Founda-

tion?" Why should we barter away our birthright for a mess of pottage from the predatory trusts?

We are in no danger unless we can be bought. We are not in desperate straits unless our people are desperately mean spirited and mendicant. I can not think so ill of my people. They are not going to sell out or surrender. They are going to take care of their own colleges and preserve their own civilization. They will do this at all cost, and cost what it may our people are well able to pay the bill.

It is a time for large views and courageous self-sacrifice, for fearless fidelity and daring generosity. For one I confidently expect our people to resent any effort to allure their colleges away from them. They will both keep their colleges and care for them. Any other course would be unworthy of the traditions of the past and would dim all our hopes of the future

A DANGEROUS TENDENCY

(New Orleans Times-Democrat.)

It is to hoped that the statement given out in Atlanta by Bishop Candler of the Methodist Church, South, with regard to the General Education Board, will provoke a general discussion of the Board, its purposes and the fruits of the system under which it works. The opinions voiced by the distinguished

Methodist leader are by no means new. Criticisms of like tenor have been offered before now by others. But they gain weight and challenge a wider attention by his championship, and the movement under attack is one of those which, in our opinion, should be carefully studied and closely watched, since its possibilities for evil, if improperly influenced or directed, must be conceded to be immense.

Bishop Candler bases his objection to the system primarily upon principle. "It is not safe," he contends, "for the educational institutions of the country to be under the virtual domination of fifteen men, however pure they may imagine their intentions to be. It is such a concentration of power in the matter of the highest interest of the nation as no fifteen men, however wise and virtuous, can be trusted to exercise without abusing it for the furtherance of their own views and interests. If a college seeks and obtains these gratuities, with the Rockefeller strings to them, it must consent to be guided by the rein with which these fifteen men will drive it."

The case is here plainly stated. The fund which the General Education Board administers is largely provided by men whose interest in shaping public opinion upon certain matters of vital concern to society and to the state is very great. Whether their philanthropy serves as a cloak to attain the ends desired, or whether the plan is unselfishly conceived and the sinister influence uncon-

sciously exerted, the effect is like to be the same in the end. The gifts are hedged about by restrictions and conditions, with the Education Board to name them and to see that they are complied with. Every college which shares in the largess poses as a suppliant, in a sense. Not only is its policy partially directed by the Board, but it is additionally influenced, wittingly or unwittingly, by the desires of its benefactors. The atmosphere of classroom and campus is dangerously subject to taint; the habits of thought of its students may with comparative ease be given a twist not easily corrected. Whether the powerful engine thus created is now put to sinister uses or not, the temptation to employ it is ever present, and must inevitably grow stronger as the system gathers strength and force.

Here in the South the temptation of the colleges to seek the conditional gratuities is great because the funds available for education are small and the need of more abundant educational facilities is pressing. In struggling schools, where the problem of maintenance is difficult, the offer of aid in philanthropic guise is naturally attractive. But no college that is worthy to live can afford to surrender its independence nor submit its policies to the guidance of any oligarchy which draws its authority and owes its existence to a few excessively rich men who have, after all, a very heavy and very practical stake in

the venture. If through this agency the American colleges, or the Southern colleges can be drawn under the control or rendered subject to the influence of the rich men who support the General Education Board, it will be only a question of time when that influence may be wrongly exerted, to the deep and lasting injury of the American people. The *Times Democrat* joins Bishop Candler in the hope that "the fewest number of our Southern colleges" will ever be "so captured and controlled."

SUBSIDIZING LEARNING TO CONTROL ACADEMIC OPINION.

(From The New York Journal of Commerce.)

"A system of giving which has its own rules and customs, which is governed by principles of selection laid down in the beginning, which ramifies throughout the country and embraces especially those smaller institutions that are hampered by narrow means, is an infinitely more powerful force in the shaping of opinion than any single capitalist who makes separate and often unconditional gifts to be controlled and invested by the institutions themselves could ever be. As a mechanism for controlling academic opinion, there has perhaps never been anything in the history of education that would compare with the board system of subsidizing learning.

"Gifts to education are like campaign contributions in that they are best made in rela-

tively small amounts and from many sources. Under such circumstances they are likely to leave the recipients in position to choose their own course in matters of opinion and teaching. If they must be large, it requires greater force of character to maintain independence of thought and action. Such freedom has been lacking in too many quarters. The spectacle of a university president preaching the maintenance of some of the worst abuses of capitalism and another meekly bowing the knee to receive the money offered by those for whose acts he had but lately suggested social ostracism as a penalty is not edifying. Instances can be given in abundance where the mere prospect of an immediate gift has changed the whole current of a college administrator's thought and made him trim his sails on an entirely new tack to catch the favoring breezes of prosperity. The craze and competition for large numbers of students has greatly crippled those who would uphold the older traditions of independent economic thinking. Increasing numbers mean increasing expense in college administration and lead to growing dependence on wealth of doubtful origin. This, among other reasons, is ground for thinking the enormous benefactions of the past few years, whether as pensions, endowments or annual gifts to colleges, may put our academic thinkers into a moral strait-jacket at the same time that they are freed from the cramping influences of limited means."

**"A STEP TOWARD THE GREATEST EVIL
THAT COULD BE INFLICTED ON THE
COUNTRY."**

(Manufacturers Record, Baltimore, Md.)

The open combination of Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller in an "educational" enterprise, thus representing an aggregation of \$60,000, or \$70,000,000, which according to the same argument of the Outlook applied to one phase of it, "represent only a fraction of the amounts which it will really control," is a "real step in advance," as Mr. Rockefeller styles it. But it is a step in advance toward the greatest evil that could be inflicted upon the country. Unchecked, it will result in an education that will train coming generations away from basic principles of American life and cripple them in character.

Control, through possession of the millions massed in the Educational Trust, of two or three or four times as many millions of dollars in education makes possible control of the machinery and the methods of education. It makes it possible for the central controlling body to determine the whole character of American education, the text-books to be used, the aims to be emphasized. Operating through State, denominational, and individual systems of schools and colleges, it gives the financial controller power to impose upon its beneficiaries its own views, good or bad, and thereby to dominate public opinion in social,

economic, and political matters. For, it would dominate the source of public opinion, the educational system of the country. Only a band of angels never subject to the weaknesses of human nature would be fit to exercise such power wisely. Angels would be strong enough to resist the temptation to exercise it at all.

DEMORALIZING DEPENDENCE.

(From The Springfield Republican.)

“There are those who still hold the idea that but for these great individual fortunes and their benefactions society would be worse off than it is in educational and philanthropic work. Such a theory is wholly untenable—that the people generally cannot be trusted properly to appreciate the importance of education and other effort for the elevation of the race and the amelioration of the general conditions of living, or to contribute adequately to their support, it is only true that the people will be laggard in support of such efforts when a comparatively few towering fortunes exist, able and willing to be leaned on for these needs. Then we may expect communities and institutions to develop a mendicant attitude and turn from self-help to help from beyond which flows down as if from some superior source that is to be held in worshipful consideration. How socially demoralizing this must be no one can fail to understand.”