

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

No. 60.—OCTOBER, 1902.

I.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF FAITH.

EVERY intelligent reader of the Scriptures has observed how much they have to say about faith; how prominent a place they give it amongst the other graces of the Spirit. They say we are united to Christ by faith; that we are justified by faith; that we live by faith; that we walk by faith; that we are sanctified by faith; that we are saved by faith. They thus give to faith a prominence and ascribe to it an efficiency such as are asserted of no other grace in the long catalogue of the graces. As grand summaries of their teaching on this subject, they say, "According to your faith be it unto you;" "without faith it is impossible to please him;" "he that believeth shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

There are many, however, who do not understand why it is that so much is thus said about this grace, and why there is ascribed to it so much importance in the plan of salvation. They think there is something strange about it; something arbitrary; something that needs explanation; something that very much needs explanation; something that is derogatory to religion in the view of the intelligent; for, as they suppose, the faith so much insisted on is, to some extent at least, a blind faith, an unintelligent faith, an unreasoning, and therefore an unreasonable, faith; and so a faith that inevitably brings about a conflict between itself and reason, and thus forces the intelligent into the dilemma of choosing in religion whether they will be controlled by knowledge or by ignorance; by reason or by mere credulity. There can be no doubt that there are many who

IV.

THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGES AND THE HIGHER EDUCATION.¹

It has become somewhat the fashion to speak in depreciatory terms of the denominational colleges. They are represented as incapable of doing the work of higher education, as behind the times, as out of sympathy with the so-called "new education," as obstructions in the way of higher attainments in learning and greater value in academic degrees. This tone of disparagement has been noted almost everywhere, but especially in the great gatherings of public teachers, and has become more or less popular. The public press, too ready to ally itself with anything that savors of a criticism of things ecclesiastical or denominational, has echoed and reinforced the effort to decry. Like many other fashions, this one will soon pass. The sober second thought of wise people will recognize and appreciate the facts, and will recoil from anything that appears to be a low estimate of that educational effort which for ages was all that the world possessed, which stimulated and developed our present secular institutions, and which must, from the very nature of things, continue to be a powerful factor in the higher training of the masses of the people.

It shall be the aim of this paper to set forth the facts, that they may speak for themselves. These will show that the day has not yet come when the denominational colleges may be safely retired or ignored; that they have done too much to lay the foundations of higher education and make it what it is to-day to yield readily to the thoughtless clamor against them. In the consideration of their relation to the higher education there will be no intended disparagement of the principles or methods

¹ A paper read before the Southern Educational Association, Richmond, Va., December, 1900.

or results of the other institutions. These, whether founded by individual enterprise and philanthropy, or by civic or State organizations, have their work to do, which none others can do, and are indispensable. When they are alluded to in this discussion, it will be only to emphasize the importance of certain lines of work which, in the very nature of the case, they may not pursue, and with equal regard to the fact that there are lines of work which the secular institutions alone can accomplish, and from which the denominational institutions must scrupulously abstain.

The past of denominational education, with its history, its conditions, its marvellous results in maintaining education, its stimulation of men's minds, need not be traversed. No more need be said of it than this: that but for the faithfulness of the church to her trust, in an uninterrupted series, not of years, nor of decades, nor even of generations, but of centuries, the world would not have to-day that wide-spread knowledge, that intellectual ambition, that consciousness of the needs of mankind, that impulse that has formulated itself in public institutions of all grades, which make this closing week in the nineteenth the most brilliant in the educational history of the world. The debt which mankind owes to denominational effort can never be paid. For ages no other effort was made. Men may not lightly esteem that past which has given the glorious present. It will be sought now to show that they may not judge that it is only a past which denominational education may claim, but that the principles underlying its work are living yet and active yet. Practical inquiry among the secular institutions will reveal the fact that most of the leading men, and most of the leading ideas in them, have been imported from the denominational institutions. And why? Because principles are unchanging; because, while education may advance, change, expand, enlarge, there are certain stages or aspects of it, even up to the verge of professional training, which are as invariable as are the methods at a mother's knee or the influences of a father's life and will upon his growing son. What a mother and father have done in the past they will continue to do. In the same manner, what the denominational institutions have effected for growing youth they will still effect.

As to the number, sufficiency of equipment, and adequacy of means, the denominational institutions are a tremendous factor, the equal of the undenominational, in the higher education. Avoiding mere details and tables of figures, take simply the summary of them. According to the best statistics attainable, there are four hundred and eighteen institutions in the United States professing to do the work of the higher education. Of these, two hundred and eighty-one, or sixty-seven per cent., are denominational. One hundred and thirty-seven, or thirty-three per cent., are what may be called the secular institutions. Of the total number it may be granted that very many are unworthy of the name of college or university, and are doing evil to the cause rather than good; but it is no less a fact that there are fewer denominational institutions that have thus only a name to live, and only a pretence to their work, than there are such among the undenominational. Taking a productive endowment of one hundred thousand dollars each as a minimum for worthy work in the higher education, it will be found that of the secular schools which do not possess this amount the proportion is fifty-one per cent., and of the denominational schools which do not possess this amount the proportion is only thirty-eight per cent. There are, all told, one hundred and seventy-nine institutions of both classes whose endowment is one hundred thousand dollars and upwards. A careful investigation of the actual income of all the institutions shows that about the same number have an annual income of twenty thousand dollars and more. Of these one hundred and seventy-nine, one hundred and nine, or sixty-one per cent., are denominational. Of the one hundred and nine thousand students enrolled last year in these one hundred and seventy-nine colleges and universities, forty-three per cent. were in those called denominational; or, if we subtract the registration of the twelve most largely attended State universities, such as those of Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and others, where professional students make up the bulk of the enrollment, and whose numbers reach nearly twenty-six thousand, a percentage of fifty-six will be found in the denominational colleges. Of the one hundred and fifty-four million dollars of productive

endowment of the one hundred and seventy-nine institutions named, thirty-six per cent., or, if we omit the endowment of the same twelve indicated above, forty-eight per cent. will be found in the denominational institutions.

From these statistics it will be seen at a glance that the day has not yet come when the denominational institutions may be safely dispensed with, or relegated to a lower plane of work, or assigned an insignificant place among the forces that make for the intellectual development of our land. On the contrary, their number, their students, and their endowments alike indicate that they are doing, and that they are capable of doing, a work immeasurable in its results and power. By their location, widely diffused in all parts of the land; by their number, far surpassing the number of the secular institutions; by their attendance, largely exceeding that of the others, and furnishing to those others a great proportion of their material for technical and professional training; by their accessibility to the masses of student material, by the economy of their administration and the comparative inexpensiveness of travelling and attending them, they offer, especially to the poorer classes of the intellectually ambitious, opportunities which can be found nowhere else. They are doing a large amount of genuine work, and on a smaller capital than the other class.

In respect to the primary end of their existence, as compared with the secular institutions, the denominational colleges and universities are an indispensable factor in the problem of higher education. Founded by the churches, their ultimate object is not merely intellectual development, but intellectual development as a means to an end, and that end the highest known, viz., the upbuilding of character in man. Character and manhood are the supreme need, as they should be the supreme end, of society. Man-making should be the end of all disciplinary and educational processes. More than the others, the denominational colleges seek, as the ultimate object of their work, that elevation of character of which a cultured mind is but a part. They endeavor to impart their education under such conditions as to make the all-round man. Founded as they are, they can legitimately do this work,

and they have done it, as witness the products everywhere. But the secular or general schools may not do this. Their aim is purely intellectual, with only so much of the moral training as comes from the intellectual apprehension of ethics, or under restraints which will secure the behaviour of the student that he may attend uninterruptedly to his intellectual duties. The denominational institutions may try to have all their students face the right way, but the denominational can legitimately try to make them go that way. A study of the rolls of the alumni of the denominational institutions will reveal the fact that this great aim has been accomplished. The very lists themselves will thrill the heart of every patriot and of every lover of education. The highest and noblest and best in all that enters into human society, in culture, thought, philosophy, government, religion, and statecraft, has sprung from this rich and fruitful source. The very leaders themselves of the secular education have been drawn from the denominational schools. That the secular schools feel their lack in this respect as compared with their sister institutions, is indicated by the struggle which some of them are earnestly making to maintain, in some sort of connection with themselves, and yet necessarily apart from their regular work, classes for religious culture, as Young Men's Christian Associations, classes for Bible study and lectures, and the like. As Dr. Thornwell, the South's greatest advocate of State institutions, put it, "The great problem to be solved in this country is the introduction of religion, the whole religion of the Bible, into public institutions of learning. That problem must be solved, or the church will be driven to establish institutions of her own."

The powers usually governing the two classes of institutions indicate that the denominational schools must be here to stay. They are dominated by the Christian sentiment and the church authorities of the land. This sentiment is a constantly rising and prevailing one. It must hold its principles and work with a firmer, and ever firmer, grasp. Its changes are all progressive, or in the line of advancement. The secular institutions, on the contrary, are more or less influenced by political environment or the changes about them. It is well-nigh impossible to eliminate

al element from the State institutions, and to secure that impartial support and freedom in opinion and work they are entitled. The temptation to small politicians, to meddle, to tinker, is too great to be resisted. It is a sad sight to witness how assiduously many university officials must needs wait upon legislatures and legislators to secure the universities' permanent interests and to guard against constantly proposed legislation which will affect them. And too frequently it is a fact that freedom of opinion on debated questions is qualified by the matter of tenure of office, and that teachers and opinions must reflect pot-house politics. All honor to those, and they are the overwhelming majority, whom we see rising above these influences and facing their duty, though it cost them their official heads.

As to the methods of higher education, the denominational colleges and universities are indispensable. While some of the institutions of this class give technical instruction, and offer the best training to specialists, and while some of the secular institutions embrace in their organization the best features of the curriculum, or other opportunities for general culture, it is nevertheless true that in the main the denominational institutions are engaged in giving general culture, or a liberal education, while the others, especially the great universities, are pressing more and more towards technical, special, and professional education. From the very nature of the case, the work of the latter must be, in the main, spectacular and pragmatic. It must be in such form as to show practical, tangible, measurable and ponderable results. It must have something to show, in order to satisfy the tax-payer from whom the appropriation comes. The masses do not appreciate general culture. They demand something they can see. The work of the denominational institutions is, as a rule, basal, fundamental, broad. To-day, were these abolished, the great bulk of the work of the general kind would be eliminated from the higher education. Can this be afforded? Can the drill and discipline of the essential features of the general culture course be dispensed with, if we would have vigorous minds and high thinking for the later development of the special course? Can there be any true

ability along special lines without that broad culture which will enable the student to grasp the truth in its manifold relations? Does special work, severed from liberal culture, develop the mind or enlarge its capacity? It is said that in the factory a single pin passes through the hands of sixteen men, each one of whom does his part upon it before it is ready for the market. How much of power can that man develop who tends one of these machines a lifetime, or what can he become in the way of breadth of thought? Specializing without adequate previous training, or the acquisition of a previous liberal education, is the curse of the day. It dwarfs the intellect, narrows the horizon, and, by a shortening of the radius of a man's activity and power, reduces him to a mere machine. The man of broad culture is the one who becomes the thinker of his age; the man of special culture becomes, perhaps, the actor. But the thinker is infinitely superior, even though he be only a theorist, a dreamer. Jacob's brethren once exclaimed, "Behold, this dreamer cometh," but the dreamer was Joseph, and in later years they felt and acknowledged his power. The thinker delves into the mines of truth and brings up their hidden treasures, while the actor in most cases stays upon the surface and merely handles what the other has brought forth. The typical denominational college affords this liberal culture. It is no wonder that from it come the finest specimens of specialists or technical students, who afterwards adorn the typical secular institutions. Carlyle has well said that "the college is only a key to a library." In the fashion of the day, and in the multiplied opportunities now afforded for special training, the great practical bulwark against the danger of losing sight of that general culture and broad thinking which make the best minds is the denominational college. The training along special lines, sometimes begun in the very kindergarten stage, the attempt to adapt studies and work to the supposed bent of the individual mind before that mind has had proper drill and culture, and liberal training, and discipline and practice, is mental murder. "Education along the line of least resistance" is a fashionable notion. It is none the less a travesty; nay, a crime. Against it the denominational colleges are the chief defence.

In this connection, it may be added that even the special training of the secular schools, if wisely effected, depends upon the previous work, practically up to maturity, accomplished in a liberal education. Specialization is, in its last and proper analysis, differentiation. The student first amasses a store of facts. Out of this he gathers certain ones that are somewhat related. From the latter he rises to the next step of the pyramid, and brings together those that are more closely allied. From these he reaches another and narrower plane, and at last arrives at the apex, the specialty. In the ascent each higher course rests upon the broader beneath it. These lower, broader courses are laid most largely to-day in our denominational schools.

In this connection, too, emphasis may again be laid upon the fact that from this difference of aim there comes a difference in the cost of an education, which is no insignificant element in the solution of the problem of higher education for the masses. Technical and special education is invariably more expensive than general education, and must be so. The drill must be more individual and specific, the apparatus for experimentation must be more costly, the location of the institutions must be at distant points, and in communities where living is most expensive, and for all these the student must pay. The result is that the cost of the training is far greater than that in general education. Thus it comes about that even in the free State institutions, as well as in the larger secular institutions, such as Harvard, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, and others, the sons of the rich are chiefly the ones who profit by their elaborate equipment for special work, except in those cases, and they are comparatively few, where scholarships are given and young men are practically sustained in their work. On the contrary, the denominational institutions are able to offer their general training at a very much lessened cost. They are located near to the sources from which they draw their material, lessening the cost of travel. From their usual environment, they offer less temptation to extravagance in tastes, dress, and living. In many other ways they invite a larger number of the sons of the poor to avail themselves of the advantages of the higher education. The larger university, the expensiveness of which is usually

in proportion to its endowment, is largely for the sons of the rich ; the church college for the sons of the poor. The church colleges are to-day actually giving, in the Christian spirit, more to higher education in free education than all others. It is a rare thing for any one of them to turn away from its doors any young man who is worthy and prepared.

As to the character, *personnel*, and equipment of their teachers, the denominational colleges must continue to have a large place in education. These institutions seldom offer as large pecuniary remuneration as the others, but they have a force from which it is worthy of note that the others are wont to draw whenever they can, in their search for the ablest teachers. The instructors in them are usually animated by a high and noble spirit. "Meat, medicine, and money" are not their object, nor yet the mere pleasure or ambition of the mind. As a rule, they are devoted to a cause, rather than to mere intellectual exercise. They are chosen for their character and religion, no less than for their intellectual power and equipment. They have the power which comes from an end beyond mere mental acquisition on their own part or mere educing of powers on their students' part. They recognize education as a means to an end, and that end not merely worldly, but moral and spiritual. That end being with them from both conviction and conscience an exalted one, its loftiness has a reflex effect upon themselves, and makes them more and more zealous in the effort to accomplish the work set before them, and the more industrious in preparing for it. With them duty is a greater stimulus than intellectual ambition. They thus become the best teachers in the world. There are scores of men to-day amongst the most eminent teachers who have been offered flattering inducements to leave the denominational colleges and take places in others, who have declined the enticing calls, and, for conscience' sake and their work's sake, have remained in the more poorly remunerative sphere. In the secular institutions, on the contrary, and especially in the State institutions, offices are held sometimes as the result of political favoritism, or are bestowed for purposes of policy. A case of the latter recently occurred, where it was notorious that the controlling board felt that it must

fill a vacant professorship from a certain quarter of the State which up to that time had not been represented in the faculty! In the same institution, and it is one of the best, another vacancy must needs be filled by none but a Baptist, because, forsooth, there was at that time a smaller representation in the faculty of that body than of other religious denominations.

In the denominational colleges alone certain studies can be legitimately pursued which are essential to the higher education of men, and without which a man is to-day really not a scholar of the highest type. Among these studies are ethics and sociology. True, there are ways of approaching these subjects in the secular colleges. But there is no true study of them apart from the sources and authority from which their principles spring, in the will of a divine Law-giver, and in the giving and adaptation of a divine revelation as a medium of bestowing the knowledge and authority. This source and this authority can be traced and studied and philosophized over nowhere else but in the institutions which recognize and appreciate them. Let it be carefully understood here that it is not of peculiar denominational propagandism that we are speaking, but of a totally different and more important thing, viz., the culture of youth on the basis of revealed religion.

And again, the study of that which above all else has made our English literature and our English civilization—the Bible, the word of God—can be properly pursued, or pursued at all, only in the denominational institutions. If studied at all in the secular schools it must be solely as literature and scrupulously apart from its religious features, except perhaps in their historical aspects. In the discussion of the use of the Bible in public institutions, the argument is largely on the side of those who oppose its introduction. The free-thinker or atheist has a right to protest against it in the institution which he sustains. But all believers, and they form the mass of the educators and of the educated people, regard something else besides literature and history as the chief subjects of that book, and as the secret of the wonderful part which that book has played in the life and work of mankind, and even in its literary results. The secret of its sway and power

is its spiritual relation to men. It comes from a divine source. It teaches the principle of a life imparted by supernatural gift. To study it without these facts in view is to study the bare facts of a science without regard to the philosophical principles by which they are related or out of which they grow. It is to attempt to know a system without knowing its reason or philosophy.

In view, then, of these facts it may safely be concluded that the day of the denominational college has not passed. These institutions are yet, and will continue to be, a force in the educational world. Their number, equipment, endowment, and attendance show them to be the equal in outward importance and promise of their sister institutions. Their primary aim is that which is the supreme end of society. Their government secures them freedom from injurious molestation. Their methods meet and fill the great want in mental discipline and intellectual development. Their opportunity, especially with the poor, is beyond measure. Their instructors are animated and inspired by the loftiest possible motives. They appeal to the highest instincts and sentiment in the human heart and mind, man's religious nature. The subjects which they teach in connection with the higher education, and which they alone can fully and legitimately teach, are vital in their nature and in their bearing upon true education. That they fall short of the accomplishment of all these ends and in the work to be done goes without saying, but so do the others as well in their specific end. With all their defects, and with all their shortcomings, and with all their need to know more and to do better, they are here to stay.

GEORGE SUMMEY.

Clarksville, Tenn.