

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1894

I

THE RELATION OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL TO GENERAL EDUCATION

Last winter I listened to an address from a gentleman of the highest distinction connected with the educational interests of New England, on the subject of "A liberal education," of which the leading thought was that, in an ideal course of education, a young man would pass successively through three stages: first, disciplinary; second, liberalizing; third, professional or technical. According to the view presented, these three stages are passed, with us here in America, successively in the preparatory school, that is, the high school, or so-called academy; in the college; and, finally, as the name implies, in the professional school, whether of law, of medicine, of divinity, or of technology.

In the middle term or stage of this course—that is, in the college—it was the view of the speaker that the liberalizing studies should be pursued with a good deal of range as to choice of subjects, and of leisure as to the time devoted to study, to reflection, to enjoyment of work, and even to enjoyment of sport and play. Freedom, a considerable degree of freedom, involving, as was said, both liberty of choice as to the subjects of study, and leisure as to the application of the student's powers, the occupation of his mind, the use of his time, was, if not an essential of the liberalizing effect, at least a most favorable and felicitous condition.

Looking at this scheme from beginning to end, as related to the existing organization of American schools and higher

III

STUDENT CO-OPERATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNMENT

Of all the problems which colleges have had to deal with, the most difficult have had to do with college life, not with college learning. The practical genius of the Anglo-Saxon people at the very dawn of their conscious life demanded that the learning of the school and college should be a lamp to the feet of men. The learning of the cloister was well enough, but it was not the only, nor even the most important thing. It has been the pride of English schools and colleges that they have trained not merely scholars, but statesmen; that they have developed not merely men of letters, but men of affairs; that they have directed the progress of thought not more than the growth of colonies and the rule of kings. The college has existed for the state, it has sought to influence the standards of life within the state, it has realized that its graduates were to be not merely scholars, but citizens.

While it has sought to do this for the state, and has done it with conspicuous success, the college has found it difficult to assimilate the raw material constantly sent to its mills, and has at times failed in the practical management of its own temporary citizens—crude emigrants from many and often hostile homes, who have not yet reached the full standard of naturalization. During the Middle Ages so miscellaneous was the collection of students in all the great universities, and so rude were the best elements among them, that the difficulty of governing them became immense, and yet there was a thorough-going system, capable of the exertion of great repressive power, always in operation. Down to the Renaissance there were practically no students in the universities who were not in greater or less degree members of the clerical body. In one form or other they were under the domination, direct and per-

sonal, of "Mother Church," and their teachers were in every case their spiritual superiors. With the temporal power of penance, and the spiritual terrors of excommunication, in addition to the rules of various monastic orders, supported by the institution of the confessional, it would seem as though there existed a ready-made system of government adequate to all needs. But men are men, and human nature is the same in all ages. Youth is a period of vivacity and vitality. And under the conditions of life prevalent in the Middle Ages, rough and boisterous conduct, indulgence, and excess were not only natural, but were hardly deemed scandalous. The traditional warfare of town and gown not merely raged periodically, but the students were sure to take sides in the oft-recurring conflict between the organized forces of a powerful and centralized church to which they owed spiritual allegiance, and the too often disorganized impotence of a feudalized monarchy to whom they owed temporal allegiance. The result was not merely disorder, but open conflict, leading to secessions of the universities from towns where they believed themselves to have been oppressed and mistreated. Thus Bologna migrated to Verona, Paris to Oxford, Oxford to Stamford, under the hard compulsion of a pitiless feudalism in conflict with a riotous student body. A brief extract from the chronicles of the reign of Henry III, translated from Walter Map, will give a striking picture of student life in the thirteenth century. "At that time the lord legate went to Oxford. The scholar clerks sent him an honorable present in the shape of meat and drink, before breakfast. After breakfast they went to his lodging to call and pay their respects. On their arrival an Italian porter, with improper and untimely jesting, opened the gate a little and bawled out after the Roman manner, 'What do ye want?' whereto the clerks replied, 'To pay our respect to the lord legate.' For they felt sure that they would receive honor in return for honor. But the porter replied with taunts, and in wanton pride and abuse refused them all admittance. On seeing this the clerks made a rush and got in; the Romans wishing to keep them back struck them with their fists and sticks;

while the contending parties were bandying blows and abuse, a poor Irish chaplain, who was standing at the kitchen door, happened to earnestly beg for something in God's name, as poor and hungry men will do. The master of the legate's cooks heard him, but paid no heed, and being annoyed with the poor man, threw in his face some hot water from the caldron in which rich meat was being cooked. At this wrong a clerk from the Welsh border cried out 'Shame! that we should put up with this,' and drawing a bow which he carried—for as the tumult increased some of the clerks had snatched up arms that came to their hands—he discharged an arrow which pierced the cook, whom the clerks satirically called 'Nabuzaradan,' which means Chief of the Cooks. When he fell dead, an uproar arose, at which the legate, overcome with amazement and excessive fright, which may befall even the most steadfast, took refuge in the church tower, having on his canonical hood, and had the doors closed behind him. When the approach of darkness had put an end to the tumult, the legate laid aside his canonicals and mounted his best horse in haste; and under the guidance of those who were acquainted with the less known fords, with much danger crossed the river at the nearest point, that he might the more quickly fly to the protection of the king's wings."

It was out of such conditions as these, and the monastic ideals to which they gave birth, that the system of government common to the English universities sprang up. The life of Oxford, in my own student days, was one of the best examples of the survival, not of the fittest, but of the most unfit. In my judgment it was a striking anachronism. We lived in beautiful old Gothic buildings, arranged in series of quadrangles, communicating with each other by narrow passageways, some of which were closed by iron gateways, and shut in from the outside world by barred windows wherever the buildings formed the external front, or by high walls rendered unscalable by iron spikes and railings where the beautiful gardens extended beyond the walls, while the great entrance was closed by a massive gateway only to be entered by a little

wicket between the hours of 9 P. M. and 8 A. M. Inside this walled and barred retreat, the most minute report of the conduct of the inmates was daily formulated and placed on file. He who was out after the hour of nine paid a fine proportionate to the hour of his return in order to be admitted. He who had a guest who left his college later than that hour paid a corresponding fine that his friend might be allowed to return to his own college. In every way the student felt that the college was *in loco parentis*, the parent which the college represented being of a peculiarly suspicious temperament, and well assured that no opportunity for misconduct would be missed by his *quasi* son. And yet within these colleges from time immemorial has existed a spiritual relationship as sweet and as strong as has ever existed between teacher and taught, between master and disciple, or between parent and son—existed, I have sometimes thought, not because of the restraint imposed upon the younger, but despite it—and all the while both master and pupil have found their self-reliance, their independence, and their self-assertion limited and atrophied by the feeling that they lived beneath so parental a system that effort and anxiety for their own usefulness were unnecessary; while, on the other hand, a more aggressive class, not used to having others think and act for them, have constantly chafed under the restraints of a home that was made a prison and the harshness of a life that, in being made too easy, was made to antagonize the dogged determination of English blood to think and act for itself.

If we turn to the German universities, we are met by a great contrast. The student body, instead of being gathered into colleges under a strict and too careful regimen, are turned out into the world without any special care or attention. Here, as in the English universities, it is true that the authorities of the university have jurisdiction of public offenses committed by students, and that as the Vice Chancellor holds a court in England, so the Rector holds his court in Germany. But the German student goes and comes at his own sweet will. He keeps no chapels, his lecture attendance is a matter of

form rather than of requirement, no inquiry is made into his manner of life unless he comes in conflict with the city officials. Then he is brought before the city courts only to plead his university privileges and to have his case referred to the university court. The outcome is that for a time he will be put into what is supposed to be solitary confinement, in a room, or rooms, set apart for that purpose, usually on the top-most floor of the university building. The spell of seclusion is easily broken by a small fee paid to his jailer, and the prisoner, if at all popular, will make merry with his friends during the greater part of the time that his confinement lasts, enjoying such eatables and drinkables as his friends may see fit to provide. Scarcely any more riotous scene is conceivable than an afternoon reception of a popular student in confinement.

What a contrast is presented by the careful nightly promenade of the Oxford proctor inquiring into the presence or absence of cap and gown on students out for perfectly legitimate purposes, with the processions to and from opera, theater, and concert hall constantly to be seen in any German university town! And yet it is probable that the order in the one institution is neither better nor worse than in the other.

The fact appears to be that conduct is largely a matter of temperament, training, and temptation. The Oxford system has to contend with the more assertive British temperament, the more aggressive British training, and also itself, by exercising too great repression, throws constant temptation in the way of students. In importing the British system of education, our ancestors in many respects copied, not the English, but the Scotch, type.

Retaining the dormitory system, they did not retain the remnants of monastic order, and, while establishing a definite system of government, rendered necessary by the early age at which the students of a century ago began their college course, they rather embraced the spirit than copied the form of college rule. Its theory was still parental. It was almost universally required that one or more tutors should reside in every college building. But it usually stopped there. And,

wherever the tutor was possessed of a liberal spirit and kept himself in close touch and sympathy with college life, the arrangement was usually successful. It was often found, however, that a tutor of poor judgment provoked more dissatisfaction and disorder than he prevented by his official authority. Yet the system of tutorial presence, if not supervision, in the dormitory is still popular. It exists in a great many colleges which have the dormitory system, and, by a large proportion of college officials, is regarded as desirable, if not essential. The most important purpose which these inmates of the college buildings served was that, by learning the drift of college sentiment, they often brought the governing body to recognize it. And in this is to be found the key to the best college government in our own country during the present century: a careful inquiry into college sentiment and the prompt correction of it when misled, or an equally prompt recognition of it when in the right. For, as the students have increased in age, and as the self-consciousness of modern life has grown, the sober judgment of the great majority of students, influenced more and more by the various expressions of public opinion, especially that voiced by the press, has become more and more worthy of consideration. Youth, which is always sensitive, has become critical as well. And as new institutions, often of state foundation, with larger liberty, have grown up in close neighborhood with the older colleges sometimes based upon methods evolved from older American ideals, but deeply influenced by new conditions largely derived from the study of German universities, the older colleges have had to reckon with a spirit of independence, self-reliance, and push generated by these new student bodies, keenly alive to the freedom of life in cities and large towns. More and more the colleges have drifted into a condition of anarchy tempered by good feeling, and the student body has been free to do what it would, except for temporary and sometimes violent assertions of authority in the face of external acts of lawlessness.

This lawlessness, of which we have heard much in the past

year, has largely been the result of old and evil traditions generated by the recklessness of boyhood under the restraints of the older methods—a recklessness which has not diminished in proportion as greater freedom has been secured. These traditions survive in those which separate class and class, in those which dishonor our young manhood, as well as violate good order, in hazing, in cane rushes, and similar performances; in the old antagonism of town and gown, and various other disorderly acts without excuse in any seat of learning, and especially in colleges which have no roots in the distant past, when these things were the unhappy attendants of an unrefined condition of life.

The problem before us is, how to develop a new theory of government which shall remove the temptations which periodically appear, and regulate, as simply and as nearly automatically as possible, our college life. This problem involves a complete recasting of our views of what college life is and ought to be. It demands a recognition of the student as a free agent, the complete abandonment of ideas drawn from feudalism and despotism, and the fundamental recognition of the facts (1) that students, when they enter college, assume certain definite obligations in the form of a simple contract; (2) that in the great majority of cases they are young men of earnest purpose, with a well-defined object in view; (3) and that, if given an opportunity to choose between right and wrong under natural conditions, they will almost inevitably choose the right. On the other hand, it must be recognized with equal clearness that the college is not a shop to which men may come and purchase what they wish in just the quantity they wish without reference to utility and a rational object. The college, as represented by its teaching body, is to lead; it is to direct men to truth; it is to provide a carefully-ordered and well-adjusted course, and all who enter the college must be guided and directed within certain well-defined limits to the ends which they themselves have chosen. And in the second place, it must be clearly recognized that the student body is immature, that its judgment is undeveloped, that it is subject to freaks

and fancies, and must be protected against its own ill-considered judgments. As a corollary to these two propositions, it may be further said that, in the discipline of the college, it may well be recognized that it is important to develop a thorough-going habit of self-command and self-control as a part of the mental and moral discipline which intellectual training provides, and to this end nothing is more important than education in the forming of concrete judgments, and in making a rational choice between conflicting courses of conduct as presented by questions involving social and governmental action even on a small scale.

Thus societies and clubs often afford that training for public life which in the old New England town was received in the town meeting, and men learn in private affairs the art of executive management with which they afterward may serve the state, and so they may learn in college government the fundamental principles of co-operation and self-control in social and political relations which they will afterward need as citizens.

Certain of our colleges have already adopted a co-operative system by which the students have a definite and extensive part in college discipline. Others have only gone so far as to assign the regulation of such questions as examinations, which present peculiar temptations to some students, to the student body; and, thirdly, other institutions have regulated their dormitories by a so-called "house-system," whereby the inmates of each house are permitted to control the affairs of their dormitory, even to the extent of electing its inmates. The Amherst system is the best illustration of the first of these. Princeton and Cornell have satisfactorily made trial of the second, while the University of Chicago is the best known exponent of the third. There are, however, in none of them any peculiarities or complex conditions which need to be especially explained. Everything turns on the simple question as to whether student co-operation is desirable, and, if desirable, possible.

That student co-operation is desirable is now very generally admitted among younger members of faculties. It is prac-

tically universally conceded that from seventy-five to ninety per cent. of the students have the interest of the college quite as much at heart as the faculty or trustees. The intense self-consciousness of modern college life, paraded as it is before the public in the daily and weekly press, has given the average student a keen desire to promote the reputation of the institution to which he belongs. The great difficulty lies, first, in giving expression to this college sentiment, and, second, in eliminating the occasional acute activity of a few unruly spirits out of sympathy with the purpose for which colleges exist, and unfit to enjoy their privileges or to bear their responsibilities. The community, from whatever point of view we may look at it,—political, moral, or religious,—has always been the victim of such a class. The object of college discipline, viewed from the standpoint of such men, has come to be looked upon as one in which punishment is the principal thing, while the real object of college discipline is to protect the residue of the college family from the misconduct and the evil report engendered by these few. Yet even to these men the college owes an obligation. The college cannot, any more than can the state, execute the highest penalties of the law upon men who merely throw themselves athwart the purposes of the state. The college ought occasionally to suppress men merely as public nuisances, a function once frequently exercised upon a higher plane by a bill of attainder. But the college, by also acting under contract, must be careful how it acts, especially in the absence of a well-proved concrete case. This care should be in direct proportion to the demand which it makes upon the students for a thorough recognition of the responsibility which they assume in their initial contract at matriculation. Give the seventy-five or more per cent. of students a voice in the determination of college conduct, teach them how to use that voice, encourage them to think that it is their reputation and the reputation of their college that is at stake, and, by an energetic public opinion, they will more effectively suppress the disorderly element than any law that can be applied can ever do. This will be an education which will give them a

deeper interest, both as students and alumni in their *alma mater*, and will also be an important factor in their education as citizens.

How this can be accomplished is not an easy question to answer broadly, and yet specifically it should not be difficult. One thing must be well guarded—the ideals of government must be kept in the hands of the faculty, and such a representation must be secured for these ideals as will make them the standard toward which the whole system tends; and, in the second place, care must be taken to prevent what is not infrequent in college life, as it is common in public life, the possibility of the overweening influence in college councils of demagogues. In my own student days, I have known a student agitator, of shrewd and unscrupulous political capacity, to keep the whole college in hot water for weeks together over some fancied grievance which he was able from time to time to exaggerate into a general conspiracy against the welfare of his fellow-students. I shall not undertake to outline any specific plan. So far as my own experience and inquiry have extended, I believe the Amherst plan to be the most successful thus far formulated. But Amherst has been fortunate in having to do with the descendants of a singularly earnest and law-abiding people. Other colleges must work upon less easily repressed and less homogeneous material, and yet I believe in this, as in all relations between student and faculty, that the fundamental principle is the same, and one that can be safely acted upon—the utmost mutual trust in the oneness of purpose of student and teacher, and the sincere confidence of each in the devotion of all to the institution to which they equally own allegiance.

ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,
EASTON, PA.