

The Independent

Published Weekly

VOL. LII

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUG. 2, 1900

No. 2696

Survey of the World.

No Gold Democratic Ticket

The national committee of the Gold Democratic party at its meeting in Indianapolis on the 25th ult. decided by unanimous vote that it would be unwise and inexpedient to put up a ticket. A committee appointed at a meeting of a few Independents in New York—consisting of John J. Chapman, Robert Weidenmann and Thomas M. Osborne—urged the Gold Democrats to take the opposite course, but after thorough discussion it appeared that only two members, Mr. Woodbury, of New Hampshire, and Mr. Ehrich, of Colorado, were in favor of nominations. The vote of the committee was 26 to 1, and it was made unanimous upon the dissenting member's motion. Whereupon Mr. Chapman and his associates issued a proclamation declaring that the committee had brought the usefulness of the Gold Democratic organization to an end, attacking both the great parties, and calling a mass convention in Indianapolis on the 14th inst. to nominate a ticket or to co-operate in the nomination of one with the American Anti-Imperialist League, which is to have a convention in that city on the 15th. These men from New York are not affiliated with the League, but prefer to be known as Independents. At the meeting of the Gold Democratic committee W. N. Haldeman, of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, withdrew from the Executive Committee and the organization, having gone over to Bryan, and being greatly moved by sympathy for the Boers and by disapproval of the present Government's friendly relations with

England. Mr. Ehrich also withdrew, and will vote for Bryan. The committee issued an address in which voters were urged not to be deceived by the plea that the money question has been finally settled. An impression prevailed that a large majority of those identified with the organization would vote for McKinley, altho a considerable number of men in Indiana known as Gold Democrats in 1896 have joined Bryan's party. In New York Tammany has ratified the action of the Kansas City Convention at a meeting which adopted resolutions describing the Republican administration as "silent and cowering in the shadow of England's throne," and undertaking to "wage unceasing warfare against Trusts," the most prominent supporters of these sentiments in the meeting being Mr. Croker, Mr. Carroll and the Van Wycks, whose large holdings of Ice Trust shares were recently disclosed by the courts. Mr. Bryan says that in his notification speech "imperialism will be the only question dealt with at any length," because he thinks it is paramount now, as silver was paramount four years ago.

Race Riots in New Orleans

The immediate cause of the race riots of last week in New Orleans was the killing of two policemen by a negro named Robert Charles, who had recently come to the city from some town in Mississippi. The movements of Charles and his associate, Leonard Pierce, excited the suspicions of the police. On Monday night the two negroes were accosted by three policemen and

The Conspiracy Against the College.

By Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.,

PRESIDENT OF LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.

THE year 1900 has been marked by two very important events in the field of higher education. The first of these was the formal announcement by President Eliot of Harvard University in his annual report that by the "progressive diminution" of the number of courses required for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, that degree could now be taken in three years instead of four. The second was the award by President Harper of the University of Chicago of a quasi-degree in the form of a publicly conferred certificate on certain students who had pursued their studies for but two years in the university.

The significance of these events lies in the fact that they mark the culmination of one phase of the assault on the once conceded position of the American College and the beginning of a new phase.

There was a time when the college was dominant in the American system of education. The college by the weight of its corporate force, the position of its professors, and the support of its alumni easily outweighed all other influences. It had a well defined position and it filled its place. It was distinctly the home of higher education. Its aim and object was the development of the intellectual powers and the formation of character. Its entrance requirements were, properly enough, practical rather than ideal, and largely determined by the ability of the schools and academies to prepare students for admission to college. Partly because of this, but partly also because of a sound conception of the field of higher education, their earlier years were largely occupied with studies of a distinctly disciplinary nature. Out of these years gradually expanded the rich flower of college teaching, the broad and comprehensive training in moral, mental and material philosophy, in history and other branches, inadequate in quantity to enable a student to pretend to mastery in any department, but adequate both in quantity and quality to enable even the

less able students to estimate justly the world in which they live and their capacity for usefulness in it. Above all, the college has prepared men by its moral influence to be strong men, men conscious of their debt to society, men capable of justly estimating the value of work done by others in widely different spheres, men aware of their obligations as educated men to themselves, their country and their God.

Nothing has more nobly testified to the efficiency of the college than the affection which it has awakened in its graduates. The love of the American college graduate for his *alma mater* is almost unheard of elsewhere. Its one great parallel is to be found in the love of Englishmen for—not their university, but their school, for Eton, Harrow and Rugby. A distinguished English scholar once said to me: "You Americans love your universities. We don't; we love our schools; it is there our characters are formed." He put his finger on a great fact. He was confused, as too many are, by our false nomenclature. Americans have always loved their colleges (and are not Eton and Rugby colleges, too, in name, tho more correctly classed as public schools?), and not their universities; and they have loved them precisely for the reason assigned, that in them their characters have been formed.

It was the introduction of the university idea into the American college that began the mischief; it is the forcing of the university idea to its legitimate conclusion that is threatening the very existence of the college. And the two factors in the movement are the few more aggressively radical universities at the one end, and the growing number of rich and ambitious preparatory schools at the other.

The university idea was full of a much needed demand for more vigor and more breadth in the work of the higher education. It gave courage to those who realized the need of doing away with stereo-

typed methods of teaching and hide-bound devotion to certain books and certain topics. But it was unfortunate in its blind devotion to its one idea of the true university, specialization. America needed university development. It would have been far better if this could have been added to the college course, and not engrafted into it. But it has been engrafted into the college, and the question is a serious one whether the graft is not being cared for to the destruction of the original wood.

This makes its appearance in several ways.

In the first place the university ideal being always associated with specialization, there has been a steady development of a series of ideas from this source. First, each subject has demanded more time; more time in hours per week, more time in years studied in college, more time in preparation for college. The result has been that each subject has grown so great as to threaten the existence of all others, and as the point of view of the specialist necessarily is concerned with the attainment of a thorough knowledge of his specialty, the student's growth and development as a man drops out of sight; the one thought is his proficiency in a given subject. The necessity of ancillary knowledge is of course constantly felt, and what is immediately connected with the specialty is recognized as a necessary study and demanded as a co-ordinate. But many are desirable rather than necessary auxiliaries, and the constant cry is: "Such things should be studied in the preparatory schools; it is too late for them now."

In the second place the professor ceases to become a teacher and becomes a mere demonstrator. The essential concern of the true teacher is not with the subject taught, but with the person to whom it is taught. The teacher, as a scholar may be, nay, must be, absorbed in the subject of his studies if he is to become a master. But when the scholar becomes a teacher he must be absorbed in his pupils if he is to make scholars of them. It is the intense personal contact that makes the spark of scholarship leap from the teacher to the taught. Now, in the small laboratory class or the seminary the university teacher is a true teacher of the highest class, but the same man ab-

hors the work of early preparation and will have nothing to do with large classes, especially if the students are required to take the course.

In the third place, the interest of the specialist becomes fixed at an even further point from the needs of the beginner. He does not want to do work in, let us say, general science of an elementary nature; then he specializes and will only teach botany, then he becomes absorbed in physiological botany only, and will have nothing to do with anything else. He may be wise and right as a student of science, but such views cripple the work of the college and restrict the vision of the students, who in a large measure see with the eyes of their teacher.

In the fourth place, this sweeping estimate of the needs of a single department forces men into one of two attitudes to the college's teaching. It either leads them to think their own department so pre-eminent as to make them blind to the just claims of others, or it drives them to the position that all are equally good if adequately mastered. Either extreme is fatal to the best results of college work.

Under the influence of these tendencies in the advocates of the university spirit in the American college a great revolution has taken place. The standard of admission has been raised, elective studies have been made almost the rule, lectures have supplanted the drill of the recitation, the studies of the senior year have been supplanted by the studies of the professions of law, medicine and theology. In all this there has been neither law nor reason. Each college has fought for its own position. The terrible fear of being thought unprogressive has battled with the certain ruin of cutting adrift from natural feeders among the preparatory schools. Much has been done in a wise recognition of what was truly progressive, too much has been done in a blind spirit of compromise between conflicting views. The university party has not lacked for bold and even reckless leadership. The conservatives being more concerned with teaching than with educational agitation, have scarcely found adequate public recognition.

The steady raising of requirements for admission to college has put a great strain on students and schools. The demand has been particularly hard on the

public high schools, asking, indeed, more than many parts of the country can afford to concede. This has made the age of admission to college too great, and has aroused a wide discussion as to the advisability of a college education. Many specialists at once took up the cry that the college course was too long and too diversified. President Harper's scheme may be regarded as a concession to this cry. It means two years in college and then professional study or business. It means, in brief, a college course robbed of its best gifts, its two years of broad and liberal culture, its real worth.

Here, too, is found the demand for "a two-years' course in biology preparatory to the study of medicine," such as is offered by one of our universities, and various other ingenious contrivances labeled "just as good, and half the price."

But the worst phase of this tendency is the effect it has been slowly but surely having on the schools. In many sections it has been making a sharp cleavage between the public high schools and the private preparatory schools. Thus the principal of one of the latter in reply to a circular letter of inquiry recently wrote: "Raise your requirements as high as you wish, we will meet them. We should like to see it so that no boy in this State could enter college without first taking a course in a preparatory school." Here a selfish policy shut a really able man's eyes to the great importance of an unbroken and easy course for the capable and industrious from the grammar school to the university. Another principal, the head of one of the most noted schools in America, said to me: "The time has come when schools like mine must cut loose from the colleges, and become, like Eton and Harrow, something more than mere preparatory schools."

Harvard's action is a real recognition of two things; it is a pity it were not also a frank recognition of them. It recognizes that in forcing the entrance require-

ments up to the present point as a preparation for college Harvard had made a mistake. and in the second place, that under the present conditions preparatory schools fitting for Harvard are really doing freshman work. It is a fair question to ask, whether it is not better that the well endowed colleges should do freshman work, rather than the preparatory schools. But it is also pertinent to inquire whether this fact is not having a real influence on the relation of the boy to the school and college. The break between school and college, if it falls at eighteen or earlier, leaves the boy plastic, ready for the influences of the higher education of the college. If it comes subsequent to eighteen it is likely to find the boy already formed into a man. The school ideal thenceforth is his ideal. He never even sees the ideal of the college, but tries to bend and shape the work of college to fit the ideal he has brought with him. Such men miss the charm and culture of college life. If eager to get on they make college but an antechamber to this or that professional school, not the great school for a noble life. If not anxious to get on, they make it but a place of play, of idle luxury or foolish sport.

It is with no small risk to the ideal of a college of ample leisure and adequate resources, pledged to the pursuit of the highest truth and the inculcation of the loftiest principles, that the largest universities and the richest preparatory schools join hands to reduce the time allotted by general consent to the college. The college, strong in its community of interests between teachers and students, rich in its traditions of intellectual and moral vigor, happy in the affection of its host of useful and successful graduates, needs no apologist, but it may need ere long more active and united defense if it is not to be curtailed in its courses and robbed of its best years.

EASTON, PA.