

UC-NRLF




B 3 020 208

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

Received *Jan.*, 189*8*

Accession No. *69040* . Class No. *1151*





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



University of the State of New York

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE CHURCHES

An Address

DELIVERED AT THE

31st University Convocation

SENATE CHAMBER, ALBANY, N. Y.

July 5, 1893

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

—◆◆—

ALBANY

UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

1893

THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE CHURCHES

PROF. RICHARD T. ELY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

The relations of state and church have occupied the attention of profound thinkers for centuries, and it can not be said that an entirely satisfactory adjustment has yet been found. It is indeed natural enough that difficulties should arise between state and church precisely because these are the two grandest and the most beneficent institutions known to man. Both are indispensable to human welfare, and yet each one covers so nearly the whole of life that it must touch the other at a thousand points. The church has to do with morals; so has the state; the church has to do with the family; so has the state; the church has to do with education; so has the state. There are a few far reaching illustrations, but they are sufficient to show that the relations of church and state can not be fully settled by any brief formula. "Separation of church and state," is a phrase easily uttered, but it has never been applied in such a manner as to give entire satisfaction. The principle of separation is the principle which is called distinctively the American principle. It has been applied variously in different parts of the American union, and while undoubtedly the principle itself receives the assent of the vast majority of Americans, dissatisfaction arises at many points. It will probably be admitted that the educational field is the one in which there has been the most pronounced controversy concerning questions which touch both the state and the church in their relations, and it may not be too much to say that this controversy has in recent years tended to grow in vehemence as well as in its extent. The claims of the church are in the main well grounded and equally so are the claims of the state. Both have vital interests at stake, and the welfare of humanity demands the cooperation of both. Can not the claims of both be satisfied without a departure from the best American traditions? It seems to me that this is possible, and I wish to offer for discussion

a plan applicable particularly to the higher educational institutions; viz, the colleges and universities.

It is proposed that various religious denominations should group their educational efforts, so far as these touch the higher education, around the state universities of the country and such non-sectarian institutions as Cornell university in this state. These efforts should include the formation of Christian associations of young men and women and other like societies; the establishment of gild houses, with reading rooms and libraries, the foundation of dormitories to furnish homes for the students of the universities. With these dormitories should be connected educational features. This is my plan in brief, and I shall endeavor to show that it will be beneficial alike to church and state.

The plan itself is so simple that its very simplicity is likely to conceal its far reaching import unless careful consideration is given to it. Dormitories are an old historical institution which give an immense hold on the affections of students. Any religious denomination or group of denominations desiring to do so may now erect dormitories adjacent to the grounds of any state university. Students of any and all denominations may be invited to find in these dormitories homes. These religious homes would be under the control of trustees appointed by their founders or their supporters, and they could frame any rules for their government which they might see fit. Those entering these homes would do so with a full knowledge of the rules, whether they included attendance upon morning prayers and participation in other religious exercises or not.

A fully equipped home, as I take it, should have at its head a man of learning and piety, a strong man calculated to influence the young; and this man, called principal possibly or otherwise suitably designated, should receive a salary at least equal to that of any professor in a college or university to which the home should become an adjunct. To this principal, with possibly assistants, should be committed by the trustees of the home, instruction in church history, evidences of Christianity, and any other subjects which might be regarded as of practical importance to the denomination under whose auspices it existed. If this denomination were not already amply provided with theological seminaries, or if any existing theological seminary could be removed to the

seat of the state university — or any other university in question,— it would be eminently desirable to develop a theological seminary in connection with the home. The home itself could bear the name of some religious light or of its founder. It could also be built as a memorial.

It will be asked whether the dormitories or homes are needed and if established, whether they will meet a real demand. I can give a positive answer in the affirmative so far as the University of Wisconsin is concerned, and I think an affirmative answer safe so far as every state university in the country is concerned; and there are state universities in every state in the union except a few on or near the Atlantic seaboard. Of course these dormitories would be made attractive homes and their accommodations offered at reasonable prices. Properly equipped and well governed they would meet the warm approval of students as well as the hearty endorsement of faculties and other authorities of the universities.

It is maintained that this plan of cooperation of the churches with the public life as manifested in educational institutions would lead to a larger, fuller, deeper religious life, softening sectarian asperities and quickening all desirable activities.

Great thinkers like Adam Smith, who have advocated religious freedom, have dreaded the results of sectarianism, and Adam Smith proposed that "some sort of probation even in the higher and more difficult sciences" should "be undergone by every person before he should be permitted to exercise any liberal profession or before he could be received as a candidate for any honorable office of trust or profit." The plan which is here proposed is far better than that suggested by Adam Smith, if one must make a choice between them, although the two are not incompatible. Thomas Jefferson, the American thinker, elaborated a somewhat similar plan in connection with the University of Virginia. In a letter dated November 2, 1822, he uses these words: "In our annual report to the legislature, after stating the constitutional reasons against the public establishment of any religious instruction, we suggest the expediency of encouraging the different religious sects to establish each for itself a professorship of their own tenets, on the confines of the university, so near that their students may attend the lectures there, and have the free use of our libraries and every other accommodation we can

give them; preserving, however, their independence of us and of each other. This fills the chasm objected to ours, as a defect in an institution professing to give instruction in all useful sciences. I think the invitation will be accepted by some sects from candid intentions, and by others from jealousy and rivalry. And by bringing the sects together and mixing them with the mass of other students, we can soften their asperities, liberalize and neutralize their prejudices, and make the general religion a religion of peace, reason and morality."

The plan which I have offered is simply an elaboration of that offered by Thomas Jefferson. To him, whatever one may otherwise think of him, will not be denied many fruitful ideas.

Let us examine this plan somewhat more carefully from the standpoint of the church. It is admitted that the desire of the religious denominations to exercise an influence upon the education of youth is praiseworthy. What is claimed is that they can do their work far better in connection with public educational institutions, especially in the case of colleges and universities. It is not proposed at the present time to discuss the question of the common schools, but it is simply asserted that least of all is there need of separate denominational institutions for the higher education.

The denominational institutions in the country are, with notable exceptions — and I wish by repetition to emphasize the fact that there are notable exceptions — poor institutions, doing perhaps directly as much harm as good by diverting youth from superior institutions by appeals to sectarian loyalty, and indirectly doing vastly more harm than good by impeding the development of superior institutions and by cultivating a small spirit. Probably few in the east realize how narrow an outlook on life is given by many a sectarian college in our west. The minor denominational college must give inferior instruction because its means are so limited. When one of my colleagues visited a sectarian institution in an adjoining state, the college took a holiday, evidently not wishing him to see the kind of work which was going forward. In another neighboring state a college president is scouring the country seeking to find an endowment of \$50,000, something like one sixth of the sum which the University of Wisconsin will spend during the coming year. According to recently compiled

statistics of the 300 or 400 so-called colleges in the country, only 75 have an annual income from endowment equal to \$10,000 and only 90 can show an income from all sources of \$20,000. No matter how much self-sacrificing effort may go into the work of these institutions,—and it is frankly admitted that they represent an immense amount of very noble self-sacrifice,—it is simply impossible that they can do respectable work with such an equipment.

These denominational institutions of the poorer class which in the minds of competent persons are a disgrace to the denominations supporting them, bring no credit to the church. They repel rather than attract the strong characters among the youth. At the same time they are too much inclined to conduct an ignoble war upon public educational institutions, calculated to estrange from the church many who ought to be her strong adherents. It is true, it seems to me, that in the west, the worst enemy of the state universities has been sectarianism and not politics, and even when politics has appeared to be the enemy it has often merely been the tool of sectarianism. The spectacle which has been afforded to ingenuous youth when they have beheld the war of sectarianism upon public activity has not been an edifying one. Let us suppose now that a religious denomination turns frankly about, as many enlightened and earnest religious people would have the religious denominations do, and seeks heartily to support state universities and institutions like Cornell and to cooperate with them. At once such a religious denomination comes before the country in such a manner as to commend it to all true patriots. It says, in effect, We who belong to this denomination will seek not to pull down but to build up the state and what the state can not do on account of its limitations, that we will furnish. The frank adoption of this policy by any religious denomination would add immensely to its prestige and be in keeping with its character as a true American church. At the same time, funds entirely inadequate for the support of rival sectarian colleges would be quite ample for the support of halls or dormitories such as I have advocated. In Madison, for example, I should say that a quarter of a million dollars would be a sum which would enable a religious denomination to do a very excellent work, although a larger endowment, of course, could

be used. About \$150,000 of this sum, it would seem to me, should be expended upon grounds and buildings, and \$100,000 kept for endowment. The building itself would yield an income and this, together with the income of the endowment, would support the principal and needed assistants and also maintain lecture courses. The position of the religious denomination thus cooperating with the state university would be most worthy and dignified. Let me remind you that the colleges at Oxford were originally simply dormitories or homes and were called halls.

The state universities have come to stay. With the exception of a few institutions in the east and perhaps Chicago and Stanford universities, they are to-day the leading universities in the United States and they are rapidly gaining upon all others. The University of Wisconsin has over 1200 students and is growing at the present time at the rate of about 200 a year. The University of Minnesota has some 1500 students and has increased more rapidly in numbers in recent years than any other university in the United States. The University of Michigan has nearly 3000 students. Other state universities have also a large number, and are rapidly gaining ground, and this increase in numbers has been attended with an equally remarkable improvement in quality of work. Here are thousands of young men gathered together. They are the flower of the land. What will the churches do for these young men? Will they leave them alone? Will a church which has 500 students in a state university do nothing for these 500 and devote all its energies and money to 100 in some sectarian college? Surely that is not rational even from a denominational standpoint. The thousands of young men in the state universities are ready and willing to be influenced. They are a rich field which a wise denomination can not permanently refuse to cultivate. The politicians in at least one western state have shown greater wisdom than religious leaders, thus illustrating in one way the saying that "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." While religious denominations are holding aloof from the students in this institution, I have known a political leader carefully to cultivate relations with the students in order to have influence with them later after they have separated and gone out into different parts of the state and the country.

But I would not have you think that even now there is any ground for the charge that state institutions are godless or unfriendly to religion. Such is by no means the case. The professors and regents or trustees of such institutions are mostly earnest church members and in their various denominations take part in the religious life of their respective communities. They are superintendents of Sunday schools, teachers of Bible classes, and without interfering with religious freedom they exercise a very great influence upon students. There are also among students of these institutions voluntary religious associations of many different kinds, and from them go into the ministry and mission field earnest men and women. Having been connected with two denominational institutions as well as a state university, I would claim for the latter at least as high a religious character as for the former. But all this has for the most part happened without the cordial support and cooperation of the church as an organized institution.

The funds which are already used by the different religious denominations of the country would be quite ample to carry out fully and efficiently the plan elaborated, and if there were any surplus surely there is need for all the money which the church can raise. Are there not mission fields in every part of the world which are destitute? Is not Macedonia ever crying out: Come over and help us? Are there not colleges in Asia Minor and China and elsewhere which need help? Are there not the slums of cities crying out for light and reproaching in their misery the church and causing some to doubt Christianity? Is there not enough and more than enough work for the church to do which the state will not and indeed can not do?

I would before leaving the special consideration of the subject from the standpoint of the church put forward the claim that the plan which I have advocated will tend to the unity of Christendom which is now so earnestly longed for by Christian people. It might not remove all denominational lines, and to many this does not seem desirable, but bringing into hearty cooperation with public institutions the various religious denominations, they would cultivate a unity in action and would in time discover whether an organic unity is desirable or not.

I claim for this plan also the merit that it would elevate public life. The great evil at the present time in the United States is that the forces of good are too split up. There is in our country always a desire on the part of the majority for good government, but there is little unity among those who constitute this majority. This grouping of churches about the state would give us unity with variety, and the public life which is now too often debased would be ennobled. The great trouble with us is that the state does not receive our affections. Our treasure is elsewhere and where our treasure is there also is our heart. Our interests are too diverse. We are engaged in various business enterprises like railways, gas works, electric lighting works, etc., which have interests by no means identical with those of the public, and even in education we have erected a means of division in the denominational college. We win money in industries which must fight the state and then give money to sectarian institutions which continue to fight the state. What kind of a public life have we a right to expect under such circumstances? The measure which I propose would tend to strengthen public institutions, to induce men and women to make generous gifts to them and thus to bring to the state that feeling, that warm affection, which the noblest patriots have ever cherished.

Something has already been accomplished in the direction advocated, and the plan outlined has the cordial support of many careful and experienced thinkers on educational topics. The views of Thomas Jefferson have already been quoted. His plans with reference to the University of Virginia have not as yet been fully carried out. Yet there is a certain grouping of the churches about the institution. Professor Noah K. Davis of the University of Virginia writes me as follows: "Our practice here, which has been pursued for 40 or more years, is to appoint a chaplain for two years, in turn a methodist, a baptist, a presbyterian and an episcopalian, who is supported by voluntary contributions of professors and students. He devotes his whole time to the university, holding regular Sunday and week-day services. His efforts are seconded by our college Young Men's Christian association, the oldest in the world. The plan works well and we are not troubled with sectarianism."

Another state university, the University of Michigan, has been inclined to dispute the claim of the University of Virginia to the

oldest college Young Men's Christian association, and the University of Michigan has perhaps even to a larger extent secured the cooperation of the churches. Various denominations have established halls of one kind and another at Ann Arbor, the seat of the University of Michigan, although no one has gone so far as I have advocated in this paper. At Ann Arbor, the protestant episcopal church seems to have done more than any other religious denomination along this line, and the results appear to be most gratifying. While writing this address there lies before me a journal containing a paper prepared by Rev. H. Tatlock, the rector of the episcopal church at Ann Arbor. He claims that there are more members of his church at Ann Arbor than the combined number of students at Trinity, Hobart, Kenyon and the University of the South, which are the four largest protestant episcopal colleges in the United States. They have at Ann Arbor a hall called Harris hall, named after the late bishop of the diocese, and lectureships called the Baldwin and Slocum lectureships, named by their founders. A bequest of \$10,000 was recently made, it appears, to the hall, and there is an appeal for an increased endowment. Mr Tatlock states that one religious denomination is to open a theological school at Ann Arbor during the coming fall and he urges his own church to establish there what Bishop Harris saw in a vision, namely, "a school of the prophets." I will quote a short paragraph from Mr Tatlock to show his views of the wisdom of what has been done from his standpoint as a clergyman: "It is the duty of the church in her corporate capacity to be a city set on a hill. It is the duty of the church to exercise foresight and energy, to seize and to hold every strategic point, to take possession of the heights, to set her light on high places. There are many proofs of wisdom in the administration of the church in this diocese. In the laying of the foundation and in the rearing of the superstructure of our city of God, there is abundant evidence of the presence of the spirit of wisdom and understanding. But in recent years, as it seems to me, nothing that the church in Michigan has done gives fuller proof of the presence of this spirit than the establishing of the church hall and guild in connection with our great university at Ann Arbor."

A beginning along this line has also been made at Boulder, the seat of the University of Colorado. There has been established

there, under private auspices, a divinity school, the design of which is to make use of the facilities supplied by the state university and to cooperate with it in every proper manner. This divinity school is mentioned in the circulars of the University of Colorado.

One of the most remarkable educational institutions in the United States is one in the work of which I am about to participate. I refer to Chautauqua, where to-morrow I shall have the honor of beginning a course of instruction. Chautauqua furnishes a fine illustration of the principle for which I am contending. We find at Chautauqua variety in unity. The presbyterians, congregationalists and the methodists have already their headquarters there, and the episcopalians are about to erect a building for their headquarters. Other religious denominations have also established headquarters at Chautauqua. They cultivate there their denominational life, and they unite together frequently for common worship and participate in education and recreation. I believe no enlightened member of any denomination represented at Chautauqua will claim that his denomination has suffered. On the contrary I think he will say that this spectacle of the union of Christians is highly beneficial to all who participate in the life there.

Canada also, as I understand, affords a fine illustration. Different religious schools seem to be grouped about the University of Toronto. The protestant episcopalians have a divinity school at Toronto called Wycliffe college in affiliation with Toronto university, and a few years ago it was announced that the methodists intended to move their college from Cobourg to Toronto and establish a strong divinity school there. I quote the words of Dr Withrow in regard to this movement: "By this act the educational policy of the methodist church undergoes a great change, and we believe will receive a new impulse and a wider development on a higher plane. It no longer holds itself aloof as a denominational college, but enters into intimate association with the national university in the endeavor to develop one of the broadest and best equipped institutions of higher learning on the continent. Its students will meet and mingle with those of the other churches, and in the intimate association of college life will cultivate broader principles and more genial fellowship.

The friends of education anticipate for it an eminent success in unsealing founts of liberality hitherto unknown and in greatly promoting the interests of higher education by surrounding with an atmosphere of religious sympathy and cooperation the central university."

The congregationalists of England have indorsed a policy like this by establishing a theological seminary, viz, Mansfield college at Oxford; and I think eminent leaders of the Roman catholic church will admit that I have conceded everything which they claim with respect to education.

The state universities, and I doubt not institutions like Cornell,—and I might also mention here in particular the University of Pennsylvania,—are more than ready to assist in every way in bringing about cordial cooperation between church and state in education. I quote from letters from President Northrop of the University of Minnesota and President Jesse of the University of Missouri. President Northrop writes as follows: "My view has always been that Christian people should help to make the university what it ought to be and should utilize it to the fullest extent in educating their children. The university would thus be kept essentially Christian in its influence, the churches would not be burdened with the support of special church institutions except for theology, and even theological seminaries should be so placed locally that the students could receive much needed instruction in the university. The churches by building special church homes for the students of their faith could watch over the lambs of their flock and give them all the special or denominational training they desire. I do not undertake to make comparisons as to the value of the education got at the university and that gained in a denominational college. But I certainly know no reason why the former should not be at least as good as the latter. If it be so, and the churches can have their students trained in the university without cost, what possible reason is there for exhausting the resources of the churches in running a lot of unnecessary colleges?"

President Jesse writes: "It would be a good thing if the churches would sell out even at a sacrifice their colleges and use the proceeds for theological schools near the best universities. We would give the necessary ground on our campus. We teach

yearly Hebrew and of course Greek, history, English, etc. On demand we are constantly prepared to give good instruction in Syriac, Aramaic and Phœnician. We had this year a small class in Persian. On demand we would gladly furnish the best instruction in New-testament Greek, ecclesiastical history, etc. In fact, we would be charmed to create a demand for these things in order that we might fill it. Half the money spent in maintaining a moderately good academic college would support a good theological school here."

Many things which I would like to say I have been obliged to pass over. I have not dwelt upon the importance of state universities. I will say, however, that I thoroughly believe in taxation for the support of education of every sort in all its branches, and hold that the position of those who would divide educational institutions into classes, claiming that the state should support one kind and not the other, is entirely illogical as well as unhistorical, indeed, I may say un-American.

Yet I heard some one here to-day say that state aid was un-American. Washington, the Adamses, Jefferson and Monroe favored a national university at Washington. Were they un-American? Was Thomas Jefferson un-American when he founded the University of Virginia? Thomas Jefferson did not think so, but gloried in that university and wished it with the declaration of independence to be remembered with his name. What has been the practice of America? We who live in the northwest can not admit that a few states east of Ohio and north of Virginia shall tell what is American. In the early history of this country even those states contributed taxation for the support of the university and with the exception of those few states, every state in the American Union is taxed to-day for the support of higher education. Are they not American? Is Michigan not American? Are Wisconsin, Nebraska and Missouri not American? Is the title American to be restricted to the practice of New York and Massachusetts? I can not admit it for a moment.

I would like, if there were time, to say something about what constitutes paternalism. Is the state something apart from us, over us, doing things for us or do we ourselves act through the state? Where do the resources of the state come from and who deter-

mine its activity? If we ourselves act through the state I consider it a noble kind of self-help. This is paternalism, when the people have no trust in themselves; when they fold their arms and say we are not good nor wise nor competent enough to establish our own educational institutions and we hope some kind millionaire will do it for us. In the meantime we fold our arms and wait for somebody to help us. That is paternalism and a very bad kind of paternalism. The gifts of the rich are welcome; we have never refused them in Wisconsin. They are not refused in Michigan or Minnesota. But let us not rely simply on rich men, but rather help ourselves and then if rich men will help us to help ourselves that is desirable. If I could choose I would rather the state of Wisconsin should give its \$300,000 a year to the university than to have it come entirely from some rich man. I would not have any one take from the state that burden, or rather privilege, of supporting education in all its branches. If the University of Wisconsin had been supported by some multimillionaire through all these years, Wisconsin would not be where it is to-day in civilization. But this support has been an education and a fine one to the people of Wisconsin as it has been to the people of Michigan and Minnesota. I glory in what my adopted state of Wisconsin is doing. I glory in the fact that her legislators and farmers and day laborers wish the university to enjoy an income of \$300,000 a year largely from taxation. I glory in the fact that the highest salary paid by the state of Wisconsin is paid to the president of the university of Wisconsin, a higher salary than received by any judge or by the governor of the commonwealth. If some of you in New York could go to these northwestern states and see what we are doing there, you would come back and wish perhaps that your Cornell university were not almost, but entirely a state university supported like the University of Michigan by a tax of perhaps one-sixth of a mill on all property in the state. And do the people approve of it or is it something done against their will? I would like to see a politician in the state of Wisconsin who would openly attack the state university by appealing to the wage receivers and farmers. Not long ago I went into a field and talked with two men who were digging out stumps. I asked them whether they objected to paying taxes for the support of the state uni-

versity. They said "No indeed, we are glad to pay the taxes," for they knew that, although they and perhaps their children would never go to state university, it was doing more than anything else in the state of Wisconsin for the little red school house at the country cross roads. As has been said by another speaker to-day the good results from education come from above and not from below. You can say we will have flourishing primary schools and none other; but if you do your primary schools will be very inferior.

Through a mistaken policy, private and sectarian foundations have been brought into existence resulting in the educational chaos from which we are struggling to emerge. We must recognize the situation. We can not make *tabula rasa* and begin from the beginning, but must build on foundations already laid and I urge the hearty cooperation of the best private and denominational schools with public educational institutions for the attainment of common ends, namely, for the suppression of quackery and pretense and for the encouragement of sound learning. I think that it is practicable to bring about such cooperation. By no means do I advocate an iconoclastic policy with respect to religious schools. Many of these institutions which, if we were making a beginning I would not regard as desirable, have accomplished much. They have associated with them long history and tender traditions and must be used in building up the educational system in this country. I have myself been associated a good part of my life with private foundations, and attended as a student two denominational colleges for which I have affection. I have recently tried in a small way to assist a college under denominational auspices and have in mind a strictly denominational college to which I would like to make a donation. I can even conceive myself in the service of a university under denominational auspices and serving it faithfully, diligently. I mention this to show that I recognize the facts with which we have to deal and to avoid misunderstanding. I would say to the churches, cooperate so far as practicable with the public institutions; foster your strongest denominational schools, bringing about consolidation where possible and allowing the weak and inefficient to die out.

We have heard much of the free church in the free state. I would add to the rallying cry, "The free state and the free church," the free university, the university with freedom in teaching, freedom in learning and freedom in worshipping.

In the free state the free university allied to the free church will give us a glorious civilization.

Appendix

MEMORANDUM IN REGARD TO THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AND THE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

BY REV J. P. SHERATON, D. D., PRINCIPAL OF WYCLIFFE COLLEGE,
TORONTO, ONTARIO¹

1 The University of Toronto is the capstone of the educational system of Ontario, a free, undenominational, graded system. There are separate schools for Roman catholics, saddled on the province in the Confederation compact. Roman catholics can pay to these, instead of to the public schools; but many prefer the public schools, their own being notoriously inferior.

2 The University of Toronto originated in large grants of land made by the legislature of Upper Canada. But the house of representatives at that time had no power to carry out its intention. There was no responsible government. The church of England was established. The disposal of the grant was in the hands of the council of state, one member of which was Dr Strachan, first bishop of Toronto. The new institution was called King's college, for which a royal charter was procured. It was exclusively church of England and every student and teacher was required to subscribe to the 39 articles. The provisions of the charter were rigidly sectarian. The church of Scotland, (presbyterian) in self-defense established the University of Queens at Kingston, and the methodists Victoria university at Cobourg.

3 At length came the revolution in Canada by which the "family compact" was destroyed, the church of England disestablished and King's college "secularized" and brought into harmony with the intentions of the legislature who originally

¹ Sent with letter of June 28, 1893.

gave it its endowments. All this was achieved under the leadership of loyal lay members of the church of England, notably the Hon. Robert Baldwin. The University of Toronto passed through many vicissitudes till it reached its present form. Attempts have been made at different times to draw in the denominational universities. A few years ago a system of federation was inaugurated and under it Victoria university has been removed to Toronto and become federated to the provincial university.

4 When King's college was "secularized" and the provincial university established on the present undenominational basis, Bishop Strachan, instead of accepting the situation and planting his theological college beside the provincial university, procured from England money and a royal charter and established the University of Trinity college on a strictly denominational basis and in armed rivalry to the provincial institution. After some 40 years, Trinity college has between 50 and 60 students in arts and theology, while the University of Toronto has over 800 students in arts alone, of whom 150 or more, are episcopalians.

5 The University of Toronto has federated with it Knox college, (presbyterian) Wycliffe college, (Church of England) St Michael's college, (Roman catholic) and Victoria college, (methodist). Take Wycliffe college as an illustration,— we have : (1) Representation on the university senate and a voice in all matters relating to the curriculum and government of the university ; (2) Certain options in the arts curriculum, (*see* the Calendar), e. g. Biblical Greek for classical Greek in third and fourth years in pass course. This needs to be judiciously restrained. A few options are helpful ; any abuse would be detrimental ; (3) The advantage of all the university can give us in the department of arts, not only for regular, but also for occasional students who may take only a portion of the arts curriculum. All our means are devoted to theological education. The fees are very small in the university ; \$20 a year covers all ordinary lectures. (4) We exercise a strong influence in the university and over students of our own church. This can be greatly increased ; e. g. I have a Bible class for university students. We admit university students into our residence. (5) A strong, broadening and healthy influence is exerted on our students. They gain in large-

ness of view and breadth of sympathy by free associations with others.

Experience strongly confirms me in the view that our policy is best from every point of view ; best in the interests of the student and his education, best in the denominational interest from any right standpoint, best in the general cause of education and its advancement.

I stand against the narrow religionist on the one hand, who dreads scientific research and curtails freedom, and, on the other hand, against the narrow scientists, who confound healthy Christian influence with clericalism.

We are straitened by want of means; but if I had a million of dollars, I would oppose a denominational university. I could use the whole of it wisely in equipping a large theological college, in establishing lectureships in ethics, connection of science and religion, Bible instruction for undergraduates in arts; establishing tutorships for backward men; establishing bursaries and scholarships, especially to encourage theological students to take a full arts course, in building residences for church of England arts students, and in providing means for wholesome social intercourse etc. Oh, the possibilities are unlimited.

FROM JAMES H. CANFIELD, CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
NEBRASKA¹

I have printed nothing on the subject to which you refer, except fugitive matter in the press. This I have not kept and I do not know where to put my hand on it.

For 20 years, I have advocated strenuously in the four new states with which I have been connected, the very doctrine which you set forth. You are preeminently right in your position. It is wise from an economic standpoint, from an educational standpoint, and from an ecclesiastical standpoint; and it is the only wise course, in my judgment, which the churches can possibly follow. A tithe of the money which they expend annually in the maintenance of inferior schools would build superb church homes, aid indigent students, and throw an

¹ Quoted from letter of July 1, 1898.

influence about state institutions that would be valuable in the extreme. Had such a course been pursued in Nebraska, we should have three thousand students in the university to-day; to say nothing of the additional equipment which would be possible because of the interest of all classes in the state in their own institution.

The day is coming and coming rapidly, in which the people will recognize the fact that state education (by which I mean education as a function of the state, maintained and directed and supervised by the state), is the greatest, the most powerful factor in forming a true and lasting democracy.

If the use of my name in any way whatever will be of assistance to you, quote me as approving your most ultra positions.

University of the State of New York

Object. The object of the University as defined by law is to encourage and promote education in advance of the common elementary branches. Its field includes not only the work of academies, colleges, universities, professional and technical schools, but also educational work connected with libraries, museums, university extension courses and similar agencies.

The University is a supervisory and administrative, not a teaching institution. It is a state department and at the same time a federation of over 500 institutions of higher and secondary education.

Government. The University is governed and all its corporate powers exercised by 19 elective regents and by the governor, lieutenant-governor, secretary of state and superintendent of public instruction, who are regents *ex officio*. Regents are elected in the same manner as United States senators and serve without salary.

Elective officers are a chancellor and a vice-chancellor who serve without salary, and a secretary.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEPARTMENTS

1 **Regents office (executive)**—including incorporation, supervision, inspection, reports, legislation, finances and all other work not assigned to another department.

2 **Examination**—including preacademic, law student, medical student, academic, higher, law, medical, library, extension and any other examinations conducted by the regents, and also credentials or degrees conferred on examination.

3 **Extension**—including summer, vacation, evening, and correspondence schools and other forms of extension teaching, lecture courses, study clubs, reading circles and other agencies for the promotion and wider extension of opportunities and facilities for education to those unable to attend the usual teaching institutions.


4 **State Library**—including state law, medical, and education libraries, public libraries and duplicate departments, library school, traveling, extension, home and capitol libraries, reading courses, annotated lists and other bibliographic publications, lending books to students and all other library interests intrusted to the regents.

5 **State Museum**—including all scientific specimens and collections, works of art, objects of historic interest and similar property appropriate to a general museum, if owned by the state and not placed in other custody by a specific law, also the research department carried on by the state geologist and paleontologist, botanist and entomologist, with all other scientific interests of the University.

UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION

The University convocation of the regents and the officers of institutions in the University, for consideration of subjects of mutual interest, has been held annually since 1863 in the senate chamber in Albany on the first Wednesday, Thursday and Friday after July 4.

Though primarily a New York meeting, nearly all questions discussed are of equal interest outside the state, and its reputation as the most important higher educational meeting of the country has in the past few years drawn to it many eminent educators not residents of New York. At recent meetings more than 30 prominent universities and colleges from half as many different states have been represented by more than 100 of their officers and graduates, who are most cordially welcomed and share fully in all discussions. It elects each year a council of five to represent it in intervals between meetings. Its proceedings issued annually are of great value in all educational libraries. One of the faculty of Johns Hopkins university and a frequent attendant of convocation, said in a recent article "It is growing in efficiency and in importance. The topics discussed are not merely the educational problems of New York state, but of the nation and of the world. The *personnel* of those who take part in the convocation, likewise, makes it rather a national than a state institution. It is in fact the most important annual educational convention held in the United States, and merits well the name of the 'congress of higher education,' conferred by Chancellor Curtis."





8000780174

RETURN TO → **CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT**
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
HOME USE		
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
 Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.
 Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

AUTO DISC CIRC JUN 25 '93

FEB 09 1996

RECEIVED

DEC 17 1985

CIRCULATION DEPT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

YC 57352

LIBRARY USE

A
☆☆
LB 3505
F3
v. 2

