

YALE ALUMNI WEEKLY

SUBSCRIPTION, - \$3.00 PER YEAR.

Foreign Postage, 40 cents per year.

PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

Single copies, ten cents each. For rates for papers in quantity, address the office. All orders for papers should be paid for in advance.

Checks, drafts and orders should be made payable to the Yale Alumni Weekly.

All correspondence should be addressed,—
Yale Alumni Weekly, New Haven, Conn.

The office is at Room 6, White Hall.

ADVISORY BOARD.

H. C. ROBINSON, '53.	J. R. SHEFFIELD, '87.
W. W. SKIDDY, '65 S.	J. A. HARTWELL, '89 S.
C. P. LINDSLEY, '75 S.	L. S. WELCH, '89.
W. CAMP, '80.	E. VAN INGEN, '91 S.
W. G. DAGGETT, '80.	P. JAY, '92.

EDITOR.

LEWIS S. WELCH, '89.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

WALTER CAMP, '80.

ASSISTANT EDITOR.

E. J. THOMPSON, Sp.

NEWS EDITOR.

FRED. M. DAVIES, '99.

ASSISTANT.

PRESTON KUMLER, 1900.

BUSINESS DEPARTMENT ASSISTANTS.

O. M. CLARK, '98. BURNETT GOODWIN, '99 S.

Entered as second class matter at New Haven P. O.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., DEC. 22, 1898.

All material for the WEEKLY, which is not of the character of late news, should be received not later than Friday morning, for the issue of the following week. Articles of a general nature can always be prepared so as to be received by that time, and alumni notes should all be in the office at that time.

In the case of record of late news, it is possible to handle a limited amount of very important matter as late as Monday afternoon, but its use can not be guaranteed by that time.

THE NEXT ISSUE.

The next issue of the WEEKLY will be on January 5, 1899.

EDWARD GAY MASON.

It is not possible, with the sad news coming so late, to try to say, in this issue of the WEEKLY, what the loss to Yale has been in the death of Edward Gay Mason, of the Class of Sixty, and of the Corporation of the University.

Mr. Mason's interest in Yale drew him early into her service in his own city and section of the country. By his election by the Alumni to the Corporation in 1891, he was made a sharer of the responsibility for her highest interests. He did not take this office lightly or esteem it but an honor. None was more regular at Corporation meetings than he; none more vigorously or intelligently applied himself to the problems of Yale government. He was a student and of broad, intellectual sympathies. He was on the side of progress and resourceful in suggestion for the advancement of the University's interests. He was far-seeing, and did not shrink from meeting the future's demands. He was not destructive, but clung with reverence to the good things of the former times. Particularly did he prize all the memorials of Yale's storied past, and used his influence to retain them. Differing not infrequently with some of his colleagues on matters of policy and standing strongly for his own convictions, he bore himself with such courtesy as never to estrange. The charm of his manner, which made him friends so quickly and so universally, rested on the native parts of the gentleman, which could not leave him. It is a

sobering thought that such an one has gone from the councils of Yale when the University comes to the great crisis of choice. It is not strange that men began to talk of Mr. Mason himself, as one who might well be trusted to lead into the tremendous possibilities of the future.

As for the man himself, it may be easier after some days to write. It is unspeakably hard for the brotherhood of Yale to let him go.

"NARROWNESS AT YALE."

The leader in the November *Lit.* would have received earlier consideration in the columns of the WEEKLY, but for two reasons. The first was the natural unwillingness to consider an article made up principally of general charges. The second was the pressure of other matter, which seemed at the time more important for insertion in the columns of this paper. This article is taken up now because it has been given so much publicity outside of Yale, by those who have been over eager to use it as a means of attack upon the University.

The article in question was entitled, "Narrowness at Yale." Its main points can be indicated, without a repetition of the entire essay, which, for this number is impossible. This article we have referred to as a leader. By this is meant that it was the first article in the magazine and was written by a member of the Board. This follows the immemorial custom in the make-up of the *Lit.* The fact should, however, be kept in mind, that the leader, in so far as it is an expression of opinion, is the opinion of the man who writes it. It has never been the custom of the *Lit.*, according to our best knowledge, to assume the responsibility for what its leader may contain. In this case, Mr. Benjamin B. Moore of the Class of Ninety-Nine, signed the article and takes the responsibility for it.

The article charges with narrowness the undergraduate body of Yale, its Faculty and its Corporation. It admits at the opening, the largeness of the indictment and concedes, at the same time, the "strength, virility, unquestionable power, and many other fine qualities" of the general Yale character.

The charge, as to the undergraduate, rests upon the statement of the writer that the average undergraduate is without broad sympathies or general interest in the different sides of University life; that the athlete or the student, deeply interested in athletics, is little interested in any other side of college life; that the hard student is generally a grind, equally insensible with the athlete to the interests of the college outside of his own particular work; that a man in literary work, like contributing to the *Yale Literary Magazine*, is bound up in his own aspirations and efforts.

As to the narrow interest in athletics, the article says that the great virtues or athletic sports, and the value of interest in them, do not constitute "an excuse for man being crude and unread, and wholly without cultivation. Because a man likes to see a football game; perhaps likes it better than anything else, he need not be entirely ignorant of all other subjects."

"This lack of breadth creeps even into the religious side of the college." The special point made, in connection with the voluntary religious work of Yale is, that the many good men, who go into it "in all sincerity and with the highest motives," often become very narrow, and confine their energies and interests to the four walls of Dwight Hall.

The writer fits also his general accusation to the Sophomore societies. Their members are so narrowed, he says, by their attachment to them, that they form their cliques and try to use society affiliations for political advancement. He would not destroy them, but make them broad.

The cause of this fault in the undergraduate body of Yale, he assigns to three traits: laziness, indifference and the fear of being "queered." As to the third point, he says: "What is needed is a greater degree of individuality; less submerged personality and a strong diminution of that dead conservatism and mere brute public opinion, which stifles and oppresses Yale life."

When it comes to the Faculty, the writer says that there are too many men on the Yale staff who are entirely confined to their own speciality; who do not seem to admit any basis for culture or general education outside of their own line. "Culture is a thing," he says, "of which the average Yale undergraduate knows little and cares less, but the lack of it in some of his professors is what gives them in his eyes their small and grotesque appearance. Such men, before assuming their positions, need broadening and a keen realization of the fact that no subject, much less the mere pedantic side of it, is of any value for its own sake; and they also need to learn the meaning of a word strange to American and especially to New England ears,—culture; for the Faculty of Yale ought to be conspicuously at the head of a movement towards greater breadth among undergraduates retarded and repressed by the opposing influence of certain professors."

Turning his attention to the Corporation, this *Lit.* editor says: "Sectarianism is a thing that should have no part in the control of one of the country's great institutions of learning;—no university ought to be ruled in the interest of a religious body. But the ministers of one sect, notorious for the restriction of its ideas, have almost a predominant voice in governing Yale, governing it from a sectarian standpoint, as if in bygone Puritan times, narrowly and short-sightedly, not seeing that, if the Yale which they rule is to be in fact as in name a university, that is, a center of the country's culture, she must break with the dead past and with the Puritan narrowness of New England, and must cast-off all traces of sectarianism, taking on a hitherto unknown breadth of view and policy—a breadth that means advancement and the highest culture."

NEW YORK LIFE

INSURANCE COMPANY.

JOHN A. MCCALL, PRESIDENT.

This Company has been in successful operation since 1845, and has now over 300,000 policy-holders and over \$200,000,000 in assets. It offers the most privileges and on the most favorable terms, of any Company. Under its new system of classifying and compensating agents, it offers to young men continuous employment and a life income. Its policies and agents' contracts will interest all students.

NEW YORK LIFE

INSURANCE COMPANY,
346 & 348 Broadway,
NEW YORK.

This resume gives so much of the article, and such a number of its characteristic passages, that it is unnecessary to discuss it at length. As we read it over, it is hard to realize that one so intelligent as its author could have perpetrated such stuff as some of its passages. We feel almost like apologizing for reprinting such a paragraph as that about New England culture. Such passages do rather more than answer themselves.

But one or two observations may be pertinent. The first is a personal one. However this article reads (and the passages we have selected give a fair idea of it), we know that the spirit of its writer was as far removed from the spirit of its reception in many quarters outside of the College as it possibly could be. A knowledge of the writer and a frank talk with him concerning the article, allows us to emphasize this point very strongly. This *Lit.* editor is one of the strong and earnest men of his class. He is as far removed from being out with his College, or soured by circumstances, as any Yale man can be. He is rather unusually ready to recognize the strong points of Yale, and it is to a degree his great appreciation of them that has led to such strong statements about those points in the University life and government which, as he sees them, do not consist with the general character of the University which he greatly admires. We venture the opinion that the writer of this article may be properly called an idealist, who has seen so much in Yale to keep him an idealist as to make him especially sensitive to that which he feels is out of key with the real Yale character. The article, as we construe it, is a case of very rigid self-examination by an extremely sensitive and conscientious Yale man. He wrote it, as we believe, in the hope that a few would appreciate what he meant and would respond with such effort as an individual may give to remove these blemishes. It was a little talk in the family which he though he was giving. An unfriendly outside world listened and said it was a bad row and so treated it.

But as to the actual statements of the article, taken as the average reader would take them, there is no other comment possible in our mind than that they are at least misleading, and that the criticisms, wherever they do touch on fact, are at best exaggerated. Furthermore, except in a few points, the arraignment is so general that one hardly cares to notice it. It is one thing to say that an institution has this or that failing or vice. It is another to point to the actual evidence of it. In the latter case, there is something to work on, and, if the criticism go so far as to suggest the line of work itself, then it is a most welcome contribution, no matter what its conclusions be. Any constructive criticism is, in itself, an evidence of good will, and, by its direction of thoughtful attention to the institution, does good.

The *Lit.* leader says Yale is not what it ought to be, and stops there. Well, Yale unquestionably is not all she ought to be. But we categorically deny the different allegations of the article in question. It is not true to call Yale narrow. It is not true to say that the

[Continued on 113th page.]

Yale Law School.

For circulars and other information apply to
Prof. FRANCIS WAYLAND,
Dean.