

interest in his subject, is forced to content himself with what is little more than a lecture in teaching the larger groups of ordinary men to whom the subject has only a general interest. A lecture system of this kind is beset with perils. It is something of which we have to make use, because there are not enough first-rate men in the country to teach all the subjects of study which this generation demands, in classes of size small enough to adapt themselves to the recitation system. The choice in many lines of study lies between having recitations with fourth-rate men or lectures from first-rate ones. I never met a good teacher who really approved of the lecture system, or who did not prefer small classes to large ones. But these really good teachers are just the men that we wish to bring in contact with as many students as possible. If we refuse to let them lecture, we either confine the benefit of their instructions to a few, or increase their hours beyond the possibility of human endurance.

#### COLLEGE SPIRIT MENACED.

Another evil connected with the elective system is the loss of *esprit de corps*. In a college like West Point or Annapolis, where a homogeneous body of men is pursuing a common scheme of studies, with a common end in view, and with rigorous requirements as to the work which must be done by each individual, this spirit is seen at its strongest. The place sets its character stamp upon every one; sometimes perhaps for evil, but in the vast majority of cases for good. An approximation to this state of things was seen in our early American colleges. In many of them it is still maintained to a considerable degree. But the forces which maintain it are far less potent to-day than they were fifty years ago. The community of interests is less, the community of hard work is very much less. If this college spirit once passes away, the whole group of qualities which we have known by the name of college democracy is in danger of passing also. For the increase of wealth in the outside world is a perpetual menace to old-fashioned democratic equality. If we have within the college life not only differences in things studied, but differences in enjoyment between rich and poor, we are at once in danger of witnessing a development of social distinctions and class interests which shall sweep away the thing which was most characteristic and most valuable in the earlier education of our colleges. Not the intellectual life only, nor the social life only, but the whole religious and moral atmosphere suffers deterioration if a place becomes known either as a rich man's college; or, worse yet, as a college where rich and poor meet on different footings. What shall it profit us if we gain the whole world and lose our own soul, if we develop the intellectual and material side of our education, and lose the traditional spirit of democracy and loyalty and Christianity?

That there will be an advance in thoroughness of preparation for the special lines of work which our students are to undertake is a thing of which we may safely rest assured. That there shall be a similar advance in the general training for citizenship in the United States is an obligation for whose fulfillment our universities are responsible. The Yale of the future must count for even more than the Yale of the past in the work of city, state, and nation. It must come into closer touch with our political life, and be a larger part of that life. To this end it is not enough for her to train experts competent to deal with the financial and legal problems which are before us. Side by side with this training, she must evoke in the whole body of her students and alumni that wider sense of their obligation as members of a free commonwealth which the America of the twentieth century requires.

The central problem, which we all have to face, and about which all other problems group themselves, is this: How shall we make our educational system meet the world's demands for progress on the intellectual side, without endangering the growth of that which has proved most valuable on the moral side? And it is the latter part which demands the most immediate attention from a college president, not necessarily because it is more important in itself—for where two things are both absolutely indispensable, a comparison of relative values is meaningless—but because the individual profes-

sors can, and under the keen competition between universities must, attend in a large measure to the excellence of instruction in their several departments, while the action of the university as a whole, and the intelligent thought of the university administration, is requisite to prevent the sacrifice of the moral interest of the whole commonwealth.

#### MEETING THE DIFFICULTY.

There are four ways in which we may strive to deal with this difficulty.

(1) By relegating the work of character development more and more to the preparatory schools. Our acceptance or non-acceptance of this solution determines our attitude toward the problem of entrance requirements.

(2) By striving to limit the occasion for the use of money on the part of the student. The necessity for such limitation constitutes the problem of college expenses.

(3) By endeavoring to create a body of common interests and traditions outside of the college course which shall make up for the diversity of interests within it. The most widely discussed, though possibly not the most important, point under this head is furnished by the problem of college athletics.

(4) By so arranging the work of the different departments of study that the variety inherent in the elective system shall not be attended with intellectual dissipation; providing the chance for economy of effort on the part of the instructor and the assurance of systematic coöperation on the part of the pupils. This is the problem of university organization.

The plan of relegating the responsibility for character development to the preparatory schools has at first sight much to commend it. It relieves the college officers of the most disagreeable part of their duty, that which pertains to matters of discipline, and enables them to concentrate their attention on their function as teachers. It meets the demands of many progressive men engaged in secondary education, some of whom long for an extension of their professional functions into new fields of activity, while others, justly proud of their success in the formation of character under existing conditions, desire the additional opportunity which is given them if they can keep their oldest boys a year or two longer under their influence. The larger the university the greater becomes the pressure in this direction. But with conditions as they exist at Yale, I cannot think it wise to yield to this pressure. If we take a year from the beginning of the college course, that year will be spent by most of the boys either in a high school or a large academy. In the former case we approach the German or French system of education; in the latter the English. A compromise between the two, whereby a boy finishes his high school course and then takes the additional year at an academy, is hardly admissible on any ground; the single year is somewhat too short to give the intellectual influences of the new place to which the boy goes, and far too short to give its character influences.

#### AGAINST THE FRENCH OR GERMAN SYSTEM.

I cannot believe that any one who has watched the workings of the French or German system would desire to see it adopted in this country. The passage at an advanced age from the discipline of the lycée or gymnasium to the freedom of the university, however well it may work in its intellectual results, does not produce the kind of moral ones which we need. The English system has wider possibilities: and for England it does extremely well. But it is essentially a product of English conditions,—that is, of aristocratic ones. It is an education for a privileged class. In America, on the other hand, we wish our higher education to remain democratic. We should not be satisfied with a system which excluded from its benefits the large number of boys who come from institutions, public or private, which are situated near their own homes, and prepare only small groups for college. And even for those who are fortunate enough to come from the best preparatory schools, the loss in college life would often outweigh the gain in school life. A system of influences whose operation terminates at nineteen or twenty fixes a boy's moral and social place too soon. For the

young man who has grown to the full measure of his moral stature at this age it is good; for the one who matures later it is distinctly bad. In our everyday experience at Yale, as we watch the interaction between school estimates and college estimates of character, we can see that whatever postpones a man's final social rating to as late a day as possible lengthens the period of strenuous moral effort, increases the chance of continued growth, and is of the largest value to the boys and men of the best type.

The abandonment of the responsibility for forming character would have its disadvantages for the university no less than for the students. A boy's loyalty will remain where his moral character has formed itself. The devotion and sentiment of the Englishman play not about Oxford or Cambridge, but about Eton, Harrow, and Rugby. Universities which derive their prestige and their wealth from the past rather than from the present may perhaps endure this deprivation. Not so the American college or university, which looks for its strongest support to the loyalty of its alumni.

#### RELATION TO PREPARATORY SCHOOLS.

With the desire of secondary school teachers to extend their work I have the strongest sympathy. To the idea of coöperation between universities and schools, whereby each shall arrange its teaching with reference to the other's needs, I am fully and absolutely committed, and purpose to do all that I can to further it. A university fulfills its true function only when it thus seeks and gives aid outside of itself. But I believe that the chance for this extension, this coöperation, and this leadership, is to come through the freer interchange of thought and interchange of men between school teaching and university teaching, rather than through a transference of subjects from one to the other. I believe that with the conditions as they exist, the true policy for our university with regard to entrance requirements is to find out what our secondary schools can do for their pupils, intellectually and morally, and adapt our requirements to these conditions. Detailed questions as to what specific subjects we shall require must be subordinated to this general principle

of requiring those things, and only those things, which the schools can do well. To know whether we can substitute French or German for Greek, we must know whether any considerable number of schools teach French or German in such a way as to make it a real equivalent for Greek in the way of preparation for more advanced studies. Unless we keep our minds on this principle, we shall be in perpetual danger of receiving students who have been crammed for their examinations rather than trained for their work.

#### COLLEGE EXPENSES.

The second of our leading problems is the question of college expenses. Though the increase in this respect is less than is popularly supposed, there is no doubt that it is large enough to constitute a serious danger. It is far from easy to see how this danger is to be avoided. It is all very well to talk of returning to the Spartan simplicity of ancient times, but we cannot do it, nor ought we to if we could. We cannot, for the sake of saving the cost of a bathroom, return to the time when people took no baths. Nor can we meet the difficulty by furnishing the comforts of modern civilization and charging no price for them. If the university could afford to do it for every one, it might be well; but to do it for some and not for others works against the spirit of democracy. It may readily become a form of pauperization. This same danger lurks in the whole system of beneficiary aid, as at present given in Yale and in most other colleges. To avoid this danger, and at the same time give the men the help which they fairly ought to have, we need not so much an increase of beneficiary funds as an increase of the opportunities for students to earn their living. Aid in education, if given without exacting a corresponding return, becomes demoralizing. If it is earned by the student as he goes, it has just the opposite effect. This holds good of graduate scholarships and fellowships no less than of undergraduate ones. There is no doubt that in the somewhat indiscriminate competition of different universities anxious to increase the size, real or apparent, of their graduate departments, there has been an abuse of these appliances which, unless promptly

Ex-President TIMOTHY DWIGHT, D.D., LL.D.

