which has preceded it, can in its own right reconsider its religious heritage, improving upon it in all reasonable and useful ways.

It is not desired that the colleges should set themselves to promote particular denominational organizations, creeds, rituals, or politics. Let them rather teach religion in the same historical and scientific way that all other subjects are taught. Let the empirical method be employed, with a calm, clear, appreciative, constructive and practical mind, ready to see the facts as they emerge from study, ready to interpret the facts in the light of all we know, and ready to turn these facts to the best possible service of present-day thinking and living. We look, therefore, to the college to establish and maintain a chair of religion, with one or more instructors, with an adequate set of courses, with the necessary library and collections, in order that justice may be done this great area of human experience, this great cultural branch of education.

COLLEGE AND STUDENT.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COLLEGE FOR THE STUDENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL

GEORGE ALBERT COE, LL.D.,
Professor Union Theological Seminary, New York.

If evidence of the moral virility of our higher education were needed, it could be found in the fact that the volley of criticism to which our colleges are being subjected comes chiefly from within the colleges themselves. Where self-reformation sets in so vigorously, there is surely a high degree of general health. Perhaps the most encouraging sign of all is the recognition by presidents of several of the older universities that the focus of the present difficulty is within certain administrative policies that have increasingly prevailed for about a generation. We are not suffering from any general or systemic disease. The religious and moral condition of the colleges has improved with great rapidity for more than a hundred years. Taking into consideration the extension of higher

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

education to ever larger and larger circles of the population, and, also, its closer relation to various occupations, we shall be well within the truth if we assert that religion has achieved no greater triumph in this country than in the colleges and universities. Not with a feeling of depression, therefore, but rather with cheer should we face the present difficulty.

THE DIFFICULTY.

The nature of our difficulty is easily discerned. There is little complaint as to the competence of college faculties or the quality of college equipment, but large complaint concerning the response made by students to the enormous advantages that are open to them. The feast is spread but the invited guests respond only languidly. *First*, the standard of scholarship, though it is high within the faculties, is low among the students. Studies do not take, unequivocally, the first place in the college consciousness; intellectual curiosity and ambition are not sufficiently in the atmosphere. *Second*, culture as well as scholarship is undervalued. The awakening of delight in the finer products of genius has ever been recognized as one of the aims of higher education. If a student acquires literary discrimination, love for books and a habit of enjoying the company of the elect of all ages, his education is not in vain. But present conditions do not seem to favor this type of student interest. If I should tell you that not long ago three students, spending an evening together, remained to the small hours of the morning reading and discussing poetry, and to confiding to one another their own attempts at verse, you would smile incredulously. The story is true, but you marvel at it because you know how rarely such things happen. *Third*, students are subjected to needless moral strain. We are agreed that removing students from contact with the world is not the way to develop moral strength; but it is certain that freshmen in almost any of our institutions may, without fault of their own, find themselves in group relations that intensify temptation and fail to correct wrongdoing.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

These, in outline, are the difficulties. Who is responsible? Not in any large measure the college professors. There is no evidence that they are neglecting the duties that are officially placed upon

them. The professor is supposed to be absorbed in the pursuit of a particular branch of learning; he was elected because of his promise as a scholar, and the conditions of his promotion lie precisely here. Even if he desires to make scholars of his students how is he to do it? A certain student is before him, together with thirty or forty more, for one hour three or five times a week for a half year or a year. The next hour this professor will meet another class which he sees no more often. How can he get at the personality of these students? There are professors who have a gift for doing this thing, but such gifts belong to few. Doubtless some professors neglect opportunities for personal contact with students. Yet, do his best, the individual cannot solve this problem. Under our present machinery, the subject of study is in the foreground, the personality of the student is in the background. In the undergraduate department there is little that the average instructor can do beyond teaching his subject well and marking his students fairly.

Consequently the student experiences little pressure toward scholarship. In each department he is tolerated if his work is only mediocre, and such work will bring him a diploma exactly like that of the "dig." Is it to be wondered at that the ambition of so many students takes another direction, and that studies become perfunctory, with all the moral dangers involved therein?

The departmental system in the college works also against the cultural ideal in education; for it exalts subjects of investigation rather than the personality of the pupil. Even the departments of literature drift into linguistics or chronology or some other lot of facts, while simple good taste and the delights that it makes possible are forgotten. All through the college course we see facts put into the foreground and values put into the background. Values can be known only as they are felt; they exist only for the personality in its unity. Sentiment toward what is fine or coarse, beautiful or ugly, good or evil, however, is about the last thing that the college deliberately cultivates.

EVILS IN ATHLETICS.

Nor are the professors chiefly responsible for the moral evils associated with student life. Take, for example, the evils of athletics. Intercollegiate athletics, as now conducted, involve, funda-

mentally and inevitably, dishonesty. The false certification of hired players is only a consequence or a symptom of something deeper seated. These contests involve fundamental insincerity in that the recognized methods by which they are carried on contradict the only good reasons that they allege for existing as college sports. Professedly, they exist as sport, play, recreation after labor, but in fact they have become a great organized business that requires large funds for its prosecution, employs paid specialists who necessarily infuse the professional spirit into that which is their profession, and subordinates the real interests of the college player to the demands of the business. Consider, link by link, the following chain: Expensive training, supplies, transportation; therefore, gate receipts; therefore, a crowd; therefore, spectacular playing; therefore, brilliant players, winning players, if the college fall. Of course, they are distracted from their studies, and what should be play becomes labor—hard, grinding labor. Under these conditions there is inevitable temptation to strain the rules of eligibility, and finally to violate them in order to secure players who can win games. Here is the root, also, of ungentlemanly playing. In vain do we strive to stop dirty work by formal rules at the very moment when we are forcing players to win at any cost. In vain will you build walls of definition to exclude professionalism when making a business of play is the essence of the enterprise.

The chief reason why the evil has been able to reach such a monstrous growth is to be found in the conditions already described that favor low standards of scholarship and lack of cultural ideals. Athletics do not seriously interfere with the instructional duties of the college, neither does the instructional work interfere with athletics. The trouble lies precisely in the fact that these two enterprises can be carried on side by side without serious conflict. The instructional force of the college is teaching subjects, and not holding itself responsible for educating the student. The instructor can carry on his investigations and teach his classes without knowing or caring that the grade of a given student is low because of divided allegiance. The student's college work is split up into fragments, in none of which his own self, his undivided personality, must appear for just what it is. If you reproach a student for the evils of athletics he is likely to respond that he meets every

requirement that the college places upon him. If you reproach an instructor for permitting these evils, he will reply that he does the work of his own department faithfully, that he has no means of knowing the inside facts of the athletics of the college, and that, even if he did know the facts, he would be powerless to correct the evils.

SUBJECTS VERSUS MEN.

Here is the root of the matter: In its eagerness to teach subjects the college forgets to educate men. The fault is relieved to some extent by the advisory relation that is sometimes established between the student and the dean or other adviser. No one will question the usefulness of deans or professors as advisers; but the scheme of giving advice is at best only a palliative, an effort to treat symptoms without removing causes. Something is gained if, while the faculty instructs, the dean undertakes to educate, but this does not restore the college to unity. The basal fact is that the function of instruction and the function of education have become separated.

Just as professors escape criticism for this separation, so do presidents and deans and governing boards. Every functionary performs with zeal what he understands to be his official duty. The astounding fact is that every officer can do his duty without being answerable for the progress of students in culture, scholarship, or character. Responsibility for finances and for instruction is definitely fixed, but nobody is required even to know in what direction the student, as an individual, is moving.

How may we hope to get out of this vicious circle of irresponsibility? As matters stand in American colleges, educational policies do not originate in the governing boards of trustees or regents. On the other hand, initiative in administrative policies has largely departed from the faculty, which has become often in name as well as in fact the "force of instructors." The dean, in turn, is naturally absorbed in administrative details. Hence it is to the president that we must look for leadership in restoring the unity of the college. Is it too much to say that this is the supreme administrative problem for the present generation of college presidents?