

society?—Rev. F. L. Higgins, of Toronto, in *The New Church Messenger*.

THE EDUCATIONAL PARADOX.

For The Public.

R. T. Crane, one of Chicago's manufacturers, in a book recently published, has expressed a sentiment that appears to be gaining ground in so called modern thought. In one quite pungent passage he says:

I take the ground that a young man who goes to college not only is not benefited by it, after spending seven years in time and \$10,000 to \$12,000 in money, but is most decidedly and positively injured by the college. He comes out so conceited that he is at a great disadvantage in getting into business, and it takes years, and sometimes a lifetime, to get his head back to a normal size.

Now, in regard to such sentiment, some very natural questions suggest themselves. Has the United States, in the establishment and support of schools for intellectual development, made a huge mistake? Have the founders of colleges, through mistaken benevolence, done harm to succeeding generations instead of intended good? Is there any selection or predestination in regard to the limit or extent of human learning? Is the opportunity as freely offered to one as to another, if he will? Is the poet's declaration, "A little learning is a dangerous thing," true? If it be necessary in a democracy for each individual unit to know something, is there good reason why he should not know more? If the mind be capable, as it is, of improvement in thinking, in reasoning, in matters of judgment, by what authority does any manufacturer, millionaire, or what not, become the arbiter to fix the limit on that development? Is there not in human souls an innate diversity of tastes, of gifts, of talents, of powers? Should all be manufacturers, traders, contractors, coal operators, mere plodders in hand labor? Are the conditions of birth and environment the same to all? Is it to be laid at the door of learning that some young men amount to little after college? Is it all the fault of mental development? Do the manufacturers send their own sons to college? Do they make those sons acquainted with inuring toil before college? Or do they leave them to their own devices, too busy themselves to give thought to such trifles? Does popular sentiment have anything to do with the question? Does popular sentiment not rather demand that every college graduate en-

ter some profession, or seek some position higher than the substratum? Would a community, a town, a city be the better or worse, if every person of adult age in it, working earnestly and heartily in his present sphere, were a college bred individual? Would they be better to live with, to treat with, to do business with, other things being equal?

According to some readers of *The Public*, these queries may not be put in logical sequence, but never mind. Let us take a short pleasure trip on the electric car now approaching. Superior intelligence, developed intellect, expanded thought has added much to our comfort and convenience, though there may be space for improvement. Do you notice that young man who manipulates the motor crank and car brake? He is a fine specimen of well developed manhood in physique and in features. He took his degree at Harvard last year.

"What! A Harvard graduate! And running a trolley car! He must be an ambitious youth! Why does he not seek some more remunerative position? He will never amount to anything."

We all have heard such remarks, in which we have the modern idea of education, a commodity measured in dollars and cents. "How much is it worth?" Is not a man with a well trained mind a safer manager of an electric car than is an ignoramus, who knows only one thing and that by half? It is the same in other "humble" vocations. Popular sentiment receives a shock when educated men follow such vocations. But the Chicago manufacturer is acquainted with some college products, who are swayed by this popular sentiment, his own sons, perhaps, though he thinks their heads are too much expanded, who will not stoop to conquer, but whose ambitions demand recognition in some "genteel" profession, or high and remunerative position, or none. And so these would-be critics of our schools and colleges look with disdain upon the college man at humble toil, as sadly lacking in ambition; and yet in the same breath condemn the school and college system that inspires a youth to seek for higher preferment. "What fools we mortals be!"

GEORGE W. FLINT.

The Gormonizer—"If that Bryan would only keep still, the reorganizers would have some hope."

The Wonderer—"But what about the people?"

G. T. E.

A MORNING WITH THE PREACHERS.

At the Vine Street Congregational Church, Cincinnati, June 7, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, told of a morning which he spent with the members of a ministerial association, discussing social problems. Mr. Bigelow said in part:

It was in the city of J—. I happened to be there for a course of lectures, and accepted an invitation to speak at the preachers' Monday morning meeting.

My theme was the labor problem. I attempted to show that millions of our fellow creatures, by reason of their scant wage, are compelled to work and live in conditions which stunt the mind and discourage, if not prohibit, the formation of moral character. I declared that it was the plain duty of the preachers to encourage every wise and just plan of economic betterment, in order that the discouragements to right living may be diminished and a more wholesome environment provided for the masses.

According to the custom in this association, the address of the day was followed by a general discussion. Then it was my turn to listen. That general discussion threw no light on the labor problem. But it threw a flood of light on the preachers.

Without the slightest shade of coloring I want to report the substance of their remarks on this important theme.

One preacher, with breezy optimism, brushed aside my contention as to low wages and bad conditions, with the assertion that the miners in the neighborhood of J— were getting \$34 a week.

It seems that he had heard of some miner who was said to have made that. He could not tell how many, if any, helpers this miner had with whom he was compelled to divide his \$34. It is true that the special commission appointed by the President reported that the average wage of the contract miner is from fourteen to sixteen dollars a week. This commission ought to know. But this preacher thought the commission must have been mistaken because he had heard of a miner who got more. How trustful men are of any evidence which justifies their prejudices!

The next speaker was still more optimistic. His assertion was that laborers in and around J— were making from \$2.50 to \$10 a day. "Moreover," said he, "if there are a few who do not get enough, we can't

remedy the matter. I believe Baer and Morgan and Carnegie and Rockefeller are good, conscientious Christians and are doing as well as they can for the workingmen. What do we know about business? I tell you the preachers are all right. The trouble is with the people. They need more of Jesus in their heart. That's what's the matter. If the people will treat Jesus right, He will treat the people right." This remark elicited vigorous Amens from the brethren.

Almost every preacher who took part in the discussion voiced this sentiment, that the thing needed was not economic betterment, but individual salvation. One and all they declared: "The great need of the workingman is Jesus Christ, and him crucified."

What truth is there in this threadbare phrase? If a workingman were dissipated and conversion to Christianity made him sober, to that extent his economic condition would be improved. But suppose he is already a sober and hard-working man. How will his conversion raise his wages? There can be no general and permanent increase in wages save through legislation which destroys monopoly and thereby increases the opportunities for remunerative employment. But that cannot be done without a knowledge of political economy. Will conversion to Christianity teach a man political economy? Will it teach him to run an engine? Will it teach him to pilot a steamer? It requires thought to exercise intelligently the rights of citizenship. The man who does not give earnest thought to the problem of improving the social conditions of his fellowmen is a bad citizen, although he may be a good church member or even a preacher.

Another preacher referred in his remarks, to the parable of the man who, having been relieved of one devil, was possessed of seven other devils. The application he made of the parable was this. The workingmen many of them, get a beggarly wage. That he conceded. He affirmed that they ought to get more. "But," he said, "suppose we should increase their pay, what then? There would be just that much more that they would have to squander on the saloon and theater. If we did nothing more than to increase their wage we would make them seven times more devilish. Let us preachers demand more pay for the work-

ingmen, but let us also demand that we have some control over their wages; let us have charge of their money; let us save it and invest it for them, for we know better than they how to take care of it."

These preachers look upon themselves as the shepherds of their flock, until they get to thinking of the people as sheep. They are long on benevolence and short on liberty. They never doubt their fitness to manage the affairs of others. They would be fosterfathers rather than brothers to the multitude.

The preacher who thus delivered himself was one of the leading clergymen of the city. If the teachers are capable of such childish utterances, what can be expected of their pupils? "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" If the men from whom light is supposed to come are so hopelessly ignorant, what chance is there for the illumination of the mass?

RELIGION AND POLITICS.

Extract from a sermon delivered by the Rev. Quincy Ewing, pastor of St. James' Episcopal Church, Greenville, Miss., May 17.

Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Rom. 13:7.

Speaking last Sunday morning from a text found in the same chapter from which the text for to-day is taken, both expressing the same fundamental principle, I called attention to the fact that the Christian religion has never yet become potent enough in the affairs of men to found, and inspire, and direct an altogether Christian government; and that in all ages—our own included—the laws which the citizens of any land have been expected to obey have not been framed altogether in devotion to the Christian ideal of life and conduct, but on the contrary, in many cases, in contravention of that ideal. And so, as I said, the followers of Christ have all along been compelled to render loyalty to governments and obedience to laws that were offensive to their spiritual faith; on pain, if they acted differently, of being rightly considered unfit to live amidst the unavoidable conditions of this world, and of accomplishing by their rebellion nothing whatever for the ends of righteousness. Because civil governments and laws are absolutely indispensable to the well-being and progress of humanity; and because all such governments and laws must be imperfect while men themselves are; therefore, as I en-

deavored to say, the wisdom and duty of the Christian is to be law-abiding, rather undertaking to live out his religion, despite the handicap of adverse conditions, than insisting that he must either repudiate and defy those conditions, or account himself disloyal to the Divine Leader. . .

But this was very far from saying that it is the duty of the Christian to be loyal to a bad government with the sort of loyalty that would forbid him to do what he reasonably could to substitute for it a better; or to obey bad laws, as if it were sacrilege, an affront to the expressed wisdom of the Most High, to strive to sweep them from the statute books. The followers of Christ must simply submit, if circumstances, as in the case of the ancient Romans, are such that submission is the only wisdom, and non-submission only folly. But under circumstances such as appertain to us in this land at this time, the Christian is not meeting his full obligation, unless there be mingled with his submission to imperfect governments and vicious laws the aggressive resolve to do something; to do what he righteously can, to clear away the governmental obstructions, the legal obstacles, that are in his way, and the way of other men, who would live out more nobly and widely the principles of righteous religion. Doubtless in this land and others there has been too much submission on the part of Christian men, unmingled with the resolve to reform the bad in government and law, or fight it out of existence if it decline to be reformed. Even if men professed Christianity simply as a means to faring well in the world to come, they could hardly afford to ignore the obligation to do what they could to make better the civil laws and governments under which they live; for upon the character of these things depends very largely a man's opportunities for fulfilling the precepts of Christ, for being a practical Christian; and surely they would be best prepared for the judgment of the world to come who had not only most truly professed, but had also most widely practiced, in their relations to their fellowmen, the ideal of their religion—if it be, that not those who say, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but those who do also the will of the Heavenly Father. . .

But Christianity is belittled, Jesus is dishonored, when men profess allegiance to Him, simply to fare well in the world to come. His religion is not a means to anything, or any place,