

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