SCIENCE

A WEEKLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, PUBLISHING THE OFFICIAL NOTICES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1907

CONTENTS

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to the Editor of SCIENCE, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES[1]

MANY of the great industrial concerns of the present day are said to earn their dividends by means of their by-products. Not that their main work is the less essential, but that the keenness of competition has forced the managers to pay close attention to every source of revenue. If this is the case with industry it may be said with equal truth that the benefits of institutions among men often consist chiefly of their indirect effects; and I want to speak to-night of one great indirect influence for good of American universities. By an indirect effect I mean one which is not a conscious object, or at least not one of the prime conscious objects, of existence. The prime objects of a university may be grouped under four heads: (1) giving a general education to a large number of young people; (2) fitting students by a special training for the practise of a particular occupation or profession; (3) maintaining a body of scholars who add to the sum of human knowledge; and (4) recruiting the men who are to succeed them—for with a really great scholar the problem is not so much to teach him as to discover and stimulate him. Now for the attainment of these four objects various organs of the university have been established.

[1] Address delivered at Yale University on April 19, 1907, being the third of the annual Harvard lectures. The fund for this course of lectures was provided by an anonymous Harvard graduate. The first lecture was given in 1905 by President Eliot, and the second in 1906 by Professor George H. Palmer.

These are the academic department, the professional and graduate schools, and the instructing staff. Not that each organ pursues a single aim, or that the ends desired are always logically, nor perhaps most effectively, promoted by the present subdivision of our institutions, but each organ purports, at least, to lay particular stress on one of these objects.

In addition to these objects our universities and colleges are yearly rendering another great service to the whole country, by helping to create a universal standard of citizenship, to diffuse an American ideal, and it is of this that I wish to speak.

Men whose lives have passed the half-century mark can remember, after the reconstruction of the south was over, loose talk about the next split coming between the east and west; and there were people who really felt that the Atlantic seaboard and the prairie differed so much in material interests and methods of thought that the republic might not improbably be hereafter rent along the line of a meridian. The suggestion would only provoke a smile to-day. The railroads and the growth of manufactures in the west have so blended the interests of the different sections of the country that such an idea has become an absurdity. Nor has the nation become more homogeneous on the material side alone; for the intellectual and moral bonds have been drawn closer also, and in this the universities have had no small share.

But if the sectional specter no longer frightens timid souls, we still suffer acutely from a lack of uniformity of national standards in other directions. Any candid observer of the business methods revealed by the investigations of the New York life-insurance companies, and of the discrimination on the part of the railroads, can hardly fail to perceive that the misconduct which shocked the public was due at least as much to the lack of moral standard as to the deliberate violation of recognized rules of honesty. Two men quarreled publicly over the control of a great insurance company, both of them clearly unconscious that there was anything reprehensible in the methods of administration; but when the management was exposed to view, the community was shocked and a cry was raised for reform. In the same way discriminating freight rates were demanded and given a score or more years ago without a sense that the transaction differed essentially from a reduction made to a large customer by a private manufacturer. Every one, indeed, who has had anything to do with the centers of business life in this country must have been struck with the lack of a fixed code of principles in the management of corporations; and he must have seen both the snare this spreads for the unwary, and the explosion of lack of confidence caused by the uncovering of an extreme instance of a kind of thing that everybody knows is constantly occurring in a milder form. The rules that ought to govern the relation of a director of his corporation in matters of underwriting, in the matter of financial operations with bankers or brokers with which he is connected—many things of this kind are to-day in a state of uncertainty, and the series of business transactions goes by imperceptible degrees from a perfectly honorable act at one end of the scale, to an act at the other end that excites general indignation when it is revealed; and yet there is no point at which a line can be drawn and a warning given 'thus far shalt thou go and no farther.' Often in human affairs it is more important that a line should be drawn than it is at what precise point that line is drawn; for 'where there is no vision the people perish.' The fact is that the new business methods, the new possibilities of combination on a gigantic scale, have made old canons inadequate, and brought the

need of a new code of business morality. The nature, and still more the size, of modern transactions have affected the relations of men to one another, and made things wrong that were not wrong before. It is right for each man to trade or work where he pleases, but when a great combination is used to wreck a rival or coerce an industry we are brought face to face with another problem. The boycott and the trust have unsettled many old convictions; and when the accumulation of capital in a corporate form throws into the hands of the managers the power to enrich themselves by imperceptible tributes levied on innumerable stockholders, as in the case of a reorganization or a loan effected for the general benefit of the company, we feel the need of stronger rules fixing the rights and duties of directors. One naturally looks to the courts to lay down the principles of fair dealing in such cases, but while the rapidity with which vast business transactions are negotiated has increased beyond precedent, the machinery of our courts has by no means kept pace. A momentous trial takes longer than ever before, and in affairs of great magnitude, justice, if not uncertain, is at least remote. Thus it happens that the courts have not been fully able to cope with the present industrial conditions, and the law's delay is an impediment to the maintenance of sound business principles in one part of the country, as it is to the prevention of crime in another.

An orgy of political misrule, fostered by the moral lassitude following the strain of the civil war, stirred the national conscience a generation ago. Earnest men, mainly college graduates, spoke and wrote on the subject until something like a standard of political probity was generally recognized. It was not at once carried out. Politicians, especially in municipal affairs, do not live up to it yet. But the standard must come first, its enforcement afterwards, and there can be no doubt that our public life is far purer than it was at the time of the Credit Mobilier, the whiskey frauds and the Tweed ring. The public, indeed, demand to-day a stricter standard in political than in commercial life. They demand of a legislator or an executive officer a more scrupulous avoidance of dealings in which he may have a pecuniary interest, than they do of the director of a corporation; and that is one reason why they regard with complacency a degree of government control of industry that would have been repudiated with disgust a generation ago. One of the crying needs of our time, therefore, is a well-recognized code of commercial honor.

Now, it would be absurd to suppose that universities can manufacture standards of business morality. But they can help to diffuse the fundamental principles on which all morality must rest; and, what is far more important, they can bring men into that intellectual sympathy, that common way of looking at things, which must exist before an agreement on principles of any kind can be reached. Our universities do, in fact, help to set up standards of life and thought, and thus create a national unity of principles in several ways. In the first place, the instructors themselves tend to be more and more alike in their aspirations and methods of work in all our widely scattered universities. The graduate schools, where they study their special subjects, and prepare themselves for their future career, have had a marked effect in this direction. To use a highly inappropriate metaphor, these schools shuffle the pack very thoroughly. One of the pleasantest features, indeed, of the growth of the graduate schools has been the migration of students. A young man from Missouri, for example, who has graduated—let us say—at Oberlin, may come to Yale for a grad-

uate course. He may then get an instructorship at the University of Texas; and if he does well he may be offered an assistant professorship in the University of California; and finally be called to a full professorship at the University of Michigan. Nor is such an imaginary career an exaggeration of what is continually happening. Every considerable graduate school has planted its sons in universities throughout the land; and everywhere that such a man goes he spreads the light from the place he has come from, and gets more light from the men that he meets in his new place. Methods of work, and tone of thought, as well as pure knowledge and ideas, are diffused by such men far better than they can be through books, which contain only the final results of scholarship. The many learned bodies that have adopted the habit of meeting during the Christmas recess, composed almost wholly of professors, are most suggestive illustrations of how homogeneous in tone our universities are from one end of the country to the other. The college faculties form, indeed, one great brotherhood, with common aspirations and tone of thought, a brotherhood that has its ramifications everywhere, and everywhere has charge of the great sources of the intellectual life of the future.

But the work of the universities in bringing all parts of the nation into intellectual harmony is not due solely, or perhaps mainly, to similarity in the corps of instructors. It results also from the fact that the students themselves come from all parts of the land. To take first the purely professional schools: A student coming from wheresoever it may be, who learns his medicine at Johns Hopkins, his engineering at Yale, or his law at Harvard, goes back to his home not only with a knowledge of his profession, but a broader man than he was before; and he never loses the inspiration that comes from study in a really great school. He has a higher ideal, a broader outlook, than he could have acquired in a merely local institution, however good the purely technical teaching might be; and everywhere that he practises in after-life he helps to maintain the principles of his profession, and to advance its higher interests better, because he has studied in a school of national reputation, where students come from every part of the United States. In such a case it is clearly an advantage that the men from different places should be brought into as close contact as possible; and, therefore, I have regretted that the graduates of Yale, who come to the Harvard Law School in considerable numbers every year, should have fallen into the habit of living together in a remote dormitory, instead of being scattered among the other students of the school. Their classmates would benefit greatly by being thrown with them more intimately, and no doubt they would also gain something themselves. From the same point of view the policy on the part of all ambitious universities of establishing schools to fit for every conceivable profession may be open to serious objection, especially in cases where the total demand of the community for members of that profession is small. Are we not sometimes in danger of sacrificing the general welfare to the desire of an institution to be complete in itself?

But, after all, the strictly professional schools—and for that matter the graduate school, which is mainly a professional school for teachers of secondary or university grade—all these schools touch men mainly at one point. The thoughts of the students there are so centered in the subjects they are studying, that while there can be no doubt that they get much good from their fellows in many other ways, nevertheless the broadening influence of the university upon them is brought to bear chiefly through their special line of work.

It is in the undergraduate department—the college, as we like to call it—that the university can best exert its broadening power, can bring men from different places into closer fellowship and thereby give them common ideals and a national type of manhood. So far as college students are serious-minded—and they are so more than they always like to admit themselves—they are thinking not of training themselves to earn a livelihood, but in a more or less conscious way of some portion of the riddle of the universe. Moreover, they come to college at an impressionable age, when their ideas and characters are easily molded into new shapes which are often retained through life. At such a time an acquaintance with men from distant states, and especially a real friendship with one or two of them, will have an effect in slackening prejudices, and creating common ideals, that might come later only after years of experience, if at all. Some time ago one of my students from the far south said that it would doubtless have been pleasanter for him to have gone to a southern college, but he knew that if he did so he would be a southern man, whereas he wanted to be a national man, and therefore had come to us. Before he left Cambridge he became very intimate with a student from the state of Washington, and they are now both practising law in New York. It is needless to say that my friend is a national man, and the kind of man whose presence will be a benefit to New York, or any other place where he may live; to say nothing of the fact that his being in New York will also be a benefit to the southern state from which he came, by helping the people of the north to understand the feelings of the south. That such an object should be deliberately sought and followed is perhaps unusual, and proves rare perception, or maturity, on the part of my friend; but that it tells unconsciously with many men, and that thousands more have got the benefit of the principle without ever having thought of it, is undoubtedly true.

At one time the Italian government was in the habit of sending the young recruit in the army to a garrison town in a distant part of the country. The Piedmontese might go to Calabria, the Neapolitan to Tuscany and the Venetian to Rome; the object being to break down sectional feeling, and bring about a stronger national sentiment and a greater sympathy between the different provinces. The same object on a far higher plane is attained to some extent by our own colleges.

The value to civilization of the great European universities at the close of the middle ages, with their swarms of students from every part of Christendom, can hardly be overestimated. They brought all educated men into a single intellectual fellowship, and prepared the way for the reception of new ideas, and the expansion of thought. It is not easy for us to realize how great a part they played in the life of their time, because thereafter the universities dwindled in size, and only in recent times have they begun again to rival in numbers the crowds that gathered from every nation in Europe at Salerno, at Bologna, and at Paris. Hence one finds it hard to shake off the impression that they are a modern growth. In America the aggregate body of students at institutions of higher learning has been increasing rapidly for many years, not only in actual numbers, but also in proportion to the population. Our universities are not only growing larger, but their influence is extending in wider and wider lines through the body politic. Instead of being merely places where young men of means could enjoy the luxury of a liberal course of study, and where the youth aiming at a professional career could get their training, with such a general education as was

thought necessary as a foundation therefor, they aim to-day at diffusing learning directly or indirectly through all strata of society, helping to bring light to any one who wants it. This is especially true of the western universities, which are truly institutions founded by and for the whole community, and which enjoy a marvelous popularity. The opening of a wider door to the influence of the university makes it all the more important that that influence should be exerted in the best possible way, and hence that so far as possible it should not be a local institution, but one which brings together young men from all parts of the country. Looked at from the point of view of the public welfare rather than that of the individual student alone, this is so much one of the chief objects of our colleges that should a general custom arise for every man to attend exclusively the university in his own neighborhood, it would be a great misfortune to education in America. One may, therefore, question whether the part of the sums which the General Education Board is proposing to spend in fostering local institutions all over the country could not be more wisely spent in assisting young people to go to the greater seats of learning. The strongest among them would find larger opportunities of pursuing their studies, and they would all go back with a wider outlook, a better intellectual horizon, than they could get at a small college nearer home.

It may be interesting in this connection to note the geographical distribution of students in some typical American universities. It is difficult to give the figures with perfect precision. In the first place because, as found in the publications of the university itself, they sometimes include the summer school, for example, and sometimes do not; and there are inaccuracies arising from duplicate registration which are not easy to eliminate. Nor is it always perfectly clear what ought properly to be included in comparing the work of the different universities. That the students of a summer school stand on a different footing from those who take the regular course is evident. As a matter of fact, they usually come in the main from no great distance; and hence it would be manifestly misleading in the case of a university whose permanent students were very widely distributed to reduce that degree of distribution by including the figures for the summer school. The same thing is true of the short-term agricultural courses given by many of the western institutions. In comparing different universities, therefore, an attempt has been made to leave out courses of this sort, as well as merely evening schools, while including all the branches of the university where the period of study covers the regular term. But as I have already said, it is difficult to get figures exactly, and those cited here must be looked upon as merely approximate.

Most of the largest American universities have at least one student from almost every state and territory in the Union; but the proportion in which they come from the different parts of the country varies a good deal. Taking Yale, Princeton and Harvard as types of the older institutions, which are large and have flourishing undergraduate departments, we find that the proportion of the students who come from a single state runs from 25 per cent. to 50 per cent., 25 per cent. being the case of Princeton, which, situated in New Jersey, has naturally less students from any one state than Harvard in the populous commonwealth of Massachusetts. In fact, Princeton draws her largest number of recruits from Pennsylvania. Now, these figures mean that in those three universities from one half to three quarters of the students come from states other than the one that supplies the largest contingent.

The proportion of men from outside the state is, indeed, large in almost all the great institutions that are not supported by taxation. Cornell, for example, gets 56 per cent., and Oberlin only 50 per cent., of their students from their own states, in spite of the great size of the states of New York and Ohio. This is true even of some of the smaller colleges of this kind. Amherst and Williams, for instance, receive from a single state only 36 per cent. and 40 per cent. of their students, the former drawing her largest number from Massachusetts, the latter from New York.

I have spoken of all these institutions as not supported by taxation, for among the most valuable of the experiments in education that we are trying in America, is that of two classes of universities side by side, striving for the same ends, doing the same work, but supported and governed on a radically different plan. All the best of the state universities have outgrown the stage when politics hampered their usefulness, and are now very close competitors of the older institutions. The most flourishing of them are in the central and western states, but the line between the two classes being by no means strictly geographical, I shall refer to the institutions that are not maintained and controlled by the state as endowed universities. Not that the state universities are wholly without endowment from private generosity. Some of them have received considerable sums in this way, but as President Pritchett has pointed out in the first bulletin of the Carnegie Foundation, the most vigorous of the state universities have been as a rule the ones that have thrown themselves most completely upon the state and obtained the smallest fraction of their support from private benefaction.

With state and endowed universities running a very close race, with their professors constantly interchanging places, with little advantage on either side except what may flow from the different method of support and government, one approaches with interest a comparison between the two in any field; and not least this question to what extent they draw their students from afar. We have seen that Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Cornell, Oberlin and even Amherst and Williams, receive only from 25 per cent. to 56 per cent. of their students from any one state. Now Michigan appears to be the only state university that attracts any such proportion of her students from outside the state to which she belongs. In her case 54 per cent. of the students come from her own borders; while in the universities of Wisconsin (80 per cent.), Minnesota (89 per cent.), Illinois (83 per cent.), Missouri (78 per cent.), Kansas (91 per cent.) and California (91 per cent.), the proportion that comes from the state itself runs from 78 per cent. to 91 per cent.; the average for these six institutions being 85 per cent. The figures are certainly significant. So far as they go they seem to show that in the endowed universities, or at any rate in several of the principal endowed universities, less than one half of the students come from any one state, but that in the state universities four fifths, or more, commonly come from the state itself.

We should, no doubt, reach a similar result if instead of inquiring how many students came from a single state, we neglected political divisions altogether, and found how many came from a geographical area or zone within a given distance from each university; but to do so would naturally involve a very elaborate investigation. The same object may, however, be roughly attained by taking the percentage of students who come from the six states most largely represented in the university. As a result of this computation we find that Yale draws 24 per cent. of her students from parts of the United States out-

side of the six states that furnish her largest contingent of recruits; and in fact of all American universities Yale is the one whose students, in proportion to their number, are most widely distributed over the nation. Princeton draws outside of her six leading states 22 per cent.; Harvard 21.5 per cent.; Oberlin 19 per cent., and Cornell 16 per cent.; while both Amherst and Williams, in spite of their small size, draw 18 per cent. Michigan, the state university whose students are by far the most widely distributed, draws 14 per cent. of her students from parts of the union lying beyond the six states that give her most recruits. The University of Missouri, with her wide southern clientele, draws 12 per cent.; Illinois, 8 per cent.; Wisconsin, 4 per cent.; California, less than 3 per cent., and Minnesota and Kansas, only 1 per cent. each.

These figures make no pretense to be a statistical abstract of the distribution of students in our universities. They are taken from a few typical institutions alone, and, as I have already pointed out, they are not perfectly accurate. Still they are trustworthy enough to form a basis for some conclusions, not indeed very new or startling, but by no means without interest. They show that on the whole the endowed universities draw their students from a much greater area than the state universities, or rather draw a larger fraction of their students from all over the country, for, as we have seen, almost every great university draws at least one student from almost every state and territory.

Such a difference is important in view of the large size and high degree of excellence which the state universities have attained. No doubt it is in part due to the greater age of most of the endowed institutions, for the graduate of a college planted in a remote region becomes a recruiting agent for his alma mater. He advises the young fellows that he meets to go to the place where he received his own education, and in due time he sends his sons there. If he achieves success, that also works as a perpetual advertisement of his college. This suggestion of the cause of wide distribution of students is to some extent confirmed by the fact that the University of Michigan, which is the oldest of the state universities referred to, and far the oldest of them in reputation, draws her students from all parts of the country much more than any of the others. But the University of Wisconsin, founded only twelve years later, draws 80 per cent. of her students from within the state and only 4 per cent. outside the six states that give her the largest support. Moreover, if we compare Cornell with the universities of Illinois and Minnesota, which were founded at almost the same time and are about the same size, we find that Cornell draws only 56 per cent. of her students from the state of New York, while the Universities of Illinois and Minnesota draw 83 and 89 per cent., of their students from their respective states; and that from the parts of the union outside of the six principal states Cornell draws 16 per cent. of her students, while the two state universities draw only 8 per cent. and 1 per cent.

The apparent difference in the area from which students are drawn may also be due in part to the fact that all the state universities are coeducational, while the great colleges on the Atlantic seaboard which have been cited are not; and it is undoubtedly true that parents are more reluctant to send their daughters than their sons to a distant place for their education. But this motive does not apply to Cornell and Oberlin, which have admitted women freely from the start. It may, indeed, be urged that these two institutions stand in a somewhat peculiar position, and a position that has tended in the past to extend their renown and their influence over the nation.

Each of them was in her own way a pioneer in education. Each of them stood for an idea, and was in her early years radical, aggressive and militant, a condition that tends to attract persons of a like way of thinking wherever they may live. It is, of course, impossible to estimate the effect of conditions of this kind, or to allow for them in making a computation of results. Nor is it easy to select endowed and state universities whose circumstances have been so completely identical as to make comparison absolutely fair.

Perhaps the best example to be found is that of the two great universities on the Pacific slope—Leland Stanford, Jr., and the state university in California—and a comparison of these two is instructive. The University of California has been in existence more than twice as long as Leland Stanford, and is nearly twice as large; so that she ought to have an advantage on the score of both age and size, and both institutions virtually admit citizens of the state free, and charge fees of $20 a year to non-residents. Yet the University of California draws over 90 per cent. of her students from the state alone, while Leland Stanford draws 62 per cent. from that state. The students at the University of California came, according to the catalogue of 1901–2 from which these statistics are compiled, from only 29 states all told, while to Leland Stanford they come from 42. Moreover, less than 3 per cent. of the students at the former came from parts of the country outside of its six chief tributary states, as against 13 per cent. in the case of Leland Stanford. Some slight allowance must, no doubt, be made for the fact that Leland Stanford limits the number of women to 500, while at the University of California they form a decidedly larger proportion of all the students. But this is a trifling matter that could hardly affect the result seriously.

If all this array of figures does not warrant any precise quantitative comparison of the distribution of students in the different kinds of institutions, it is surely definite enough to prove that, so far as drawing from a wider area is concerned, the endowed universities are doing a more fully national work than those which are supported by state governments; and it suggests, at least, a probability that in the future they will continue to do so. There are a number of reasons why this should be the case. About half of the state universities now make some distinction in fees between citizens of the state and other people; and with the continual increase in the cost of instruction the practise is likely to grow rather than decline, for it seems unreasonable that taxpayers should be burdened to provide education for outsiders. They have been certainly extremely liberal hitherto, and a young man can go to-day more cheaply to a state university in another state that charges a differential fee, than to one of the eastern colleges.

Then there is the matter of state pride. If a boy intends to go to any state university there is a motive of local patriotism for going to his own. Is not his own as good? Is it not established, paid for and conducted, for just such as he? Is it not striving to swell its numbers? Finally, there is the question of the allegiance to his college of the graduate living in a distant state, the affection with which he looks back to it, and the eagerness with which he sings its praises. This sentiment is said to be less strong in the case of the state, than of the endowed, universities. Such a difference, if it exists, may be due to the fact that a state university, like a high school, is taken as a matter of course, as one of the regular organs of the government, and not as an institution in which a member has acquired a privileged proprietary right. Something may be due to the more common

custom of endowed universities of lodging their undergraduates in dormitories, thus giving them a real community life; and something to the practise, common, though not universal, of allowing the alumni a voice in the selection of the governing board. If such a difference in sentiment exists, whatever the cause may be, it will exert a potent influence in favor of recruiting the students of endowed universities from a wider area. But the state universities have already astonished and delighted the world too much to make safe any predictions about what they will or will not achieve in the future.

It would appear, however, that bringing young Americans together for a common education from every section of the country is at this present day preeminently the problem of the endowed universities, and especially of the larger ones; for, while some of the smaller colleges draw their students from a wide area, the larger institutions are peculiarly fitted to work on a national scale. Their very size means a wider constituency, and hence a more complete mingling of young men from all over the country. They are best adapted for the great function of helping to form a national type of manhood, because they have a better chance of drawing students in large numbers from every part of the land. But if size gives opportunities, it involves also difficulties. In a small college the individual is in less danger of being lost; the young man without aggressive personality is less likely to be ignored or submerged. Character and self-reliance are more developed by being a man of mark in Ravenna than by belonging to the mob in Rome; and what is more to our purpose, a body that is too large for general personal acquaintance tends to break up into groups whose members see little of one another. The citizen of a good-sized town has usually a wider acquaintance than the dweller in a big city.

In the social life of a college, as in other things, there is for any one form of organization an economic scale which gives the best results. Beyond that the social body becomes fissiparous, and thereby loses the benefits of size. What is worse, the lines of cleavage naturally follow the associations formed before coming to college; and hence a man from a distance, who has no friends already there, may well fail to become intimate with the men whom it is most important that he should know both for their sake and his own. In many places the social life of the students is regulated by fraternities, to some one of which almost every undergraduate belongs; and such a system may work well enough in a small college, or in one where the students come from a limited area, so that every one has a chance of being known. But in the large endowed universities that system, or any system of societies or clubs, is incapable of supplying an opportunity for the best kind of social life to the great mass of students. Nor if it could include them all would it be a fortunate arrangement, because here again we should be met by the tendency to divide on the lines of previous association, and one of the chief advantages of the great university, that of throwing together men from every part of the country, would be in great part lost.

Now, the larger colleges grow, the more pronounced this difficulty must inevitably become. In the largest of them it is already felt; in others it can be foreseen; and before many years have passed it will present a very pressing problem. With the rapid growth of the number of people who can afford to send their sons to college, with the ever greater need of education as a prerequisite to getting a good start in life, and with the tendency to require a college degree before beginning the study of a pro-

fession, there is every reason to believe that the total number of college students in the United States will increase very fast. If, therefore, the undergraduate departments of the larger endowed universities maintain their hold upon public confidence, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that in the space of a generation they may triple or quadruple in size; and before that happens the question of student life must be solved, or will have solved itself, for better or worse.

The problem is so to organize the students as to mix together on an intimate footing men of all kinds from all parts of the country. The obvious solution is to break the undergraduate body into groups like the English colleges, large enough to give each man a chance to associate closely with a considerable number of his fellows, and not so large as to cause a division into exclusive cliques. It must be understood, of course, that this applies only to the social life, not to the instruction, which would remain a university matter as heretofore. Such a suggestion of breaking up the student body has often been made, and something of the kind must be done sooner or later if we are to maintain our old ideas of the value of college life. Incidentally, it would have the effect of provoking internal emulation which we sorely need. The socialistic, or for this purpose it is more appropriate to say the Christian, spirit that has come over the world has affected profoundly our undergraduates. Of late years an appeal to purely individual objects has less effect upon them than it did formerly. A student likes to feel that he is striving not for his own selfish fame alone, but for the glory of the organization to which he belongs, and hence a rivalry between a number of colleges would add a powerful incentive to effort in many lines.

But it is not enough to suggest that the undergraduate body can advantageously be divided into groups; the difficulty comes in arranging how the groups can be formed; and here we get very little light from European experience. The German universities, and those that have followed their model, are collections of professional schools training men to be clergymen, lawyers, physicians and teachers or professors. They have nothing corresponding to the liberal culture at which our college purports to aim. That phase of education is supposed to be completed at the gymnasium. In England, on the other hand, where the universities have developed the ancient traditions in a very different way, the social conditions are such as to preclude the chief difficulty that confronts us. Oxford and Cambridge are doing a work of the same nature as our undergraduate departments, and they are made up of colleges such as I am now discussing; but the bulk of their students are drawn from a single class in the community. Men of a different class who want that kind of education usually go to London, or to one of the provincial universities. This fact, together with the inducement of scholarships, and the tendency to be guided by inherited associations, causes the students to distribute themselves among the colleges in a very satisfactory way. The men who have grown up together as boys, or who come from the same region, do not collect unduly in one college. In America we should have quite a different result if we allowed the boy to select his group on first coming to the university. He would almost certainly go to the group or college where the men were that he knew already, or at least to a place where he would not feel too much of a stranger. The students would be mainly segregated on the basis of origin, of geographical sections, of preparatory schools, of home surroundings; and thus we should have—as people have said—a college for western men, a college for southern men, a

college for millionaires. Now this is the very worst scheme of divison that could possibly be devised. It would accentuate and intensify the unfortunate lines of cleavage in the student body that are now beginning to appear. It would stereotype and perpetuate them. It would erect barriers, to prevent a student from associating readily with the very men that he ought to be thrown with. What we need, on the contrary, is a system of grouping that will bring into each group men from different parts of the country, men with different experience, and as far as possible social condition. In short, what we want is a group of colleges each of which will be national and democratic, a microcosm of the whole university. This may not be an easy feat to accomplish, but I believe it can be done. Perhaps the freshman year, which is in any case a period of transition, could be advantageously used as a time for mixing the students together, and bringing out their natural sympathies and affinities before they make their final selection of a college. But whether this solution be adopted or not, the problem is one that is, or shortly will be, common to the leading endowed universities in the eastern states, and they must all solve it sooner or later in some way if they are to maintain their undergraduate departments, and make them of the highest value to the nation.

A. Lawrence Lowell
Harvard University

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MUSEUMS

The second annual meeting of the American Association of Museums was held at the Carnegie Institute in the city of Pittsburg June 4–6, in pursuance of an invitation which had been extended to the association in May, 1906, by the trustees of that institution. The local committee of arrangements consisted of the trustees of the Carnegie Institute and a number of distinguished gentlemen representing various educational and commercial organizations in the city of Pittsburg, including the chancellor of the Western University of Pennsylvania, the president of the Chamber of Commerce, the president of the Pittsburg Stock Exchange and the presidents of the Academy of Science and Art of Pittsburg and the Botanical Society of Western Pennsylvania and the heads of various schools and colleges. An executive committee, presided over by Hon. James Macfarlane with Mr. C. C. Mellor as secretary, attended to all details.

Although the time fixed for the meeting unfortunately coincided with the commencement season in many institutions, and many members of the association were also compelled to be absent because already the work of exploration in distant regions had been begun by the museums which they represented, there were over sixty members of the association present, and almost all of the leading museums and art galleries of America were represented by one or more delegates.

The council convened in advance of the meeting of the association at the Hotel Schenley on the evening of June 3, and after dining, as the guests of Dr. Holland, the director of the Carnegie Museum, transacted the routine business which came before them in connection with the coming meeting.

The sessions were held in the lecture hall of science in the institute. President Hermon C. Bumpus, the director of the American Museum of Natural History, presided until the morning of Thursday, when the chair was taken by Dr. W. J. Holland, the second vice-president. Dr. George A. Dorsey was the secretary.

At the opening on the first day, June 4, at 10 A.M., an address of welcome was de-