

## CHAPTER II

### THE HAND ON THE UNIVERSITY

EXAMINE the personnel of the Board of Regents or of the Board of Trustees of most of our universities, and what do we find? That men of large, personal fortunes or representing large wealth are prominent there. This in itself is not in any respect to be regretted. Proper is it not only that men of scholarship and executive ability should compose bodies so important to the progress of civilization, but that men of material substance should also be included, to insure broadness of lines and stability. In every age such are sought as patrons. In every age such men deem it an honor to help hold the torch of learning. In this country they give freely out of their means to that end, and they attract donations from others. "In England," Mr. Bryce recently observed, "nothing is so hard as to get money from private persons for any educational purpose. Mr. Carnegie's splendid gifts to the universities of Scotland stand almost alone. In America nothing is so easy."<sup>1</sup>

But who are the men of means we nowadays find among our university regents and trustees, and who from without contribute so handsomely toward endowment funds? They are not mere men of independent bank accounts. They are Princes of Privilege. Generally, they are steam railroad, or municipal franchise, or tariff, or land-owning magnates; or bankers who back, or lawyers who advise, the large privilege-owning corpora-

<sup>1</sup> "America Revisited," *The Outlook*, March 25, 1905.

tions. They are of the Blood Royal of the House of Privilege.

In the university, says the poet Lowell, "truth is sought, knowledge is increased and stored; literature, science and art are fostered; honor, duty and piety are taught." And says our contemporary, Dean Van Amringe of Columbia, "The voice of reason is the voice of the university."

Why, then, should not all men be glad of enrollment in this service? An added motive for Princes of Privilege is that the universities are to large extent what Bacon called "the eyes of the nation." The people as a whole view the world through the eyes of the university. Controlling the universities then, Privilege will direct the gaze of the nation. It will have them see itself, Privilege, not as Privilege — not as special favor or advantage — but as right. Hence it is that Privilege adapts for itself the Hebrew words of wisdom: "Take fast hold of instruction; let her not go; keep her, for she is thy life."

Once strongly established, Privilege turns preceptor. It quietly extends its influence over the upper schools. It benignantly fosters the adding of knowledge to knowledge. It encourages the investigation of all things: in the heavens above, in the earth beneath and in the waters under the earth. It seeks the nature, relation and sequence of all things. It issues the proclamation of universal law.

That is to say, it does all this except in respect to one thing: itself. It endeavors to hide from general view its own nature. It wants to be represented as other than that which it really is. It aims to be classified as wealth, when in fact it is not wealth, but only a power for appropriating wealth. Wealth is stored labor; labor impressed upon matter in such a way as to fit it for the satisfaction of human desire. Wealth is natural, legitimate and to be protected. The power of appropriating wealth is not natural. It is not legitimate. It should be destroyed.

There is a science, as exact as a physical science, that

treats of the nature of wealth, and of the laws governing its production and distribution. This is the science of political economy. It should be a foundation science in a university, since it explains the conditions under which the civilized man gets his living. It might properly be called the corner-stone science of civilization. It goes to the base of society. It underlies all other sciences, as well as literature and art. Indeed, it is the very well-spring of "honor, duty and piety," since it deals with the question of how men obtain physical subsistence; and unless human physical wants are satisfied, morals cannot survive.

On the other hand, Privilege is not the subject-matter of any science, any more than is robbery. It is nothing more than a subtle means of confiscation; an ingenious and stealthy scheme of robbery. It means violence, disorder. It is directly contradictory to the peaceful and orderly precepts of science.

Obviously the science of political economy can have nothing to do with appropriation, with confiscation, with robbery. It has to do with the nature of wealth, with the laws relating to its production, and with the laws relating to its distribution among those who produce it.

Of course a university must teach political economy, else it is no school of universal knowledge. Indeed, without it, its instruction is all superstructure and no foundation. But with Princes of Privilege among its régents or trustees and its heaviest contributors, how can the real science of political economy which condemns privilege as robbery be taught? If it were so taught, the nobles of government favor would not for a moment lend their countenances and open their purses to the institution. They would not only leave it, and stop their own contributions, but through the control of politics, they would find some pretext to prevent contributions being made from the public treasury as well. They would do all in their power to destroy such an institution.

But the Princes of Privilege have no mind to abandon the university to others. They keep before them the Hebrew injunction, "Take fast hold of instruction; let her not go; keep her, for she is thy life." This admonition was intended for the mass of men, but Privilege sees in it a peculiar application to itself. If it would not have a kind of political economy taught in the schools fatal to its life, it must direct that instruction itself.

This is a fact plain of view to any who will look. "Teaching is more than a theory; it is an act," says President Hadley of Yale.<sup>1</sup> "It is not a subjective or individual affair, but a course of conduct which creates important social relations and social obligations." It follows that teaching — especially the teaching of political economy — must have regard to "social expediency."

What have science and morality to do with expediency? Nothing. They do not know the word. They do not compromise: advancing a little here, withdrawing a little there. Science and morality are not to be trimmed, or whittled, or paltered with. They are downright, absolute, final. They take no ifs, or buts, or perhapses. They deal with vast unchanging truths that were, that are, that ever will be. Expressions of the Supreme Will that made and governs the cosmos, they belong to a benevolent plan which, followed, would lead man out of his mere animal shell to an infinite progression. But expediency is his cry. It is the sign of his faltering weakness; the hobbling excuse for his non-compliance with the obvious natural mandates.

President Hadley admits as much. "Teaching costs money," says he. "Modern university teaching costs more money per capita than it ever did before, because the public wishes a university to maintain places of scientific research, and scientific research is extremely expensive. A university is more likely to obtain this money if

<sup>1</sup> "Academic Freedom in Theory and Practice," *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1903.

it gives the property owners reason to believe that vested rights will not be interfered with. If we recognize vested rights in order to secure the means of progress in physical science, is there not danger that we shall stifle the spirit of independence, which is equally important as a means of progress in moral science?"<sup>1</sup>

Vested rights? What does President Hadley mean? If vested rights *accord* with natural justice, what business is it of a university to "interfere" with them? If they *violate* natural justice, then it certainly is the business of the teacher of universal truth to condemn them.

If the language of the head of the great New Haven institution of learning lacks absolute clearness, we must remember that he is dealing with a matter requiring extreme delicacy of language. He is raising the question whether a university should be passively for privilege, or actively against it; whether it should refuse to build up its institution and carry on its work with money received from sources that it ought, in justice, to denounce, or accept the money, say nothing about its source, and so warp the moral teachings? For when he speaks of "property owners," he obviously means the owners, not of that which is properly, in the eye of uncompromising, unswerving, unchanging science, property; but what in colloquial speech and in legal diction is given that name.

Property in common speech and in law is any object of value which a person may legally acquire and hold. Piracy has at various ages been legal. Its fruits were at such times in the colloquial and in the legal sense property. The ownership of human flesh and blood was lawful in a large section of this country up to forty years ago. Legally it was property. Neither custom nor law now upholds these things. Neither in custom nor in law are they property.

The principles of political economy do not rest on

<sup>1</sup> "Academic Freedom in Theory and Practice," *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1903.

human custom or human enactment. Nor do they change. They are based on laws of nature which are eternal. Those laws decree the unalienable right of each human being to himself and to the fruit of his exertions. Since a man's energies cannot produce anything except they be applied to natural elements, it follows that there must be free or at least equal access to nature, and no right of exclusion. Free human labor can then apply itself to the free natural elements and produce things needed to satisfy human desires. These things so produced are property. They are brought forth by labor from the natural elements. They belong to the man who produces them. The origin and only title to property in the politico-economic sense is production.

Privileges do not proceed from production: from labor applied to nature. They are not in essence even tangible things. They are grants of power: active or passive delegation of power of government to certain individuals to take property from other individuals. They are not moral; they contravene the moral law.

Is not this what President Hadley implies? When he uses the term "vested rights," he surely does not mean vested justice, but things that in morals must be classed as forms of injustice. "Vested rights" that are based upon the moral as well as the civil law can have no injustice in them, can do no harm, and should not be interfered with. But this President Hadley does not discuss. He refers not to what are *morally* vested rights. He speaks of what are *legally* vested rights, but implies that morally they are vested wrongs. Paraphrased to suit this meaning, the conclusion of his statement would be: "If we recognize vested wrongs in order to secure the means for progress in physical science, is there not danger that we shall stifle truth in its distinction between what constitutes the production of wealth and what constitutes the appropriation of wealth?"

Dr. Hadley answers this question indirectly. He im-

plies that vested wrongs are recognized by the higher institutions of learning and that the truth of political economy is stifled.

Tolstoy, in one of his later books, "The Slavery of Our Times," has a chapter devoted to "Why Learned Economists Assert what is False." In another chapter, on the "Justification of the Existing Position of Science," he says:—

This wonderful blindness which befalls people of our circle can only be explained by the fact that when people behave badly they always invent a philosophy of life which presents their bad actions to be not bad actions at all, but merely results of unalterable laws beyond their control. . . . It is admitted as an undoubted truth that if in society many thieves and robbers have sprung up who take from the laborers the fruits of their labor, this happens not because the thieves and robbers have acted badly, but because such are the inevitable economic laws, which can only be altered slowly by an evolutionary process indicated by science; and therefore, according to the guidance of science, people belonging to the class of robbers, thieves or receivers of stolen goods may quietly continue to utilize the things obtained by thefts and robbery.

Tolstoy is not confining his arraignment to those who under present civil law are adjudged thieves and robbers. He includes as well those who, by privilege, by present social sanction, possess powers to take from laborers the fruits of their labor. Because such men do so appropriate, the distinguished Russian moralist accounts them to be, under the moral code, thieves and robbers.

What can be hoped for political economy in these circumstances? Biology, astronomy, physics, therapeutics, logic, theology and scores of other grand and sub-divisions of learning may be as free as the air. Deep researches may be conducted, remarkable advances made in application. The microscope may lend itself to horticulture, the telescope and camera resolve the Magellanic cloud into binary suns. The laboratory may disclose the illusive element, helium; the mysterious metal, radium; or open up a world of wonders embraced within

the human frame. We may be informed how to double the crops, save stock from epidemics, or produce a new kind of cheese. Philology may trace through surviving words the wanderings of long-forgotten nations; anthropology search the gigantic Persian Rock of Behistan, and, despite the scour and scar of a score and a quarter of centuries, read from its granite surface the vainglorious deeds of Darius, the king of kings; and from bits of baked clay dug from desert sand flash back the learning, art, wars, love, wit, wisdom, pride, ambition and mishaps of the remote city of Nippur. "Many subjects are taught to large classes at the best Eastern universities," says Mr. Bryce, "for the study of which hardly any students can be secured in England."<sup>1</sup>

But when subjects are approached that lead up to such nowadays things as the source of great fortunes, research and demonstration must move cautiously, lest all at once some one hit the pocket nerve, and, presto! away goes what President Hadley calls "the base of supplies."

The truth of the situation is presented in an incident that Mr. Louis F. Post of Chicago relates as a fact. "Why don't you endow a chair in economics in our university?" a distinguished educator asked a millionaire. "Well," was the reply, "I suppose it might be because I haven't much respect for the kind of economics the universities are teaching." "Oh," came the rejoinder, "that could be easily arranged to suit you."

The "touch," as Mr. Post calls it, was refused, for while the millionaire, unlike his class, was one who held extremely liberal views on economic questions, he had no more respect for this kind of college administration than he had for the regular brand of college "economics."<sup>2</sup>

Adam Smith observed, in his "Wealth of Nations," that he believed college endowments rendered teachers

<sup>1</sup> "America Revisited," *The Outlook*, March 25, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> *The Public*, Chicago, Feb. 27, 1904.



free of any sense of responsibility in their work. "In the University of Oxford," he declared, "the greater part of the public professors have, for these many years, given up altogether even the pretense of teaching." But if the authority to which, as the source of income, the teacher is made subject, resides, not so much in the body corporate of which he is a member, "as in some other extraneous persons," that extraneous jurisdiction "is liable to be exercised both ignorantly and capriciously." The person subject to such "jurisdiction is necessarily degraded by it, and, instead of being one of the most respectable, is rendered one of the most contemptible, persons in the society. It is by powerful protection only that he can effectually guard himself against the bad usage to which he is at all times exposed; and this protection he is most likely to gain, not by ability or diligence in his profession, but by obsequiousness to the will of his superiors."<sup>1</sup>

But if such "extraneous jurisdictions" were in the great Scotsman's time exercised "ignorantly and capriciously," those of our time heed the Hebrew proverb: "Get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding." Privilege nowadays knows what it wants and what it will not have. And first of all, it will not have Adam Smith. He teaches too much of "natural laws"; he breathes too freely of the spirit of equal rights. Consequently the "father of political economy," as he was for a century called, is relegated to the rear in our higher institutions of learning. His immortal work, "Wealth of Nations," which Buckle, in his "History of Civilization in England," pronounces "probably the most important book that has ever been written," is, along with works based on that, made into a category called "the classical school of political economy." It is put high up on the shelves, and is no longer to be seriously studied as in the

<sup>1</sup> "Wealth of Nations," Book V, Chap. I, Part III, Art. II.

main defining the fundamentals of an everlasting science, but is only to be consulted by such as desire to examine the exploded notions of a past and less enlightened age!

And what kind of political economy is put in place of the teachings beginning with Smith and running down to John Stuart Mill? A thing emasculated like its name, for it goes commonly under the title, not of "political economy" but of "economics." No longer is taught the science of the natural order in social economy, but the science of disorder, if we may link the word "science" with the word "disorder." For with constant protestation of scientific method, the shining lights among the "economists" of our universities pursue methods devoid of the first essentials of science. They do not trouble to define their terms too clearly, for that would show at once that the monopoly principle is not wealth, cannot be defended in political economy, and must stand condemned as interfering with the operation of natural laws. To make that truth too evident would tighten the purse-strings of Princes of Privilege, who are now lavish with endowments. And so, setting out with this avoidance of precision as to the very subject-matter of the science — for political economy is the science of the nature of wealth, and of the natural laws governing its production and distribution — the thing "economics" begins anywhere, usually however, with a display of historical learning, and then proceeds with a hodgepodge of erudition, German metaphysics, hair-splitting distinctions as to non-essentials, excursions into fields belonging to other provinces, and new and bewildering uses of particular words.

Geometry, geology, zoölogy, philology, have their beaten ways, their ordered procedure, their separate knowledge, methodically formulated and arranged in a rational system, and their natural laws distinguished and defined. What are conceived to be the essential principles of each of these studies are hard and fast. They

do not change, as between authorities, or as between colleges, or as between ages. They rest upon eternal natural laws.

Not so with the university presentation of the science that deals with the social life of man. Its essential principles are no more hard and fast than is a fresh piece of putty, which may be pressed into a thousand and one shapes as it passes from hand to hand.

This soft, unresisting kind of pseudo-science can be made anything that Privilege wills, varying in this or that institution with the particular form of Privilege that there dominates. For instance, in the University of Pennsylvania, which lies within the sphere of influence of the huge steel-making and allied industries, a high protective tariff is taught to be an essential part of "economics"; whereas at Yale, where other forms of Privilege have sway, the protective principle is repudiated and cast out.

The more comprehensive question of the trusts affects Williams College in New England and the Rockefeller endowed University of Chicago antithetically. Says Professor John Bascom, holding the chair of Political Economy at Williams: "The question of trusts is an economic, social and civic question, and it is the duty of every college to meet it in all these relations. A college that is thriving on the money of the Standard Oil Trust is precluded by courtesy, by honor and by interest from any adequate criticism of its methods. It has foreclosed discussion on one of the most important questions which can come before it for consideration."<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, Professor J. Lawrence Laughlin, of the political economy department of the Chicago University, ignoring the monopoly principle and treating the trusts only as large combinations of capital, says that "billionaire wealth is billionaire power," but the effect of such

<sup>1</sup> Signed letter in the *Chicago Chronicle*, Jan. 8, 1903.

power upon production and upon our political and moral growth is not necessarily derogatory, but results well or ill, according to the use to which it is put.<sup>1</sup>

This is only to say that any power whatever, from the despotism of the Cæsars to that of the president of a modern railroad empire, may be benevolently or malignantly used, according to the purpose or caprice of the individual holding it. But human actions are no part of political economy, which embodies natural laws. What men generally want to know about trusts is whether the coercive principle in them is a natural manifestation or an artificial one. If natural, it belongs to natural law and is inevitable. If artificial, it arises from human enactments and can be destroyed.

But it is not so much what the spokesmen of the Chicago University say as what they fail to say that constitutes their gravest offense. Yet how can they be expected to enter upon an examination of questions that vitally concern the fortune of its founder, Mr. John D. Rockefeller? Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden but phrases popular thought in saying: "I do not think any school that accepts money from Mr. Rockefeller will ever investigate trusts scientifically. It would not do this because it wouldn't investigate and publish the truth about Standard Oil, which admirably illustrates all the evils of the trust system. No school which takes money from Mr. Rockefeller will be honest in its treatment of Mr. Rockefeller's trust."

The Chicago University is an outgrowth of a small Baptist college, built in 1855 on land given by Stephen A. Douglas. Thirty years or more later the Baptist Educational Society was moved by the idea of a new college. Mr. Rockefeller, who belongs to that denomination, was approached. He promised \$600,000 on condition that \$400,000 should be added to it, which was done. Large

<sup>1</sup> Signed article in *New York Journal*, Dec. 5, 1898.

contributions have followed rapidly, until now the institution has received \$20,000,000, of which Mr. Rockefeller has given more than \$14,000,000. On all the official paper of the institution his name appears as founder.

Is it in human nature to take this huge sum of Rockefeller money and then question its origin? Is it not easier to accept what Mr. Rockefeller says about it? "God gave me my money and I gave it to the university," he told the trustees in a formal address. Whatever they may think about it, will they openly dissent from this? People generally know that this was not its origin. Railroad rebates, pipe lines and all manner of sharp practices gave the start to the Rockefeller Standard Oil fortune, and with that were acquired privileges of all sorts and descriptions. This was the livery the Chicago University put on when it accepted the \$14,000,000. It cannot question the giver. It must hold its tongue; and in so doing, tacitly deny the great truths which as a higher institution of learning, it should make plain at all costs. It passes under the yoke of an intellectual and moral slavery, since it must needs forbear to tell that the source of its life and the chief means of its growth are at variance with the things clear to all men — with equal rights, with the natural order.

"The wrongful and unflinching way in which this wealth has been won," says Professor Bascom of Williams College, "the long period over which these extortions have been extended and the surprising success which has accompanied them, have made the Standard Oil Company the pioneer in a policy, the embodiment of methods which threaten the very existence of our institutions. Is a college at liberty to accept money gained in a manner so hostile to the public welfare? Is it at liberty, when the Government is being put to its wits' ends to check this aggression, to rank itself with those who fight it? It is not anti-trust laws that we need nearly so much as it is an anti-trust temper. If equal conditions were given to

all forms of production, the trust problem would shortly disappear." <sup>1</sup>

If this is true of Mr. Rockefeller and his gifts to the Chicago University, the same is to be said of the manifold gifts from Privilege to the higher institutions of learning throughout the country. Not that there are not some — many even — who, having acquired fortunes by privilege, are willing to spend liberally to educate the people to see the folly of privilege grants. Such men are as much to be honored as they are exceptional. But Princes of Privilege generally have no such liberal intentions. They strive to preserve their advantages, as to the origin of which they endeavor to keep the people ignorant.

This principle of preservation operates also in respect to Mr. Andrew Carnegie's gifts to the smaller colleges and to his \$10,000,000 professional pension fund.

Much praise may without doubt be given to various forms of Mr. Carnegie's public munificence in spending the interest and perhaps something of the principal of his enormous fortune,<sup>2</sup> even if the manner is not after the

<sup>1</sup> Letter in *Chicago Chronicle*, Jan. 8, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> The phrase "to die rich is to die disgraced" has been popularly thought to have been uttered by Mr. Carnegie, and the deduction was that he intended to distribute practically his whole fortune before dying. In an interview in the *New York Times*, March 30, 1905, Mr. Carnegie was reported as saying: "I never said that to die rich was to die disgraced." Yet Mr. Carnegie did twice use a phrase that admits of the popular construction. It appeared in two articles bearing his signature, on the "Gospel of Wealth," in the *North American Review* for June and December, 1889. These articles have since been published in book form by the Century Company under title of "The Gospel of Wealth and Other Timely Essays." On page 19 of this volume will be found this passage: "Men may die without incurring the pity of their fellows, still sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not been withdrawn, and which is left chiefly at death for public uses; yet the day is not far distant when the man who dies leaving behind him millions of available wealth, which was free for him to administer during life, will pass away 'unwept, unhonored and unsung,' no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of such as these the public verdict will then be, 'The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced.'" On page 21 of the same volume will be found this passage in the second article, referring to the foregoing passage: "The first article held that

scriptural injunction to let not the left hand know what the right hand doeth. First stands the founding and magnificent endowing of the Carnegie Institution at Washington to discover the principles of science, although it is highly improbable that steps will be taken to discover and to establish the principles of the science of political economy. Nor should it be overlooked that this Carnegie patronage of scientific research closely resembles the patronage of learning in the fourteenth century by the Florentine prince, Lorenzo the Magnificent — performed out of a great fortune wrung from the sweat of the common man's face. Perhaps less, but yet much, may be said in favor of the dispensing of some \$30,000,000 over the country in "Carnegie Libraries," although the word "library" in this case means only buildings, and not books, nor does it provide for sites or for maintenance. These libraries really represent larger public than Carnegie outlay, so that while the buildings stand as monuments to Carnegie generosity, they might very much more justly be called public libraries — public monuments to learning.

Yet if the Carnegie Institution and the library building gifts pass with mixture of praise and questioning criticism, little but adverse comment is to be made on the Carnegie gifts to the smaller colleges and the provision for pensioning of teachers in the greater colleges and universities. How can such a course but help raise the premium for that contemptible, degrading "obsequiousness" which Adam Smith declared to be the accompaniment of "extraneous jurisdiction"? The multitude of the masters in our higher institutions of learning are but scantily paid

there is but one right mode of using enormous fortunes — namely, that the possessors from time to time during their own lives should so administer these as to promote the permanent good to the communities from which they were gathered. It was held that public sentiment would soon say of one who died possessed of available wealth which he was free to administer, 'The man who dies thus rich dies disgraced.' The purpose of this paper is to present some of the best methods of performing this duty of administering surplus wealth for the good of the people."

and can make only slight provision for superannuation. The multitude of our lesser colleges are gaunt and eager with hunger.

The university develops moral characters according to its material nourishment. Thomas Jefferson uttered the political and economic shibboleth of "Equal rights for all, special privileges to none." The University of Virginia which he founded breathed the doctrine of equal rights, except perhaps as to slavery.<sup>1</sup> But now that Mr. Carnegie has given it half a million dollars on condition that others should contribute a like amount, is the dictum of "special privileges to none" to be forgotten?

Shall this and the other colleges which Carnegie bounty has favored teach the truth about matters of vast public concern at this time: about rebates, pools, combines, stock water, lobbies, tariff schedules, monopolies of transit, oil, natural gas, coking coal and iron ore? Or shall there be dodging, dust-throwing, silence? Who can doubt the latter, except by the occasional college, or by such rare professors, as, taking their professional lives in their hands and ignoring "extraneous jurisdiction," boldly proclaim the truth?

The case is not merely as if Captain Kidd in his latter days, leaving off his ship-looting ways to endow colleges and win peace and honor, should have expected the preceptors to refrain from referring ever so delicately to the spring whence flowed his bounty. It goes deeper. It is as if, in making the endowment, the illustrious mariner, through his endowments, should have quietly intimated that the departments expounding the natural laws of commerce should do that expounding in such a way as not to proscribe the highly profitable vocation of piracy!

And thus it is that President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton declares, "We can't abolish the trusts; we must

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson himself, however, was clearly and emphatically against slavery.



moralize them." Ex-President Cleveland, delivering one of the Stafford Little Lectures at the same institution, reviews the Government's part in the Chicago strike of 1894, calmly telling how, through the Attorney-General of the United States, "instead of relying entirely upon warrants issued upon criminal statutes against persons actually guilty of the offense of obstructing United States mails," he devised a plan of procedure not contemplated by the laws — a plan by which "the courts should be asked to grant injunctions which would restrain and prevent any attempt to commit such offense." Professor Simon N. Patton of the University of Pennsylvania is reported as saying that "the whole social problem would be solved" were the young wife "to become income producer" in addition to the young husband. Professor J. S. Clark of Northwestern is said to contend that an unskilled American laborer can and should support a family decently and perhaps put something away out of \$300 a year. Or observe how Mr. Rockefeller quotes as a defense of his career a thesis appearing in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* of Harvard, and has it published in book form for gratuitous presentation to clergymen. Again, take note that President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, addressing high school pupils in Buffalo, repeats his former declaration that "a scab is a hero," and adds: "I believe that long hours and hard work are best for every man. Work is the foundation of civilization, and work makes nations as it does individuals. No man can work too hard or hours too long if his health will permit."

Is it strange that in such an atmosphere the body of students come to harbor warped views about universities and other things? Thence come they to think that this *alma mater* — this fostering, nourishing, bountiful mother — is most wise, just, upright; and that all gathered within her sheltering fold are favored as by a kind of life fellowship. President Butler of Columbia says, "The *esprit de corps* of a college is its life." College "spirit" it is

called, but in the social conditions arising from the present unequal distribution of wealth it is fast becoming caste feeling.

For college "spirit" is not merely drawing a line, but digging a trench between those within and those without the college pale. Within, to college view, are the intelligent, the cultured, the wise, the well-to-do. Those without as a whole appear to be poor, improvident, ignorant, unreasoning and unreasonable. The college makes no real, concerted attempt to find *why* this is or appears to be so. That would expose Privilege, which interferes with the just distribution of wealth, and hence breeds social differences. The college treats the superficial appearance as the inner reality of things, and tacitly says that what thus appears to be, is right.

We have previously noted the uprising of class feeling among us. College spirit is giving to it the intellectual stamp. We hear now of the "intelligent class" and of the "ignorant class." This means, in plain words, that the people of leisure who go to college are the "intelligent class," while the people who have to work for a living and who do not go to college are the "ignorant class."

As yet this has had only sporadic issue in action. College students have appeared in New York and elsewhere as strike breakers. Their numbers have been insufficient to have material effect, but the spirit hostile to organized labor and critical of the whole body of "work people" has been manifested. Under stress of widening social disparities, the present nebulous college *esprit de corps* is likely to condense into sharply defined, aggressive, warring caste sentiment.

Such a state of things is hastened by the increasing cost of college life, which raises the barrier against the poor. At least such cost is rising in the greater universities, and the sentiments bred there must spread to the lesser institutions. Mr. John De Witt Warner, a regent of Cornell, has noted that the expense of the average undergraduate

there is fifty per cent. greater now than before 1885.<sup>1</sup> He ascribes this, to some extent, to the added cost of living common to the whole population. But the great cause he believes to be a departure from the simplicity and economy that until lately was the characteristic of the American college. Mr. Warner says:—

It will scarcely be questioned that the expense of college life and its social and material demands are greater than twenty years ago—much greater than forty years since. That in all respects the Spartan regimen was the better, no one would insist. But that in this respect the atmosphere of university life has not become less pure and stimulating, few will question. From my observation—and it has been sufficiently deliberate and full to have made inevitable pretty decided convictions—university culture throughout the Northwest has been vulgarized and made less practical and helpful than it used to be. Similar tendencies are spreading through the West and South. Cornell's usefulness has been seriously damaged in this respect, though much less than has that of some of the more eminent of her rivals.

Mr. Warner suggests a policy of administration to mitigate the evil. But nothing short of a vigorous and rigid paternalism could check the quickening pace set by our young Princlings of Privilege. How unlikely is the adoption of such a policy appears from the abuse of the elective principle in selecting studies—an abuse which enables those who have been called "the lazy rich" to graduate with the least possible effort.

Now, as of yore, many poor young men, by strict economy and working outside between times, manage to carry themselves through such institutions. At Columbia, for instance, a considerable number of the undergraduates while enrolled in the university incidentally earn a portion of the pay for their schooling and living. Among their occupations are tutoring, soliciting for mercantile houses, ushering in theaters and elsewhere, bookkeeping, census taking, preaching, singing and playing in choirs, typewriting, waiting on table and clearing snow from sidewalks.

<sup>1</sup> "Simplicity and Economy in Student Life," *Cornell Alumni News*, Nov. 23, 1904.

There is something of the old American independence of spirit and eagerness to learn about this. But in the former times the money disparity between such as these and the other students was comparatively small. There was then no class of students who could bet a thousand dollars on a college game, pay \$800 for the papering of a single room, spend \$200 on a small supper, and give half that sum for a couple of seats at a championship fight. The valets and chauffeurs of such princelings at college get more of the creature comforts than many an earnest young undergraduate, who, with infinite strain, is grinding his way through.

Who will believe that all this is as it should be or that it is but the workings of the inevitable? In their heart of hearts, few. He who runs may read. Privilege, which itself is unnatural, has taken hold of instruction in the higher institutions and will hold to it as to its life.