

men away from religion? No. Is there not a growing religious spirit among college students. Certainly. Any person familiar with student life will bear testimony to the fact that the student body of our colleges and universities is not less indifferent to high thinking and clean living than ever, but that there is in it an appreciable increase of the religious spirit. Is there not to be seen a widespread tendency to establish biblical chairs in colleges and chairs of allied subjects in universities? Certainly. There are few colleges of any importance which do not make some special provision for this sort of instruction. Is there not in denominational colleges a growing custom of establishing quasi-denominational departments in which undergraduates are increasing in numbers and in efficiency.

It would be possible to add other arguments to these which would favor the view that college education now as never before is introducing the religious element into undergraduate life. Support is freely given by college faculties to Christian associations for men and women; Bible classes are conducted by members of the faculty; recognition is more than ever before given to religion as an integral part of life and therefore something to be studied in classes of sociology or anthropology. The very silence concerning the claims of historical Christianity may be interpreted as an evidence of a deepening conviction on the part of college men that religion is something other than assent to external propositions and is really the life of a soul with its God.

Yet the question still presents itself, Is the general tendency of college and university education anti-religious? And the second and more final reply is, Yes. If the facts which have just been stated are carefully sifted, it will appear that except in the case of the course in the Bible and in the theological departments of colleges and universities, all the agencies making towards a deeper religious life on the part of the student and all those agencies which are making him to-day more a man of faith than were his forerunners, and are strictly educational. They lie outside the curriculum and are almost exclusively personal in character. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Bible class, the religious meeting, the public address, all these may be a part of college life, but they are not a part of the college curriculum. They may exist in a institution whose instructors as a whole are thoroughly out of sympathy with religion as they understand it.

If one will take the trouble to examine the curricula of different colleges one would be astonished to see how matters of religion have become matters of investigation rather than of inspiration. A class in anthropology is not interested in religion as a force in a student's life, but in human life in general. It is more concerned with the origins of religion than with its results. So, too, while religion may be recognized in a historical classroom as one of the forces in human pro-

gress, the class-rooms which attempt to treat Christianity as anything more than a historical or even archaeological matter, are growing fewer. We should not expect, of course, to find men dealing with physical or biological sciences speaking much of religion, but unfortunately many teachers of such subjects are forced by questions more or less direct to take positions which, either rightly or not, are interpreted as indicating that the instructor is skeptical as to the worth of the claims of historical Christianity.

It is at this point that the church is reaping the results of the ill-advised controversy into which it entered with scientific men in the middle of the last century. However much we may desire to obscure the fact, the result of that controversy has been the at least temporary alienation of men of science from Christianity as a formal system of teaching. Having been told by leaders of organized Christianity that his results cannot be accepted by Christians, the man of science has felt himself compelled to stand by those things which he has found to be capable of proof. The fact that within the last few years there has been a steady approach of the two wings of thought to each other has not yet served to overcome the unfortunate consequences of these early years of struggle.

But this is not all. By the very nature of their work the physicist and the biologist and the chemist are led in different fields than that occupied by religion. Their attitude is by no means that of hostility, but it is not one of companionship. It is rather that of a more or less tolerant agnosticism.

If it be argued that colleges and universities should not employ such men, but rather those who are avowedly and aggressively religious, the only reply that can be made is that as a whole scientific investigators and scientific teachers of the highest rank are not deeply interested in the work of the church. They are noble men, they are in many cases religious men, but they are not interested in furthering religion in their teaching. We cannot now stop to justify this statement, but no man acquainted with the facts will deny it. However true it may be that in the small college the professors of various sciences will be found among the workers of church organizations, it is certainly not true in the larger institutions; and what is more symptomatic, this indifference to religion as such is rapidly spreading to the smaller colleges. A man cannot be trained under a teacher indifferent to religion without in some way sharing in that indifference.

What is true of the teaching of science is increasingly true of the teaching of ethics. In the old days ethics were taught in colleges by the president, who was practically without exception a clergyman. At present, except in the smaller colleges, the tendency throughout the educational world is towards the putting of the teaching of ethics in the hands of men who have had no theological training and who have had but a very general interest in religion as a basis of ethics. In former

days the college president while teaching morals endeavored to impress certain great fundamental ethical truths upon his class. He regarded his position in a way as that of a prophet. To-day, although the tendency has not yet become universal, it is none the less marked towards considering the study of ethics as a sort of historical discipline in which various theories of great teachers are studied and criticized. The university teacher is more interested in theoretical origins of morality than in enforcing moral principles. The question naturally arises, therefore, whether the purely scientific attitude towards moral questions is conducive to the development of a religious interest. Probably it is not.

In one particular the curriculum of the great modern university shows a marked lack in instruction bearing upon religion. In the old days nearly every college president gave a course known as "the evidences of Christianity." While such courses are now given in many small colleges and occasionally, doubtless, in larger ones, they no longer form an important portion of the college curriculum. If given they are elective, but more frequently omitted. There can be no doubt that such an omission is a serious mistake. In institutions where there is a divinity school it may not be necessary for some arts department to undertake such a course, but in all probability even there it should be made a strong undergraduate elective. In institutions where there is no divinity school it should certainly be given. It is a most serious oversight to allow young men to go out into the world without having considered the real basis upon which they may accept the essentials of Christianity.

Shall we say that this steady tendency towards omitting religious elements from the college course marks a gain or a loss? Unquestionably it is a loss. Christianity is really at the bottom of all true educational history. If the complete story of benefactions to educational institutions could be written, it would be found that in an overwhelming majority of cases such benefactions were the direct outcome of religious interest. To dechristianize our education is a reform against nature. If Christianity be what we believe it to be, its claims, its contents, and the ground for believing in it should form a part of every college curriculum. Anything like sectarian theology should of course be omitted; anything that would give offense to others than Protestant Christians should also be omitted; but a man should be trained religiously as well as intellectually during his college course. The sooner our educational institutions grapple with this problem of religious education the sooner will they train up a generation under the control of the fundamental principles of our faith. As it is, our institutions of higher learning are neglecting religion in their curricula and either with intention or not, are educating men and women away from religion.—Christendom.

It is with knowledge as with money, we gain more by the right use of what we have. Money unexpended is little better than the clods of the valley. Knowledge unused is dead capital.