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PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE

To arouse and unify Southern Baptist sentiment and conviction on the subject of denominational education, and by mutual help to seek to standardize and to increase the efficiency of all our schools.

PROCEEDINGS

GENERAL TOPIC: "STANDARDIZATION."

DECEMBER 3, 1921.

MORNING SESSION

The Tenth Mid-Winter Conference of the Southern Baptist Education Association convened at the First Baptist Church, with President William Louis Poteat presiding.

Devotional services were conducted by Dr. J. E. Dillard, pastor of the Southside Baptist Church, Birmingham, who spoke on "Wisdom in the Book of Proverbs."

On motion of Dr. Cottingham, the Nominating Committee was instructed to present three names for membership on the Executive Committee.

President Poteat announced the following committees:

- Resolutions—President M. B. Adams, Dr. J. W. Cammack, President R. W. Weaver, President J. W. Provine and Principal N. A. Melton.
- Next Meeting—Secretary Albert R. Bond, President J. L. Johnson and Prof. J. B. Tidwell.
- Nominations—President B. H. DeMent, President John O. Dawson and Principal Claude Gray.

President Poteat delivered the annual presidential address on "The Standard Man" (See page 7). General discussion took the form of questions which were answered by the speaker.

STANDARDIZATION IN EQUIPMENT, TEACHING AND CURRICULUM

1. As Related to Institutional Autonomy—President Charles E. Dicken, Arkadelphia, Ark., discussed this topic (See page 10.)

2. As Related to the Christian Ideal—Address by President John E. White, Anderson, S. C. (See page 18); discussion by Secretary R. T. Vann, Raleigh, N. C.

3. As Conformity—Address by Secretary Harry Clark, Nashville, Tenn.; discussion by President Paul V. Bomar, Marion, Ala.

President Rufus W. Weaver, Macon, Ga., offered resolutions, which were made the special order for 2 p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION

On motion of Secretary R. T. Vann, a committee on publication was raised, consisting of Secretary Albert R. Bond, Secretary W. C. James and Secretary I. J. VanNess.

President M. B. Adams presented the report of the Committee on Resolutions. After discussion and amendment, the report was adopted as follows:

"Whereas, the establishing of the Baptist interpretation of Christianity throughout the world depends upon the education of the youth of this generation, fitting them to become the bearers of the Baptist message, and

"Whereas, no constructive program of education in the South today can be outlined without consideration being given to standards, publicity, current support, curriculum and control;

"Therefore, Be it Resolved:

"First—That the Southern Baptist Education Association undertake, in conformity with its constitution and with the approval of the Southern Baptist Convention, to set educational standards in harmony with the national definition of a standard col-
lege which is now in process of formulation, giving recognition and rating to those institutions which are approaching said standard.

"Second—That the officers of this association, acting in conjunction with the corresponding secretary of the Education Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, shall make overtures to the education boards and to the educational institutions under the direct control of the evangelical denominations of the South looking toward the adoption of identical standards and to consider the propriety of a joint participation in a publicity campaign which will unite the evangelical forces of the South in the effort so to mould public opinion that the value of Christian education will be made a definite conviction in the thinking of our Southern people, and that the editors of our Baptist papers be urged to promote the popular appreciation of our schools, avoiding whatever tends to divert attention from the important matter of intensifying the loyalty of our entire Baptist constituency to our educational program.

"Third—That the corresponding secretary of the Education Board be requested to act in conjunction with the educational agencies in the several states looking toward the working out in each state of a permanent program in which, during the period following the $75,000,000 campaign, sufficient funds shall be secured for our colleges and preparatory schools in the form of current support to enable them to meet the standards which will be adopted.

"Fourth—That adequate emphasis shall be placed upon those courses of study which deal with the intelligent comprehension of the Christian religion.

"Fifth—That the legal control of our educational institutions should be vested in the denomination and that adequate safeguards should be thrown around the institutions so that at no time shall the radical action of a single session of the controlling Baptist body work harm to the institution.

"Sixth—That the corresponding secretary of the Education Board, the officers of this association, the presidents of the colleges, the secretaries of education and other representatives in the several states shall be urged to use every means available immediately to convince our people through articles in our denominational press, through bulletins, through public addresses and through every effective agency whatsoever, that the supreme need of the hour is Christian education and the securing of a generous support of all our Baptist schools.

"Seventh—That in order to make effective the program of standardizing our Baptist schools, as set forth in the first resolution of this paper, the following shall be the procedure:

"That this conference herewith directs the appointment and organization of a Conference Committee of seven men to confer and proceed upon the business of working out a general scheme for standardization and promotion for all the schools, colleges and universities owned by the Baptists of the South.

"That the lines of procedure suggested to the consideration of this Conference Committee be as follows:

"(a) That it shall do its work under the auspices of the Education Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, which is requested to provide for its meetings and to defray the expenses.

"(b) That the first essential step of the committee be directed to securing co-operation of the state education boards, commissions or departments of each state convention, in the general idea and purpose of such a standardizing and promotion organization for Southern Baptist schools.

"(c) That the organization to be taken into consideration by this Conference Committee should be of the nature of a permanent council or commission, consisting of practical and experienced Baptist educators, which is to be commissioned by the Southern Baptist Convention.

"(d) That the committee shall present at the Southern Baptist Convention in connection with the report of the Education
Board a report of its work with recommendations to the Convention for authorization of such a standardizing and promotion council and the recommendation that the Education Board be instructed to address its energies in co-operation with the Baptist state education boards to the end of providing money to enable the schools to meet the requirements laid down for their standardization.

“(e) That it is the mind of this association that the proposed council to be established as above indicated will seek to conform in its standards for schools to the requirements of the state school system in each state and of the national standardizing and accrediting agencies.

“(f) That in fixing requirements of financial ability credit shall be given to schools for income other than from invested endowments.

“(g) That it is the ideal and purpose of the proposed scheme of standardization and promotion to attain the following ends:

“(a) The elevation of academic and cultural standards in Southern Baptist schools, in their equipment, teaching and curriculum, to the level of genuine efficiency now demanded by the educational world, but to base it all upon the Christian idea of education which is to produce strong and able Christian men and women.

“(b) The corollary of this goal, for which the council will fix the standard of requirements at an advancing rate, is promotion in patience and sympathy of campaigns for money to enable the schools to reach the standard set with a definite plan of increases in their incomes, keeping our Baptist schools in sympathy and practical fellowship with one another and thus maintaining a solid denominational front toward the problem of general education.

“(c) That these resolutions are not meant to give expression one way or the other as to whether individual Baptist institutions shall belong to other standardizing agencies.”

STANDARDIZATION IN OPINION: LOYALTY.

1. Society—Address by President Rufus W. Weaver, Macon, Ga. (See page 23); discussion by President E. W. Sikes, Hartsville, S. C. (See page 29.)

2. The Denomination—Address by President J. H. Foster, Forsyth, Ga. (See page 31); discussion by Dr. Livingston Johnson, Raleigh, N. C. (See page 35.)

The report of the Committee on Time and Place of next meeting was presented by Secretary Albert R. Bond and was adopted: Birmingham, Ala., January 23-25, 1923.

The report of the Committee on Nominations, presented by President B. H. Dement, named William Louis Poteat, Wake Forest, N. C., President; C. Cottingham, Pineville, La., Vice-President; Albert R. Bond, Birmingham, Ala., Secretary-Treasurer; Charles E. Dicken, Arkadelphia, Ark., Oscar E. Sams, Jefferson City, Tenn., James P. Craft, Danville, Va.

Secretary W. C. James, Birmingham, Ala., reported that the other church boards of education had responded favorably to an invitation for a closer co-operation to emphasize Christian education through an interdenominational association.

Sectional conferences were held during the remainder of the afternoon session; Junior Colleges and Secondary Schools; Women’s Colleges; Men’s Colleges.

NIGHT SESSION

Devotional services were conducted by Dr. A. J. Dickinson, Birmingham, Ala.

On motion of President R. W. Weaver, a committee of five was raised to nominate the members of the Conference Committee on Standardization: W. T. Lowrey, Chas. E. Brewer, F. W. Boatwright, E. G. Townsend and C. Cottingham.

Prof. J. B. Tidwell, Waco, Texas, delivered an address on “The Bible and Science” (See page 38.)
President H. E. Watters spoke on “Standardization in Opinion: Loyalty—Christian Fundamentals” (See page 44.)

DECEMBER 4TH, 1921.

Members of the association spoke on “Christian Education” at the various Baptist churches of the city.

An afternoon mass meeting was held at the First Baptist Church, at which two addresses were delivered on “Christianity and Culture” by Dr. Robert L. Kelley, Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education, New York, and Dr. William Louis Poteat, President of Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.

DECEMBER 5TH, 1921.

The report of Treasurer Albert R. Bond was read and approved. It showed: Receipts, $204; disbursements, $67.66; balance on hand, $137.34.

Mr. Frank E. Burkhalter, Nashville Tenn., Publicity Secretary of the Conservation Commission, presented a plan to place college exhibits at the various state fairs, and on motion his general plan was approved.

STANDARDIZATION AGENCIES

1. National—
   (a) Foundations—Address by Mr. Clyde Furst, New York.
   (b) Federal Bureau of Education—Address by Mr. George Zook, Washington, D. C.
   (c) Council of Church Boards of Education—Dr. Robert L. Kelley, New York.

2. Southern—
   (b) Boards of Publication—Address by Secretary J. W. Cammack, Richmond, Va. (See page 49.)
   (c) The Board of Education—Address by Secretary W. C. James, Birmingham, Ala.

A vote of thanks was extended the visiting speakers and the pastor of the First Baptist Church for courtesies.

President W. T. Lowrey, Blue Mt., Miss., presented the report of the special committee to nominate the Conference Committee on Standardization, and the following were elected: Rufus W. Weaver, W. J. McGlothlin, F. W. Boatwright, S. P. Brooks, R. T. Vann, Harry Clark and D. M. Nelson. The Executive Committee later added the name of John E. White.

   (d) The Baptist Press of the South—Dr. V. I. Masters, Editor Western Recorder, Louisville, Ky. (See page 51); Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, Editor Alabama Baptist, Birmingham, Ala. (See page 54.) Discussion by Dr. A. J. Dickinson, Birmingham, Ala.

DEFINITION

1. What Is a College?—Address by President Charles E. Brewer, Raleigh, N. C.

2. What Is a Christian College?—President John C. Dawson, Birmingham, Ala.

Discussion by President James P. Craft, Danville, Va. (See page 57.) Adjournment with prayer by Dr. Paul V. Bomar.
THE STANDARD MAN

WILLIAM LOUIS POTEAT, President Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.

The three Fates of the ancient Greek mythology and the three Norns of the Scandinavian mythology, which determined the life of every individual, were a sort of pictorial, poetic representation of the fact that there is a destiny "which shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will". Remote and unsubstantial as they now appear, they have their counterpart in modern science. Only we give them different names. Instead of Fates, we speak of Factors. They are Environment, Training, Heredity.

By Environment is meant the total situation into which one is born. It includes life's physical surroundings of climate, food, shelter; also the climate of opinion and sentiment, the intellectual and moral standards, the social conventions, all the influences which play upon life from without. Under their action life is passive.

The importance of this factor in determining life may be seen in one or two considerations. Life is not possible in an unfavorable environment. Indeed, life has been defined as correspondence with environment. Moreover, types of life are seen to be modified in responsive adjustment to a changing environment. In the case of man, environment is most extensive and varied, and its influence is correspondingly great. Civilization is a certain sort of environment, and the progress of civilization is simply improvement in the environment of human life. Social institutions and laws relate to the external conditions of life, not to life itself.

The environment is good, if it favors the development of strength for wholesome activity and for resisting evil, if it favors the making of good habits. It is bad if it tends to retard development or favors the making of bad habits.

The second factor, Training, includes all our work, our play, our intercourse. As George Eliot says somewhere, our deeds determine us as much as we determine our deeds. In training, life is active.

Our formal education is not reception, but awakening. That row of little earthen jugs on the recitation bench with the teacher sedulously pouring into them what had previously been poured into him does not represent education. Our fellowships educate us. One life signals to another. Deep calleth unto deep. The contacts, malevolent or gracious, of personal intercourse with our contemporaries or with our predecessors surviving in books awaken and "draw us out."

The drudging student trims his lamp, opens his Plutarch, puts him in the place of Roman, Grecian; draws the patched gown close, dreams, "Thus should I fight, save or rule the world." It is the active effort in response which constitutes education. Even learning, or the acquisition of knowledge, which may still be regarded as an element in education, is limited, according to the new psychology, to two processes—trial and error and association. The first is obviously active. The second is but another name for fellowship with its power to call out into action our native instincts and capacities.

Character conceived as the end of education is the sum of our organized responses, the set of our reactions. The idea is neatly expressed in our common word, "You know where to find him."

The third factor which determines the individual life is Heredity. It has been variously defined, but the differences of definition are chiefly verbal. Heredity is the tendency of offspring to develop characters (features) like those of their parents; or, germinal resemblance between organisms related by descent; or, resemblance based on descent.

Heredity is of the greatest importance. It supplies the substance of life, the material upon which the other factors operate.
It determines our nature, what we start life with, what we are by virtue of our ancestry. It can be conceived to be different only in case of a different parentage. Heredity ordains our inborn gifts and capacities, limitations, weaknesses, defects. It sets the boundaries beyond which no favoring external conditions, no intelligence or assiduity of training, no passion of ambition, is ever able to transport us. Besides, while environment and training affect only the existing generation, heredity affects all succeeding generations.

These three factors, which may be shortly described as what we have, what we do, what we are, supply the material and the impulse of life and fix its direction and bounds. They may be graphically represented by the sides of a triangle. If the "legs" of the triangle represent environment and training and the base heredity, the shape and area of the triangle vary according to the length of each of the legs, even though the base remain unchanged. The application of this fact is manifest.

Permit me now to call attention to a curious fact. There has been little improvement of the human stock within the historic period. A single illustration will be enough. Two centuries of Athenian history, B.C. 500-300, made a larger contribution of genius than any two subsequent centuries, including the last two. Sir Francis Galton's comparison may possibly be extravagant, but it must be remembered that, beginning with his "Inquiries Into Human Faculty" of 1883, he gathered a larger mass of fact than any other student in this field. He says that the Athenian race of the centuries named was as superior to the present English race, as the present English race is superior to the present African race. Did not the men of that remote period set the standard of achievement for all the later time?—in statesmanship, Themistocles and Pericles; in philosophy, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (130 courses are offered in Aristotle today in Oxford); in art, Praxiteles and Phidias; in poetry, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, with his drippings of warm tears, as Mrs. Browning sees him; in oratory, Demosthenes, Lysias and Isocrates. I recall that President Harding and Pericles made funeral orations over the dead of their country.

In striking contrast with this relatively stationary biological inheritance, the social inheritance of the race has extended amazingly in complexity and range. Man's world has developed faster than man's capacities. Is not this the explanation of the maladjustment and defeat which characterize our time? It is like setting a cave man down on Fifth Avenue.

I venture to advance some considerations in explanation of the anomaly of progress in the human environment and training, on the one hand, and no progress in the human heredity, on the other.

1. During all the lapsing centuries the emphasis has been strong upon environment and training, slight or nil upon heredity. When we speak of the old world and the new, the differentia relates to environment and training. Indeed, the term civilization itself connotes these two factors. We forget the man and the woman who alone give significance to civilization. When they showed the eminent historian Renan through the brilliant corridors of the Paris Exposition and pressed him for his impression, he only said, "I have been thinking how many exquisite things there are that we can do without."

2. In cases where the human stock has been weak or degenerate, the treatment has been palliative, not remedial and preventive. Of course, betterment and relief are as noble as necessary, but they are costly and superficial as compared with the effort to forestall.

3. The best blood of the race has been wasted in ever-recurring wars, or polluted by unrestricted matings.

4. There has been a conspiracy of silence on this fundamental matter by all the agencies of enlightenment—the home, the school, the press, the church. It has been curtly dismissed as "not nice," as a fad in vulgarity. The superstition that a
given percentage of disease and defect is decreed of Providence has been operative. The canker and tragedy of the social evil are condoned as “necessary,” humanity rots at the roots, and we acquiesce. It is further said in justification of this silence that there is peril in bringing the phenomena of sex into the focus of attention. Better let sleeping dogs lie. Moreover, the attitude of reticence and mysticism in regard to the physical basis and connotations of love refines it to a spiritual attraction and decorates it with the embroideries of sentiment and romance. To open out its evolutionary history and its hereditary issue can only degrade it and turn a herd of swine into life’s holy of holies. And it must be remembered that our knowledge of heredity and its application to man was very meager up to the year 1900.

Now, however, the conspiracy of silence is broken. To the Lambeth Conference of Anglican Bishops in 1920 a committee presented the following statement: “Whatever there may have been to say in the past in favour of a policy of silence on such subjects, the time for such a policy is now gone.” As Mr. Wells puts it, where there are no dark corners, there is little fermentation, little foulness or infection. We have seen the peril of feeble-mindedness and insanity multiplying under the cloak of silence. One in three hundred of our population is feeble-minded, one in three hundred is insane. Probably 8 percent of us are a burden on the back of the rest of us. The progressive degeneracy of the race from mismatings and anomalies in early sex life presented a dangerous possibility before which no social convention could stand. And the dogs were found not to be asleep. Innocence was already violated by an underground system of education—ignorant nurses, the gossip of unclean and uninformed companions, quacks and patent medicine vendors, sex books, and personal adventures. We saw, too, that the peril was exaggerated by the industrial revolution, which necessitated the congestion of population in the centers of manufacture and went far toward substituting the factory for the home. The boys and girls flocked to the city. The boy made his own money and spent it, consulting nobody. The girl took timidly her first steps toward independence and self-support, walked at night on the city streets unattended, and slept she knew not under whose roof. And the wage was meager. The elemental love of play and the elemental sex susceptibility were commercialized in the dance hall, the gilded gate of hell. And now the severe discipline of the World War is relaxed. It is succeeded by an artificial gaiety and the infection of moral license. It is tragic, indeed, when the peril of our children overflows into succeeding generations and spreads from centers of infection to involve thousands of innocent victims. It is hardly less tragic to continue the policy of silence and neglect and allow the waste and pollution of our best blood, which is the nation’s most precious possession.

An important feature of the new situation is our lately won knowledge of heredity and its applicability to man. Since the discovery in 1900 of the revolutionary work of Mendel, an army of workers in all parts of the world has enormously extended the science of heredity. Different types of animals and plants are now made to order by selective breeding on Mendelian principles. It is a commonplace of practical biology to control heredity for the improvement of the stock. As far back as 1883 Galton proposed the name eugenics for this science of race improvement through the control of heredity. Many human traits are now predictable in a given mating, and our knowledge of the inheritance of physical features is now precise enough to be applied with assurance to cases of doubtful parentage. Nevertheless, our knowledge is yet too limited and public sentiment too unfavorable and hostile for the practical application of what is known as positive Eugenics. That is, selective mating of the fittest for race improvement. We cannot go too fast. But there can be no doubt that we are ready for the application of
negative eugenics, that is, restrictive mat-
ing for the elimination of the obviously un-fit. The feeble-minded, the insane, the epileptic, the inebriate, the congenital de-
fective of any type, and the victim of chronic contagious diseases ought to be denied the opportunity of perpetuating their kind to the inevitable deterioration of the race.

CONCLUSIONS

1. We discover the limitations and rela-
tive superficiality of our work in educa-
tion.
2. The responsibility of teachers does not end with the existing generation. Our ministry in many cases does actually ex-
tend to two generations; but in any case we must train one generation for the ad-
vant- age of the next.
3. Biology must be required of all stu-
dents. A large section of that science deals with these matters, and the biological ap-
proach is the proper approach.
4. Human nature can be changed, brass-
tack philosophers to the contrary notwith-
standing.
   (a) Manifestly the first two factors in the production of the standard man can
   be changed. They are amenable to science.
   (b) The third factor, heredity, can be changed. Read Ezekiel 18:1-4, which I
   interpret to mean, your heredity is not your fate. Of course, the individual once
   here is pre-determined in important as-
   pects of his nature. But coming individuals may be saved from hereditary defects and handicaps.
   (c) But the best heredity is not good enough. The twist and taint consolidated
   in a long line of continuous germ-plasm need to be corrected and expunged. The capacities given in heredity need to be
called out, newly related, controlled and directed to worthy ends. The standard man will be well born, well conditioned, well trained, but also born again. Ac-
cordingly, I propose a modification of the triangle of life given earlier in this address,
in order that it may embody the Chris-
tian standard. I name the three sides Eugenics, the science of being well born; Euthenics, the science of being well con-
ditioned, and Anagenics, the science of be-
ing born again.

STANDARDIZATION: AS RELATED TO INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

CHARLES E. DICKEN, D.D., President, Ouachita College, Arkadelphia, Ark.

Those responsible for the program of this session of the Southern Baptist Edu-
cation Association have evidently decided to settle a most troublesome and grievous matter. Practically all discussions are to live, move and have their bearing on the matter of standardization. The term itself is capable of some half hundred definitions. It seems likely to have had a birthright dating back some seven centuries and of Latin-French ancestry. First, it applied to military symbols and symbol bearers. Va-
rieties of meanings in ornithology and botany as well as suggestive meanings are associated with the verb “stand.” “Stand-
ards to measure bye” is an old usage. Some authorized unit, like the standard foot of the English or metre of the French, size, weight or amount conforming to a uniform or normal measure, is the most common usage, as the gauge of railways in the “standard tread”—standard money —standard wage rate—standard interest rate, etc., etc. The idea of a definite degree of quality is also expressed in the term. For example, “Horace is the standard of Lyric, Virgil the standard of Epic Poetry.” Boyle wrote “Men will be ashamed to be
unlike those whose customs and deport­
ment pass for the standards.” So we de­
velop from experience and observation “standards of living,” “standards of perfec­
tion,” “standards of right and wrong,” “standards of race, customs and creeds” continued through generations as a base or authority by the use of which we test by comparison some recognized example.

Standardization in education for us therefore opens up or renews the task of accepting or creating some base or authority by the use of which we may test by comparison the institutional merit of the universities, colleges and other schools of Southern Baptists.

II.
The subject of this paper sets out for discussion not so much the suggestion of standards as the laying of ground work for possible standards by suggesting how conformity might be possible without setting aside the self-governing power of the institutions themselves to so great a degree, at least, as to destroy what may have been accomplished to date by the Baptist educational policy, which has been that of largely allowing each institution to fix its own standard with the possible challenge to “be careful and not run away from its own constituency.” This has resulted in inevitable confusion even among our educators, while a vast majority of our people are totally in the dark.

We have academies calling themselves colleges, and colleges calling themselves universities and seminaries providing for those too zealous to take college training by offering courses ranging from the academy to graduate work. Standardization as related to institutional autonomy must have some ground work for a beginning. Baptists have acted independently in founding their schools and on this account have wasted a large amount of energy and money. Further gifts will depend on honesty and efficiency.

III.
The academy work should precede the college course; it is a preparation for the college work. The college course, the general education, should precede the university or professional work. Our professional men, lawyers, physicians, preachers, etc., should complete the academy and college courses before they enter the professional schools or universities. These are the steps which will promote the highest efficiency.

A mutual agreement to this end and a strict adherence to this policy on the part of Southern Baptist educational institutions will be a necessary ground work toward the development of educational standards.

IV.
The setting up of educational policies which infringe upon the right of a college to be a college will bring to naught all efforts at standardization. Let us examine a number of college standards already erected. Whether a college is a college depends mainly upon three things:

1. Material equipment.
2. Teaching power.
3. Curriculum.

Attention is called to the following estimates of what these three elements should consist of:

1. Association of Colleges in the Middle States and Maryland.

An institution to be ranked as a college of liberal arts must have at least eight professors giving their entire time to instruction therein; must require for admission not less than four years of academy or high school preparation, or its equivalent; must conduct a curriculum of four full years of approved grade in liberal arts and sciences.

There should be library and laboratory facilities adequate to the work which the institution announces, and these should be kept up to their full efficiency by means of adequate annual expenditures.

There should be a minimum productive endowment, beyond all the indebtedness, of at least $500,000. In the case of tax-supported institutions or those maintained by religious or other organizations, financial support or contributive services equivalent in value to the endowment specified are substitutes.

2. United States Bureau of Education
A college of arts and sciences should have an annual income of at least $40,000. At least three-fifths of an income as small as $40,000 should be expended for salaries for teaching and administration. Exception is made of certain denominational institutions whose teaching staffs work without salaries.

A college of arts and sciences should have as many as eleven departments, in each of which at least one teacher devotes his whole time to collegiate instruction. Some of the larger departments will require more than one instructor. The following departments are suggestive: English; modern languages (or French or German or Spanish) other than English; ancient languages; history; philosophy and psychology; economic, political and social sciences; mathematics; physics; chemistry; biology (or zoology and botany); geology and geography. In addition, it seems desirable, wherever possible, to separate the departments of Romance and Germanic languages and some of the other groups might well be divided, especially in the larger colleges.

Members of the faculty of a college of arts and sciences should have pursued graduate study in addition to the bachelor's degree. At least one-fourth of the faculty should hold the degree of doctor of philosophy or degrees representing equivalent scholarly attainments bestowed by reputable graduate schools. At least three-fourths of the faculty should have secured the master's degree in course at a reputable graduate school.

At least $1,000 a year should be expended for the purpose of new books and periodicals for the library. Probably two or three times this figure would be needed to keep the library in a sound condition. A similar sum should be appropriated annually for the purchase of new equipment and apparatus for scientific laboratories.

3. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six (6) professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar school studies.

An institution not supported by taxation, in order to meet the requirement in regard to endowment, must have productive endowment of not less than $200,000 over and above any indebtedness of the institution.

4. Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.

A college of the first-class must meet the following requirements:

It must have six professors, giving full time to college or university work, and offer a course of four full years in the liberal arts and sciences, and must require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar school studies.

Its head of departments must have the baccalaureate degree and the M.A. degree, or, in lieu of the M.A. degree, conspicuous teaching ability.

It must have $200,000 of productive funds, or an income for maintenance of not less than $15,000 per annum.

It must have a library of not less than 5,000 volumes.

It must have a laboratory equipment sufficient for at least two years' work each in physics, chemistry, botany and zoology, according to modern methods of instruction in these subjects.

It must have one hour a week at least of Biblical instruction in all the liberal arts classes.

It must have only such professors and teachers as are of positive Christian character and influence.

5. Methodist-Episcopal Church, South, College's Class "A"

To be classified as an "A" class college, an institution must meet, in addition to the entrance requirements named on the following conditions:

At least seven professors or assistant professors giving their entire time to the in-
struction of college students. All of the seven required teachers must have a bachelor's degree from a standard college and should have in addition one or more years of university training. To be counted under the terms of this article a professor must receive from the institution in which he teaches a yearly salary of not less than $1,200 and an assistant professor a yearly salary of not less than $800.

A library of at least 5,000 bound volumes selected with reference to college uses and exclusive of government publications. Not less than $500 must be spent annually in the purchase of books.

Laboratory equipment in science worth $5,000, so distributed as to establish efficient working laboratories for chemistry, physics and biology.

Financial Requirements—A permanent productive endowment of $200,000 above indebtedness and exclusive of annuities and money invested in dormitories and other college buildings, or a permanent productive endowment of $100,000 and an assured annual income for the payment of the academic faculty of $10,000, including income from said endowment and exclusive of literary tuition and after the interest on all debts of the college has been paid.”


An institution to be ranked as a recognized college or university shall have at least six professors giving their entire time to college or university work, the necessary equipment to give a course of four full years of college grade in the liberal arts and sciences and shall require for admission not less than fifteen secondary units of preparation in a recognized four-year high school or its equivalent. It shall require for graduation not less than 120 semester hours.

7. Indiana.

(a) Number—There shall be eight or more teachers devoting their time exclusively to college courses.

(b) Hours Per Week—No teacher may be required to teach more than twenty hours per week. It is desirable that no teacher be allowed to teach more than sixteen hours per week.

(c) Preparation—The teachers shall be graduates of standard normal schools, standard colleges, or universities doing graduate work. Head professors shall have pursued such graduate work for at least one year, and a majority of them should have training equivalent to that presupposed for the degree of doctor of philosophy.

(d) Quality of Teaching—The teaching shall be of good quality and done in a manner satisfactory to the state teachers’ training board.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

(a) Endowment—Within a period of one year from September 1, 1920, there shall be a productive endowment beyond all indebtedness of not less than $50,000.

(b) Income—In lieu of this endowment a fixed annual income, independent of all student’s fees, of not less than $25,000 shall be provided.

In the case of tax-supported institutions or those supported by religious organizations, financial support or contributed services equivalent in value to the endowment specified may be accepted as substitution for endowment.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS

(a) Academic Year—The academic or collegiate year shall consist of not less than thirty-six weeks.

(b) Class and Laboratory Hour—The class hour should be at least fifty minutes in length; two such hours of practice or demonstration in a laboratory are considered equivalent to a recitation hour.

(c) The curriculum—The curriculum leading to the bachelor’s degree shall include four full years of work beyond the entrance requirements. It should comprehend a definite plan for selection of major subjects, with such provision for minors and electives as seems best suited to the needs of the students.

(d) Hours Per Week—The work may be organized on any hour-per-week basis not exceeding sixteen.
(a) Laboratories—For teaching each of the sciences offered, there shall be adequate laboratory facilities for meeting the requirements of the state teachers' training board.

(b) Library. The library shall contain at least 8,000 volumes exclusive of public documents. It must be a growing library. It must contain recent as well as earlier standard books in each of the departments of instruction. It must contain standard encyclopedias, dictionaries and other kinds of reference works, as well as leading periodicals in each department of learning.

8. Kansas.

Requirements for a standard (approved college, normal school or university):

1. Admission—The requirement for admission shall be 15 high school units, selected from those listed and defined by the state board of education.

2. Graduation—The requirement for graduation shall be the completion of a four-year course of at least 120 semester hours of sixty minutes, to include at least one year in actual residence, and the other work to be done in a college conforming in effect to the requirements herein stated.

Instruction—The institution must have at least seven professors. These professors shall give their entire time to work of college grade, and no professor should offer work in more than two departments of study. If in any of the colleges the instructors divide their time between collegiate and preparatory work, the total amount of collegiate work offered in any semester must not be less than 105 semester hours.

The Training of the Faculty—A faculty properly qualified shall consist of graduates of standard colleges who have pursued graduate work equivalent at least to that required for a master's degree. An exception as to graduate work may be made in the case of an instructor of successful experience and proved efficiency.

Endowment—The means of support shall be defined as requiring a permanent productive endowment of not less than $200,000, or an annual income of not less than $10,000, exclusive of tuition.

Laboratory Equipment—The laboratory equipment shall be worth not less than $5,000 and shall be so distributed as to establish at least an efficient chemical, physical and biological laboratory.

Library—The library, exclusive of general reference books and public documents, shall contain at least 3,000 volumes. These volumes shall be present value, selected with reference to the departments in which instruction is offered.

9. Texas

It should require for full admission not fewer than fifteen units, but may admit on thirteen units with a condition of two units, affiliated by the state department of education.

Required for Graduation—The completion of four years of work of thirty-six weeks each, with an average of not fewer than fifteen sixty-minute recitations per week. During each year the student may not complete, as a rule, more than one-fourth of the requirements for graduation, except when making up conditions. Should the college have four quarters of twelve weeks each, then a student may graduate in less than four years. At least one year of actual residence work should be required of all students who enter with advanced standing.

Number of College Departments—There should be maintained at least seven separate departments in liberal arts and sciences, with not fewer than one professor devoting his whole time to each department.

Training of the Faculty—A faculty qualified should consist entirely of graduates of standard colleges and each head of a department shall hold at least a master's degree from a standard college or have attained eminent success as a teacher. Graduate study and training in research equivalent to that required for the Ph.D. degree are urgently recommended. In departments of education, in addition to the above requirements, teachers should have
had successful experience in public school work.

Support—There should be an annual income of at least $30,000 from either or all of tuition fees, rent or endowment, but not including charges for board, for the maintenance of the college exclusive of the academy, fine arts and other special departments.

Library—The library should contain, exclusive of public documents and periodical publications, 5,000 volumes bearing specifically upon the subjects taught. By September 1, 1921, this number should be at least 7,500.

Laboratories—The laboratory equipment should be sufficient to perform all the experiments called for by the courses offered in the sciences—sufficiency to be measured by the value of the apparatus—which shall be, in chemistry not less than $2,500, in physics not less than $3,500, in biology not less than $2,500. After September 1, 1921, these figures should be $4,000, $5,000 and $4,000, respectively.

General Statement Concerning Material Equipment—The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school furniture, apparatus, and methods of cleaning shall be such as to insure hygienic conditions for both students and teachers.

General Statement Concerning Curriculum and Spirit of Administration—The character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, and the tone of the institution shall also be factors in determining its standing.

Virginia.

Standard American college is a college with a four-year curriculum, with a tendency to differentiate its parts in such a way that the first two years are a continuation of and a supplement to the work of the necessary instruction as given in the high schools, while the last two years are shaped more or less distinctly in the direction of special, professional or university instruction.

Entrance Requirements—Entrance requirements must be not less than fourteen standard high school units, covering four years of high school work in an accredited high school or its equivalent.

Required for Graduation—The completion of college work amounting to not less than fifteen sixty-minute class periods per week through four sessions of at least thirty-six weeks each, that is, sixty session hours or one hundred and twenty semester hours.

Number of College Departments—The college should maintain at least eight separate departments in liberal arts and science with not less than one professor devoting his whole time to each department.

Training of the Faculty—The minimum scholastic requirements of seventy-five per cent of the teachers of classes in the standard college shall be graduation from a standard college and, in addition, graduate work in a university of recognized standing amounting to at least one year, and the professional requirements of the remaining 25 per cent of the faculty shall be equivalent to the above standard.

Salaries—The average salary paid to members of the faculty is an important consideration in determining the standing of an institution. The minimum salary of a full professor must be not less than $1,500.

Support—In addition to income from tuition fees, room rent, boarding halls, etc., the college should have a productive endowment of $200,000 or the equivalent in assured income.

Library—The library should contain, exclusive of public documents and periodicals, at least 7,000 volumes bearing specifically upon the subjects taught, and should have an appropriation of not less than $5,000 a year for permanent additions.

Laboratories—The laboratory equipment should be sufficient for all of the experiments called for by the courses offered in the sciences—sufficiency to be measured by
the value of apparatus and equipment, which should be, in chemistry not less than $2,500, in physics not less than $3,500, and in biology not less than $2,000, for the courses usually offered in these subjects in the average standard college.

General Statement Concerning Material Equipment—The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school furniture, apparatus and methods of cleaning shall be such as to insure hygienic condition for both students and teachers.

General Statement Concerning Curriculum and Spirit of Administration—The character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees, and the tone of the institution shall also be factors in determining its standing.

11. Kentucky.

University of Kentucky—Fifteen units should be required for admission, with a minimum admission requirement of thirteen units. By the minimum requirements is meant the smallest number of units with which a student may be permitted to begin college work; namely, the nominal requirements minus the number of units of conditions allowed.

There should be a graduation requirement of four years (120 semester hours of collegiate grade). The conferring of a multiplicity of degrees is to be discouraged. It is better for smaller institutions to build up one good, strong degree.

There should be maintained at least seven separate departments in arts and sciences, with not less than one professor devoting his whole time to college work in each department.

A minimum educational attainment of all college professors equivalent to graduation from a college of high grade and graduate work equal to that required for the master's degree of the University of Kentucky.

Heads of departments should not receive salaries less than those paid by standard institutions. The average salary paid to members of the faculty is a serious factor in determining the standing of any institution. There should be an annual income sufficient to yield a net annual income of at least $10,000 available for instructional purposes in the college department (arts and sciences). If an institution offers courses in addition to the usual arts and sciences courses, it should have a correspondingly larger income.

The library should contain, exclusive of public documents and periodical publications, at least 5,000 volumes, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught.

There should be a laboratory equipment of a value of not less than $3,000 in physics ($4,000 if work is offered in advance of one year course), $2,500 in chemistry, $2,500 in biology.

The location and construction of the buildings, the lighting, heating and ventilation of the rooms, the nature of the laboratories, corridors, closets, water supply, school supply, school furniture, apparatus and methods of cleaning should be such as to insure hygienic conditions for both students and teachers. (This question should be left to the committee.)

The character of the curriculum, the efficiency of instruction, the scientific spirit, the standard for regular degrees, the conservatism in granting honorary degrees and the tone of the institution should also be factors in determining its standing (this question should be left to the committee).

It will be noted that in these rather widely selected estimates of what really constitutes a college there may be found a considerable elasticity of opinion on the subject. In the main, however, in the matter of equipment, teaching power and curriculum there is fair agreement. In the erecting of standards care should be taken in the following:

The secondary civic schools in particular are seeking too much credit in the colleges of liberal arts and sciences. These institu-
tions are extending their courses in many instances into college texts and thus encroach from underneath on the college course. If the colleges allow this invasion, it will finally result, of course, in a softened and spongy college start. A clean break on entrance units and a refusal of credits beyond that is safe.

Then again the classical college course has its menace from inside. Any standard which would seek to invade the regular 8 to 11 department classical college course either by suggestion or substitution is in my judgment a mistake. This may be and has been done by over-emphasis of the sciences in some instances and vocational training in others and over-electives in others. Two suggestions have already been made to this association which would eventually do away entirely with the classical college course. The first suggestion was that the last two years of the classical course be entirely elective and under the university system. This would of course make our institutions neither colleges nor universities, just junior colleges dabbling at professional or vocational training, with no apparent sense of relationship between material equipment and applied instruction. The other suggestion was that students should be encouraged to cut cross lots by allowing them credit for the last two years in the classical course when they had left the college at the end of the sophomore year and finished in the various technical schools of law, dentistry, medicine, etc., at such creditable institutions as might be mentioned receiving their baccalaureate and technical degrees at the same time notwithstanding the fact of having hurdled the junior and senior years of the classical course.

The fact that these suggestions, so apparently hostile to what really constitutes a college, have found expression here and throughout the South without opposition seems to indicate a possibility, however remote, that our ideas of standards do not embrace the fullest conception of the value of the classical college course but indicates to the contrary that it is altogether undesirable, if not unnecessary.

Again, care should be taken on the part of our technical or professional institutions not to press down from the top on the courses of the college. And the college in turn should not attempt to embrace in the classical course too much professional or technical training for which credit is asked in the graduate school. To be definite, shall our Christian colleges each attempt graduate theological training or confine themselves particularly to English Bible studies for all classes of students? On the other hand, shall our graduate theological schools be open for and solicit in the various states undergraduates in competition with the Christian college? Why should not training in our seminaries be confined as much as possible to graduate work, compelling the student for the ministry to take his academy and college course, then graduate work in the professional school? It seems that the Christian ministry would set the highest efficiency by following the logical order in education: academy, then college, then graduate training. "There are some who want to serve the Lord and feel the need of some preparation, but are either too old to do the preparatory work or too zealous to give the time to it." And what is worse, they have not gotten far enough along to know that the Lord's work requires the best of training. Should graduate schools make provision for these classes or refuse them admittance and turn them back to the academies and colleges of the various sections?

Inasmuch as the details necessarily attaching to the paramount issue, standardization, are to be discussed by other members of the group in this meeting, I have sought mainly to present widely recognized standards for senior colleges in different sections of the United States. I have omitted to mention the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for the reason that the standards of this association are well known by the membership of this organization. I have ventured to
state my earnest conviction regarding the classical college course in the hope that, whatever machinery may be set in motion, whatever institution may be built up, the classical course which has been instrumental in the production of religious, political, social and economic leaders in the past may not be sacrificed now when the world needs a greater number of substantial leaders than ever before.

STANDARDIZATION: THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL

JOHN E. WHITE, D.D., President, Anderson College, Anderson, S. C.

The stated purpose of this conference is "To arouse and unify Southern Baptist sentiment and conviction on the subject of denominational education, and by mutual help to seek to standardize and increase the efficiency of all our schools."

If this statement were my text to be interpreted in the light of the program in our hands, four propositions would appear as the common sense of this conference:

First—That standardization is just now the subject demanding attention of Southern Baptist school men.

Second—That arousing and unifying Southern Baptist sentiment and conviction on the subject of denominational education is definitely involved in the problem of standardization.

Third—That the motive of standardization and the end to be secured through its process is to "increase the efficiency of all our schools."

Fourth—That by mutual help and through this conference some standardizing scheme for Southern Baptist schools is to be agreed to and proceeded upon.

We are therefore concentrating the discussions of this session of the association upon the problem of "Standardization," approaching it from various angles. Under ordinary conditions, it might be complained that this program is an over-emphasis and that we cannot string all our educational fish on one string. But the conditions are not ordinary, and such a complaint is not justified. It would have saved us from some confusion if we had sooner put our heads together upon standardization as a practical concern involving all our schools.

It may be recalled that Dr. S. P. Brooks urged it upon this association at the 1920 session in Nashville. His address later published by the Board of Education in Birmingham has lost none of its wisdom, nor his arguments any of their cogency by our inattention. His plea was that, as responsible workers in Southern Baptist education, we should initiate something ourselves and that this association was the place to begin with it.

"The Baptist plan," he said, "is too independent, and properly so, to unite organically with either state or private systems of education;" "by conference we may standardize our curriculum and pass our students from one institution to another."

"There is no valid reason," he urged, "why Baptist colleges of the whole South might not after conference enter into organic union whereby students can get proper credits with a maximum of educational value and a minimum of time lost in preparation for professional schools."

He also proposed that this association should appoint "a time and place when our college men may gather unhindered by other engagements, lay their catalogs on the table and find out the strength of some and the weakness of others, and let the work be validated in terms of some common denominator."

These observations are a suggested contribution to the discussions we are now entering on. It is assigned to me to consider standardization as related to the Christian ideal.

STANDARDIZATION IN GENERAL

The word "standard" is defined as "any measure of extent, quantity, quality or value established by law or by general
usage and consent." To standardize a thing is to require and secure submission to a standard of value measurements and to bring about conformity thereto. It may be understood at once that standardization as a general proposition involves dealing with variations, inequalities and adjustments. Its process may be a leveling-up process, a leveling-down process, or in actual practice a process of constructive compromise aimed toward approximate uniformity. The history of standardizing schemes in general bristles with difficulties and indicates only partial successes. The Roman Catholic Church undertook to standardize religion. The Spanish Inquisition was a standardizing scheme. Its failure drove the King of Spain insane. His obsession was conformity and uniformity. They put him in a room and gave him a hundred clocks which he vainly and constantly corrected, trying to make them keep time together. The Standard Oil Company was a standardizing scheme in the oil business; the American Federation of Labor is a standardizing scheme for industries. We are familiar with the standardizing schemes for the professions. There seems to be an inherent difficulty in getting things to become standardized and more difficulty in getting them to stay so. The reason for it is that standardization implies the acceptance of super-government, submission to control, and a certain inward logic of monopoly.

The difficulties of standardization applied to education involve this and other elements of resistance. Education occupies the field of freedom in a peculiar sense. Its soul frets at the suggestion of arbitrary limitations. Under the control of the state, education would seem to offer to standardization its fairest opportunity for effectiveness, but the boards of state education have not found it an easy nut to crack. In the field of denominational schools, the difficulties of standardization are particularly great. It is well for us to recognize the fact that in this field we are dealing with factors of the most sensitive sort. This is said not to discourage the determination to overcome these difficulties, but to assert that they are not to be overcome by inattention to them or by drifting in a loose and careless tide. I would especially assert the judgment that the difficulties in the path of any statesmanlike general scheme of standardization for Southern Baptist schools are increased whenever it is conceived as a simple, local, individual, institutional problem which will just naturally solve itself through independent action.

AS RELATED TO THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL

The Christian ideal of education is, as understood among us, something more than a pious slogan, an article of our creed or an abstraction of our educational philosophy. It embraces the primary and absolute significance of a Christian school, its origin, motive, method and objective. The Christian ideal in education, therefore, protests at once the definition of a Christian school as "standard," which omits all consideration of Christianity. The implication of standardization and the sense in which the public accepts it is excellence, superiority and completeness. Definitions proclaimed as authoritative and acquiesced in as the expressions of the highest educational genius and virtue tend to become the laws which standardize all educational conscience. Here is an issue Christian educators ought to meet in the vestibule of standardization, at the very door of it. It is something to scrutinize today and not a few years hence, here and not off yonder. It is too late when definitions have become commandments. Perhaps the question whether a strictly Christian school is practicable in this country or is up for debate. There are educational experts who foresee and foretell its elimination from the field. On the other hand, the later developments in American education seemed a while ago to indicate a powerful reinforcement of its claims to permanence in public conscience and intelligence. The Christian ideal has loomed up as the practical ideal in education. The clear revelation of these days was two years ago announced as "the fatality of progress with-
out God," "greatened energies without greatened souls to direct them." We are even now in an epoch of world dismay in which deep thinking men seem really to be troubled by the observation that human nature uncontrolled by religious culture affords an unsound basis for civilization. Education dominated by intellectualism and achieving its passion in academic and technical efficiency is asserted to be the sort of education that reinforces the barbarism of human selfishness. In our own country there has been a loud expression distrustful of social security, if the popular type of education continues development along prevailing lines. It is for character, a better man and moral culture the future is alarmed. Denominational school men were saying this all the time. The Christian ideal of education was and is yet their slogan. The Christian school was, and is, appealed for as the protagonist of this ideal in practical demonstration. The passion for it is its native breath, the life of its life, the one ground of its confidence toward its own future. Is it possible that these institutions under our leadership would themselves inaugurate for themselves a scheme of standardization which absorbed itself exclusively in academic objectives? It is inconceivable. How then is it to be possible for them to agree to adopt and engage for a preempting scheme of standardization avowedly non-moral in its enthusiasm, which others have inaugurated? There are signs plain enough that state education is moving toward the necessity of providing for religion in the state schools and colleges. If the denominational schoolmen regard that a good tendency, let them promote it; if they regard it as a tendency contrary to the constitutional limitations of the state schools and colleges, let them discourage it. But, in either case, our influence in the educational world requires a policy of increased intensity of emphasis in our institutions on the Christian ideal as the standardizing form for academic excellence.

THE SCHEME FOR SOUTHERN BAPTISTS

If we can agree that Southern Baptist school men have a responsibility as parties of the first part for the standardization of their schools and ought therefore to engage upon it as a practical task, the difficulties that confront us will, I believe, begin to give way. It will be found that many of our representative minds have been moving in this direction. The address of Dr. S. P. Brooks before this association, to which reference has already been made, contains working ideas and a positive urgency in that direction. In a paper prepared last year by Dr. Rufus W. Weaver for a committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, though it was not included in the report of that committee, thought was intelligently directed to a proposition of this sort as a tentative formula of Southern Baptist purpose. It is proper and pertinent to quote its suggestion:

"Therefore, your committee offers the suggestion that the Southern Baptist Education Association, composed of our Southern Baptist colleges and secondary schools, shall, in accordance with its newly adopted constitution, set up high yet reasonable educational standards, in which a requirement shall be made for the study of the Bible and other related subjects, and that should other denominations seek to co-operate in the acceptance of these standards of Christian education the Southern Baptist Education Association shall be encouraged to promote such affiliation."

At its last session in Nashville, this association took steps in that direction, or thought it did, by passing a resolution requesting the Board of Education at Birmingham to move in this direction. That resolution has not been rescinded. Information from officials of the Board of Education is to the effect that a most favorable response from the boards of other denominations resulted from their correspondence.

The Southern Baptist Convention at Chattanooga adopted a resolution unanimously recommended by the committee on resolutions, which bears conclusively and
affirmatively toward a scheme for standardization of, for and by Southern Baptist schools and colleges. In the last article published from his pen, Dr. J. B. Gambrell asserted that this resolution was the most important action taken by the Chattanooga convention:

"Whereas, The Baptist schools and colleges within this convention have been well assured of the confidence and support of the churches;

"And whereas, This convention desires to encourage them in the bold emphasis of the religious motives in their foundations that they may assert themselves definitely as Christian institutions, and that they may stand in close fellowship together in the cause of Christian education in the South;

"Therefore to This End, Be It Resolved:

"First—That it is the sense of this convention that they should be kept exclusively independent and administratively free under the sole control of the Baptist bodies to which they belong, and that no powers of exaction or penalty outside these bodies should be otherwise delegated or recognized by them in their co-operative engagements with other institutions or agencies with which they may be usefully associated in educational work.

"Second—That while recognizing that this convention has no official responsibility or authority with Baptist institutions, which are subject only to the authority of the state conventions or associations to which they belong, it may properly, and herewith does, express its concern for a common educational policy for all the forces of education under the direction of Baptists in the South.

"Therefore, it is the express confidence of this convention that those charged with responsibility in the several states will cooperate in the promotion of the highest standards of instruction and equipment for Baptist schools and colleges and for the protection of their interests in relation to other institutions and agencies within the terms of the foregoing resolution.

"And, furthermore, that steps will be taken to devise standardization agreements to include the definition which differentiates the ideal and methods of the Christian school and college.

"To these ends we commend the good offices of the Board of Education at Birmingham and the Southern Baptist Education Association."

CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

I would be very happy if I were able to make sensible suggestions toward a standardizing movement related intentionally to the Christian ideal. I attempt to do so diffidently and in the realization of difficulties inevitable. We share together in the consciousness of a real problem and a most vital and practical one.

First of all, we have never done anything of a comprehensive sort to extend the co-ordination of Southern Baptist education beyond state lines. We have never tried before to think together on the subject of standardization. We probably distrust ourselves. We know that we have to reckon with institutional individualism and that "Self, the wavering balance shakes, it's rarely right adjusted;" we know that state conventions are to be reckoned with as jealous units of ownership and control; we know we confront the actual backwardness of a majority of our schools; we know that in most of the states our colleges are embarrassed about entrance requirements by the inadequacy of the public school system, especially in some states the lack of four-year high schools, and in other states the inefficiency, in fact, of the eleventh grades of high schools. It is insistent also in the background of our outlook on the problem that we have to work out our academic salvation under limitations natural in the genius of institutions of New Testament foundation and function. It is a situation that appeals to courage and requires faith, hope and love in large measures.

I venture to submit the following suggestions as the guarding principles for our procedure:

1. Authority—The foundations of academic authority for any scheme of stand-
ardization for Southern Baptist schools must be carefully laid. Its sanction must be established in the organized conscience, consent and co-operation of the Baptist people. Therefore, the State Baptist Boards of Education afford the essential basis of beginnings. Their co-operation with one another to support a scheme of standardization must be secured. I cannot see why these boards could not come from their conventions authorized to engage with this association and our Board of Education in the creation of a Standardizing Council. If it is true that Southern Baptists must standardize their schools themselves or drift under the authority of outside agencies, it should not be difficult to impress the fact upon state conventions, upon whose authority the state education boards would proceed.

2. Survey—The scheme of standardization should be laid in intelligence of all the facts and forces surrounding Baptist education in the South. Included in our survey would be consideration of our school contacts with the other standardizing agencies in the field—state, southern and national—also our proper and desirable, and perhaps practical, relations of sympathy with other denominational agencies of education, and especially our own actual conditions of education equipment, teaching and curriculum in the bounds of the Southern Baptist Convention, which are to be affected by the standards set up.

3. Spirit—The ruling spirit of a standardizing scheme for Southern Baptists will have to be constructive patience. The Christian ideal indicates such a spirit. Schools cannot leap to heights that were made to climb. There is no Baptist institution in the South that has not depended upon patience for its progress. None of them are what they are at their best, except for pains. Impatient standardization would have chocked every small college in America in its cradle. Standards are for pulling up by. It is a stupid truculence that conceives a standardizing agency in the South as a criminal court of education. It is a statesmanlike sagacity that conceives it as a court of sympathetic correction and promotion. Other denominations have long ago set us a great example. We may study with profit more than one denominational scheme of standardization with great encouragement. The Northern Methodist Church offers a significant illustration of a scheme of standardization in progressive operation for thirty years, and now successfully administered for their 136 institutions in their territory. It has been done, and it is being done, in the spirit of constructive patience and firm sympathy. It was begun in 1892, when the General Conference established a university senate which was empowered, first, to formulate standard requirements for graduation to the baccalaureate degree in their church schools. Under this university senate their board of education was directed to apply this standard and classify as colleges only such institutions as met the requirements. These requirements went into force patiently enough two years later. At first the standards were adjusted sympathetically to the actual situations of their colleges, with the policy laid down that the movement was to be a progressive one and that the requirements were to be increased at every quadrennial conference. Every four years the university senate, in cooperation with the board of education, set the standard of equipment forward, and the general conference, through its board of education, took the task of enabling the schools to meet the new standards. It was a series of graduated advances holding on to every gain achieved and building on it toward higher ground. This method attained the dignity of a great policy, and the important fact is pointed out in connection with it that it provided for and secured the reaction on the denomination in such a way as to enable all their schools to come forward. In 1919 the university senate of the Northern Methodist Church celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. In the official report of that session it is inspiring to read that they had so far gotten their schools for-
ward in twenty-five years by quadrennial advances that the minimum endowment for their colleges was raised from $200,000 to $300,000, becoming effective June 30, 1922. It was further indicated by that meeting that a minimum endowment of $500,000 would be required June 30, 1925. Thus the Northern Methodist Church worked out its educational salvation in patience and sympathy until now their schools are in an impregnable position and fearless of the coercion of any outside standardizing agency. They preserved their denominational unity and so commanded their situation that in the six years—1914 to 1920—they added thirty-five million dollars from the Northern Methodist people to the treasuries of their educational institution. It is worth while in this connection to look up the record of the Episcopal Church, which has established twenty colleges but which now only controls five.

STANDARDIZATION IN OPINION: SOCIETY

Rufus W. Weaver, D.D., President, Mercer University, Macon, Ga.

During the summer of 1920 I spent an hour with a distinguished educator whose influence in the development of Chicago University has been surpassed only by the two men who have occupied the presidency of the institution. He turned to me suddenly and said, "Do you think society is going to permit educational institutions and other foundations to pile up millions upon millions of dollars, or do you think there is going to be an end to such things?" I was surprised at the question and replied that I had not thought about the matter.

The following evening I attended a meeting of the Reds on the Northside, addressed by Mrs. Parsons, wife of the anarchist who was hanged in Chicago more than thirty years ago, in which she outlined the glorious results which had come to labor due to the sacrifice made by her husband and his fellow-martyrs. The second address was delivered by the notorious labor leader, Jimmie Dawson, who in 1919 paralyzed for a brief period the city of Seattle, stopping every street car, turning off every electric light and holding up the water supply and the delivery of milk. In his address he denounced roundly Samuel P. Gompers for being an extreme conservative, and demanded a leader for the American Federation of Labor who would bring about such a reconstruction of society as would give to the toilers the profits of capital. He indicated the industrial program by which labor might gain complete mastery, and urged upon his audience the obligation to work for the coming revolution.

The most significant event of the evening was not either of these addresses but the sale of current periodicals presided over by the chairman of the meeting. In the list of papers and magazines which were sold were The Dial, a radical literary magazine having for its contributors many university professors; Poetry, devoted to the exploiting of free verse and free verse writers; The Nation, The Freedman, The Liberator and The New Majority. In the days of the anarchists, Herr Most, the editor of an anarchist journal, hurled vituperations against the laws and the institutions of society. The periodicals, bought and read by the element of discontent gathered that night in Chicago, edited almost entirely by university men and women, their contributors being made up largely of those who hold professional chairs in the great universities, were quite different in literary excellence from the anarchist journal, but in spirit and tendency they were similar. The significance of this incident is that it furnishes proof that the point of contact has been made between the groups of discontent scattered throughout the nation and the radical thinking of the best trained minds in America.

The outstanding feature of our modern
democracy is the right of free association for the exploitation of any group of ideas which any body of men and women may desire to promulgate. The world is filled with propaganda. Wars are simply ideas employing force. Education is simply propaganda approved by one generation for the benefit of the next generation. The goal of those who are seeking to impose their ideas upon others is to put into the curriculum of the public school, the college and the university, the theories and the principles for which they stand. Whatever you wish to see reproduced in the nation you must introduce into the schools, has become a popular truism. The curriculum of the school has come to be the battlefield of the world.

Education is a method for supervising the expansion of an enlarging personality. Education is to be measured as to its moral value and usefulness by its content and its goal. As George Steven says, “The main difference between the best and the worst is in the choice, by another hand than their own, of the circumstances which should play upon them in youth, of those to which the attention should be directed, and out of which should spring thoughts and feelings and acts of choice and efforts that make the man. Now that choice by another hand is ‘Education.’ ”

The various groups of society which have each a program of life are seeking either by the pressure of money, the power of the state, the sublity of the propagandist, or the devotion to religion, to bring the curriculum into harmony with their purpose, and the instruction to the exploitation of their theories.

You will pardon a reference to my personal experience. Like the Apostle Paul, I am one born out of due season. I was not trained to be a college executive. In all my dreaming I never imagined such a misfortune. I am an amateur college president, having had the position bestowed upon me, not due to any fitness but because of the embarrassment and distress of a board of trustees reaching out wildly for some one to take the place. During the period when I represented the denomination officially in its relation to its own schools, I had my theories and convictions which I did not hesitate to declare to those of low and high degree, even including college presidents. But within ten days after I became president, I discovered that my chief responsibility was not to the board of trustees, not to the denomination, not to the faculty, but my chief responsibility was to the students who were to be brought under the authority of the institution, and for whom I was to determine the kind of education that they were to receive.

The Christian conception of society requires that the child shall be placed in the midst, and that the laws, the institutions and the whole social order shall be organized in the interest of the child’s highest and truest self-realization. The right of society to influence an educational institution is limited to the purpose of securing the betterment of the child and the growing youth. As Christian institutions and as the executives of these institutions, we stand uncompromisingly upon the principle, by whomsoever we may be assailed, that the prime obligation resting upon us is to further the interests of our students, and to provide them with that knowledge and with that organizing purpose which will best fit them for usefulness and for the most effective service of God.

Among the factors which today are exerting direct and immediate influence upon educational institutions, I wish to discuss simply two: One the unorganized but ever-present influence of the students themselves, and the other, the inevitably modifying effect of great financial foundations which, by aiding some institutions liberally and other institutions niggardly, or not at all, are affecting, whether they so intend or not, the whole system of higher education.

THE GUILD OF STUDENTS

Within the last two generations there has developed within our colleges and universities another system of education which
is becoming more and more powerful in the formation of the students' daily program, in the distribution of the honors for which students are most appreciative, and in the control of student public opinion. As Wilbur C. Abbott says in a recent number of The Atlantic Monthly, "They have created a real *imperium in imperio*, a student university, which would have been called, in olden times, a guild of students."

The situation of the college president is almost identical with that of a friend of mine who was president of one of the large railway systems in the South. We were discussing at a club the re-valuation by the government of the American railways. He said: "I used to think that I was responsible to the board of directors and that I had certain obligations to the stockholders who had invested their money in the railroad, but since I have received orders from the various labor unions whose men are employed by my railway, and from the government which settles for me railway rates and wages, I do not know to whom I owe my chief responsibility, but I do know that I cannot with any satisfaction to myself serve three masters."

Student activities, student government, the growing application of the theory that the student body is a democracy independent of faculty control, the intense interest in athletics, the demand that the curriculum shall be modified in the interest of these activities, that college credit given for glee club work, debating, and, probably a little later, credit for superior skill in punting a football or putting the baseball over the plate, have created a condition in which society as organized within the college community is modifying the whole educative process, and the tendency lies in the direction of not allowing the studies of these young men in any way to interfere with their education. The winning of letters, not the letters that appear upon the diploma, but the letters which appear upon sweaters, is becoming a more desirable objective in the mind of the student than the acquirement of knowledge, however useful, or the commendation of the president as he pronounces *magna cum laude*.

Under these conditions I am seriously thinking of recommending a new set of requirements for admission to college. The present system of Carnegie units smacks of the steel plant, having the rigidity and the mechanical character of the product of such a plant. All college students fall into one of two classes: Those who come and those who are sent. The college exists for those who come. The student who enters without any clearly defined object, who contemplates no life career, whose activities are not controlled by a worthy dominant purpose, whose conception of his college course is a good time covering a period of four years, may have his fifteen Carnegie units, but he is in no sense ready for college. The induction of the psychological test in Mercer University is enabling us to determine beyond any question whether the student has the intellectual equipment necessary to profit from a four years' stay in college. The other question to my mind is equally important: That relates to the purpose which the individual student has in coming to college. I am seriously thinking of recommending to the board of trustees that one of the requirements for admission to Mercer University shall be a divine call to get a college education.

A body of students meeting these three tests, possessing the fifteen Carnegie units, having passed successfully the psychological test, dominated by a purpose to pursue their education with reference to a life career, will provide a student constituency competent and willing to co-operate with the authorities of the institution in everything which will promote the best interests of the college.

**EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS**

There are now in existence several foundations. The oldest of these is the Slater Fund organized in 1882, the income of which is used to promote education among the negroes. The original foundation was $1,000,000.

Another endowment similar in character
was founded by Mrs. Anna Jeanes, the income of which is also devoted to the betterment of the negro race.

The world's two greatest philanthropists, if we measure greatness by the amount of money given to the promotion of human welfare, are John Davison Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie.

John D. Rockefeller was born July 8, 1839, in Richford, N. Y. At the age of 14 he moved to Cleveland, O., where he acquired a common school education. He began his business life as a clerk in a commission house, and at nineteen became a partner in the firm of Clark and Rockefeller, commission merchants. He was shrewd, thrifty, astute, and a born money maker. He was converted about the age of twelve and united with the Baptist Church at Richford. He amassed his great fortune in the development of the Standard Oil Company. He has given liberally to religious causes, education and research work. His total gifts exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. He founded Chicago University, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the General Education Board.

Andrew Carnegie was born in Dunfermline, Scotland, November 25, 1835. He came to America at the age of thirteen, settling in Pittsburgh. He was a weaver's assistant in a cotton factory, a telegraph messenger boy, and later telegraph operator, becoming superintendent of the Pittsburgh division of the Pennsylvania System. During the Civil War he was the superintendent of Military Railways and Government Telegraph Lines in the East. His fortune was made in the manufacture of steel. His benefactions exceed three hundred million dollars, and are widely distributed, but his gifts were never made for any object which sought to promote the Christian religion. Towards the close of his life, it has been reported there was some softening of his antagonism to Christianity. However, he excluded all institutions supported by religious bodies from the benefits incident to his system of teachers' pension, and his gifts of church organs were based upon the cultural value to any community which good music always affords.

The General Education Board chartered in 1903 was established to promote practical farming, public high schools in the Southern states, negro education and higher education everywhere throughout the United States. This board is appropriating the funds necessary to pay the salaries and traveling expenses of a special high school representative whose business it is to stir up public sentiment in favor of public high schools. To him is committed, with the consent of the state, the determining of the high schools which shall be recognized as meeting the standards and which are classed as accredited high schools. The General Education Board since its foundation has appropriated millions of dollars to colleges and universities in the United States, about one-third of which has been given to institutions within the South. The board has adopted the policy of selecting certain colleges and universities whose work they approve, whose constituency guarantees future growth, and whose educational standards are being maintained. These prosperous institutions are aided on the basis that increased endowment will enable them to furnish an illustration to other schools of what an institution of such a grade should be.

Although Mr. Rockefeller is a Baptist, the president of the board a Baptist minister, the assistant secretary a Baptist minister, one of the two secretaries a Baptist layman, the other being a Jew, there is no evidence that any partiality has ever been shown to Baptist institutions. Gifts have always been made conditioned upon a sum of money from two to four times the amount given by the General Education Board being raised for the institution. Since Mr. Rockefeller's gift of fifty million dollars made in the winter of 1918 in which he expresses the hope that this money shall be used to increase the salaries of college professors, an increased number of colleges and universities have received annual subsidies and gifts to endowment conditioned upon the income.
from the endowment being used to maintain the increased schedule of professors' salaries. On the whole, the work of the General Education Board seems to be conducted fairly without any partisan favor being shown to the denominational schools, and it appears that great benefit has come through this board to the farming classes, the high schools, the negroes, and the favored colleges.

One position taken by the General Education Board limits the sphere of usefulness of the denominational college. I refer to that part of the contract made with one of our colleges, and I assume is made with other favored institutions (never having received any aid from this board, I am not in position to speak dogmatically) that no part of the income from the fund so contributed by this board shall ever be used for specifically theological instruction. The right of inspection of the books of the college is guaranteed, while the fund must always be kept separate.

"The Outlook," of which Dr. Lyman Abbott is the editor, gave this warning at the time that the General Education Board received a gift of thirty-two millions of dollars from Mr. Rockefeller: "With this financial power in its control, the General Education Board is in position to do what no other body in this country can at present even attempt. It can determine largely what institutions shall grow and, in some measure, what shall stand still or decay. It can look over the territory of the nation, note the places where there is a famine of learning and start new educational plants of any species it chooses or revive old ones. It can do in many ways what the government does for education in France or Germany. Its power will be enormous. It seems as if it might be able really to determine the character of American education. The funds it holds represent only a fraction of the amounts which it will really control. By giving a sum to an institution on condition that the institution raise an equal or a greater amount, it will be able to direct much larger amounts than it possesses."

The question resolves itself into whether the General Education Board since 1903 has exercised its power to the injury of institutions such as we have represented here today? I think we may fairly say that the aid which we have received has been small in comparison with our needs, but the gifts possess a value greater than the amount bestowed because these gifts have incited the friends of these institutions to make contributions. So far as I know, there has never been any large gift made to any institution in the South which was under strict denominational control, and by this I mean any institution the whole of whose trustees could be changed by a religious body within a period of three years. Such a gift may have been made, but if it has I am not aware of it. The attitude of our institutions has been for the most part that of the outstretched hand willing to receive whatever the General Education Board may give. If there has been any well-defined policy to interfere with or to destroy the type of education which we represent, there is no evidence of it in the conduct of this board. However, had the General Education Board appreciated Christian education as we believe it should, our situation throughout the South would at this time have been radically changed. It may prove in the end to our advantage, for it means that Southern Baptists may expect some small assistance from this board, but any marked advance made by any of the institutions must grow out of the generosity of our own people.

Recently an incident occurred which illustrates the sensitiveness of the General Education Board to any suggestions that they are undertaking to control the educational policies of any denominational school. For a number of years previous to 1918 the educational institutions of Georgia were running in debt. In order to prevent the recurrence of debt, the Georgia Baptist Convention, without any serious reflection as to consequences, established a Holding Commission, ordered these institutions to transfer to this body all the as-
sets, including deeds to property and endowment investments with instructions that no debt was ever to be incurred by the institution of any kind whatsoever. Soon after the transfer was made the denomination learned that these gentlemen interpreted their rights to be that of legal owners, and that they were appointed for life, and that their only responsibility was limited to making an annual report to the convention, and that the institutions whose property they held had nothing to do with investments that were being made. Some of these facts were brought out by an inquiry made by the General Education Board. They were not known to us before. When the application presented by Mercer University to the General Education Board did not receive favorable consideration, the question was raised by the president of Mercer University as to whether the failure to make any appropriation for annual support or for endowment was due to the condition in which our assets were placed. The following memorandum indicates the official attitude of the General Education Board:

"Copy of Memorandum by Wallace Buttrick for the files of the General Education Board.

"Mercer University, Macon, Ga.

"On Tuesday morning, September 6, 1921, President Weaver of Mercer University called on Dr. Sage and me. By reference to a memorandum by Dr. Sage, dated May 18, 1921, it will be seen that the property of Mercer University is held by a Holding Commission, created by the State Convention. To this Holding Commission the trustees of Mercer University have deeded its property and transferred its endowment.

"An application from Mercer University is before the General Education Board, consideration having been postponed from the May meeting.

"Dr. Weaver desires an expression of opinion on the part of Dr. Sage and me as to whether such an arrangement for the holding of property is wise. Dr. Sage and I declined to express an opinion for the board or for ourselves personally. It is our conviction that the Baptists of Georgia should not be guided in their actions by any opinions held by us, but that the whole question should be discussed and settled on its merits by the people who are responsible for the institution."

The conclusion which we may draw from this survey I believe to be the following: The fears which were entertained when the General Education Board became the recipient of many millions of dollars that they would undertake to control the educational program of America has not been fulfilled, and the reason probably is that the men who are responsible for the administration of these funds have been responsive to educational public opinion. If the time comes, and I believe it is coming, when the institutions which have a moral and spiritual purpose wrought into the structure of their organizations are recognized as being better agencies in educating the youth of the land, larger gifts will come to us from such foundations as the General Education Board.

The Carnegie Foundation, organized by a man who, during the period when he was making his vast wealth, was hostile to Christianity, has done more than any other great corporation to transfer the allegiance of colleges and universities from the religious bodies that founded them to independent and self-perpetuating boards of trustees whose interest in the promotion of Christian religion was secondary to their interest in the promotion of education. In 1850 there were in this country one hundred and forty colleges, of which one hundred and eight were at the time of their establishment under denominational control. Thirty-six of these institutions, or one-third of the number, that changed their charter are now non-sectarian, and some of them changed their charter in order that their professors might receive the benefits of the Carnegie Foundation. These thirty-six institutions have a combined endowment of over one hundred and twelve millions of dollars. The other seventy-two
institutions have a combined endowment of less than sixteen millions. Quite a number of these institutions changed from denominational control to an independent board of trustees simply to gain the benefits offered by the Carnegie Foundation.

The mind of society is public opinion. The need of our Christian colleges is the right sort of propaganda. We are getting the wrong sort in certain denominational papers. If the Education Board of the Southern Baptist Convention wishes to render a service to the Kingdom of God which will make those who participated in its foundation forever thankful, let that board undertake as its supreme task the creating of an appreciation of our Baptist schools and colleges which will lead our people everywhere to recognize what these institutions have done, and to inspire in them the purpose to make these Southern Baptist colleges and universities not simply the best in the South but the best in the world.

STANDARDIZATION AND LOYALTY TO SOCIETY

E. W. Sikes, D.D., President, Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.

To distinguish between the loyalty to the denomination and the Christian fundamentals requires some discrimination. The massacre on St. Bartholomew, the expulsion of the Huguenots and the burnings at Smithfield were acts of loyalty to a denomination. Such loyalty may degenerate into unadulterated sectarianism.

Loyalty to Christian fundamentals may mean loyalty to certain doctrines, to certain accepted interpretations of the teachings of Jesus. The "truth once delivered to the saints" is a favorite and sometimes dangerous slogan of some. They seem to think that this revelation has been vouchedsafe to the few, a feeling that is always dangerous. In the truest, widest sense, both these loyalties include a loyalty to society. However, a man may have no loyalty to any denomination and may give no credence to the Christian fundamentals, but at the same time be loyal to society. No denomination could claim Benjamin Franklin; I am not sure that he would subscribe to the fundamentals, but no one would doubt his loyalty to society.

Society is the sum total of the acts and relationships between man: man has slowly emerged into a social animal. Ishmael's hand was to be against every man and every man's hand against him (Gen. 16:12). Society is bound together by a network of ties that cross and recross each other. None of us liveth to himself (Rom. 14:7). This living together enables each individual to accomplish more, to develop more rapidly, to have more enjoyment, more of the comforts and conveniences of life.

Loyalty to society means loyalty to all those forces that work for the maintenance, good order and improvement of social relations. These are social obligations independent of denomination and theological creed. A man is obligated to protect his country against the invader and the marauder, his home against the despoiler, his community against the degrader. Being a good Baptist and being a good Christian does not release from these obligations, but on the other hand makes them more compelling. There are dangers that threaten society, and when once these anti-social forces grow so strong that society begins to disintegrate there seems to be no force that can save it. A country may endure and recover from a plague, conquer the desolation of war and flood, but let it begin to disintegrate, let this germ once infect it, and there seems to be no antidote. Egypt, Greece, Rome and pre-revolutionary France were so infected, and sent to ruin and decay. A society will go to decay by simply drifting with the current. Public education or tax-supported institutions must respond to the demands of the public. What does public current opinion demand? What is the
taxpayer willing to support? With the coming of the referendum, popular democracy will make itself felt distinctly. If the public demands agricultural, industrial or vocational training, then that is what the tax-supported school must emphasize. Now, your Christian college can be independent of that, but it, too, will be under the influence of the denomination supporting and controlling it. Now, the purpose of the Christian college is distinctively for character-building under definite influence and for a definite purpose; it is distinctively for the purpose of making a life—making a living is subsidiary.

There are certain things that a Christian college is obligated to society to stand for:

1. Scholarship—Sound and thorough scholarship. It has no right to call the youth to its halls and send them away deficient in sound learning, nor to deceive them into thinking that they have what they do not have. It must stop nothing short of the best. There is not too much knowledge. God wants us to know all that there is to be known. There is no ban on knowledge.

2. Intellectual Honesty—The college must teach its students to be honest intellectually. Intellectual dishonesty leads to casuistry which leads to bad morals, bad conduct and bad business. Facts are facts, and there is no progress until the facts are faced squarely. The strength of Secretary Hughes lies in his ability to gather the facts, and then interpret them.

3. Protest—Society has the right to expect the college, both denomination and private, to be able to protest against erroneous educational tendencies, though current and popular. True, these schools are liable to err also. Then the protest will come from the other side. In this way society will get the advantage of a balance of power of a bicameral system as we have in our government. "It will make one hand wash the other." The tree that grows alone does not make good lumber.

4. Union of Learning and Christianity—While society will expect the same subjects to be taught and the same pedagogical principles to be used, it also expects the Christian college to bring the student face to face with the acceptance and practice of the ethics and conduct of Jesus. It expects the Christian college to lead him through all the mysteries of science, through all the speculations of philosophy, and then to turn him out a stronger, wiser, Christian, to harmonize any doubts that may arise, to help him hold on to God while he puts away his childish ideas of God, nature, men and literature.

5. Public-Spirited—Public-spirited men must be produced, people who have other interests than their own; not alone unselshful men but men who feel that the public welfare is entitled to a portion of their time, talents and means. There are many disagreeable public duties—tasks that the educated man would rather let alone, but society needs some loyalty at this time. The ward-politician is alert to every interest of his organization. He sees to it that his adherents are registered, that they vote, that they are poll-holders, registrars and watchers. Society needs to be protected at this point. The Christian citizen must be alert and familiarize himself with the administration of political machinery. Many a battle at the polls for righteousness has been lost because its champions were not familiar with the machinery of election.

6. Co-operation—A standard Christian college should not separate itself from, but should regard itself as a part of, the educational system of society. The major part of education will be done by the state through taxation. Education through taxation is no longer regarded as a charity, but is a duty, is an investment, an obligation, a social protective measure. Then it follows standard Christian colleges should co-operate, shape and stimulate such educational activities.

7. School of Religious Instruction—Society has a right to expect that if one course in a Christian college is to be pre-eminent it should be the department of
religious education—the Bible, ethics, religious work, etc. Here it must give what the state needs, but what it is estopped from giving. This department must not be subordinated to any other, must not be carried as a sideline by some other professor. The teachers in charge must be able to place this department on a par with others, be able to win for it the high esteem of students. Christian colleges must be as insistent on these courses as normal colleges are of their schools of pedagogy and methods. This is the distinctive field of instruction in such schools.

Every standardizing agency should make a place for these courses, should consider them in grading and ranking a Christian college. Minimize the importance of religious instruction and morals based thereon, and soon the sanctions of conduct will be changed, and there will be no fixed standards. In these departments the instructors must be "apt to teach," not preach. Goodness and piety are not sufficient qualifications; there must be ripe, mature scholarship, combined with the ability to present in an attractive, popular manner.

LOYALTY TO THE DENOMINATION


We are hearing a great deal about the new day that has dawned in the educational world. Legislatures are more liberal in their appropriations; citizens are more willing to pay their school tax; men of means are challenging communities and states to larger gifts; higher institutions are meeting with success in their drives for millions; denominations are putting Christian education in their budget. It is only a beginning. The educational conscience is being awakened; but ten years from now we will look back upon the little we are now doing and will wonder how our schools and colleges existed. The demand for educated men and women, together with the appeal of the heartsick and heart hungry who are willing to make every possible sacrifice to go to college, is a sufficient explanation of the present awakening.

Carlyle said, "For one person to die ignorant who has the capacity for learning, that I call the tragedy of tragedies, though it happen a thousand times a minute as, by some computation, it does."

But what will a man do with an education? That depends, to some extent, upon the man himself, but certainly upon the influences brought to bear upon him by teachers and fellow-students while in college.
and standard Sunday schools. There are standard high schools, standard colleges and universities. That which gives the greatest concern to many, to the majority of colleges today, is standardization in curriculum, equipment and teaching force.

Any college or university with a sufficient amount of money can arrange to meet every requirement of the Southern or any other association of colleges. Necessary changes in location, buildings, curriculum and faculty can be made in short order where there is ample financial backing.

_But there are some things that money cannot buy, even in the educational world, and these are the things of first importance._ The tithing of mint, anise and cummin is commended by Christ, but the weightier matters of the law are of far greater concern. Fifteen high school units plus one hundred and twenty semester hours of college work under Ph.D.'s of acknowledged scholarship, experience and ability plus teachings destructive of Baptist ideals, contrary to Baptist doctrine and subversive of the fundamental truths of the Bible, equals worse than nothing. We want our sons and daughters to increase in wisdom and in statute, but also in favor with God and man.

We have our state colleges supported by men of every belief and men of no definite convictions—Jews, Baptists, Protestants, Romanists and non-descricts of every type. They pay their taxes, patronize the state schools and have a right to demand that these institutions be loyal to their constituency.

As good citizens, we believe it is right to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's. We pay our taxes and will continue gladly to do so, recognizing the necessity of these institutions and the blessing they have been to the states. But we believe also in rendering unto God the things that are God's. We are God's stewards. We are to account to Him for money, for talent for children.

We desire for our children something the state does not, ought not and cannot give. In order to secure this, we voluntarily tax ourselves, giving five, ten or a hundred times as much for the support of denominational institutions as we pay for those under state control. And we have a right to demand that these institutions be loyal to their constituency. The only argument for a Christian college is that it be definitely and positively Christian. The only argument for a Baptist college is that, in addition to being Christian, it stand for the things that differentiate Baptists from other denominations.

More than fifty years ago the spirit of indifferentism, skepticism, agnosticism and other isms so invaded professedly Christian institutions that attention was called to the fact that many denominational colleges had ceased to be Christian and many others were following in their footsteps. There has been no change for the better. The challenge comes today to Christian people to demand of the colleges uncompromising faithfulness to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ. These institutions are not meeting their obligations when, under the very best of moral conditions, they develop to the highest point of excellency the intellectual powers of the student. A prism can untwist the sunlight and reveal the colors of the spectrum. But if what we see, when we look upon the spectrum, represents the full power of the sun, then it had as well not shine. This world, if it could exist at all, would simply be an iceberg reflecting the rays of the sun, but incapable of supporting life. Above the spectrum is a ray that cannot be seen—the calorific ray. It warms the bosom of the earth and makes animal and vegetable life a possibility. Below the spectrum is the actinic ray. It cannot be seen nor felt. But the photographer uses it in fixing the picture on the plate. Our denominational colleges should supply everything of an intellectual or cultural kind the state institutions can give, but they must also have the warm heart-beat that comes from being in touch with the Sun of Righteousness and the power to bring the student into such relationship with his Redeemer.
that the imprint of the life of Christ may be left upon his life. Intellectual flashlights that are spiritual icebergs are not the natural fruits of a genuinely Christian institution.

It is not sufficient that the student should be brought to Christ. He should be taught to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded. The fruit of a Baptist college should be an intelligent Christian, well grounded in the Baptist faith, able to give a reason for the faith that is in him. The Baptist college that does not emphasize the sole authority of the Word of God, that does not teach that a "thus saith the Lord" is final, that substitutes theories worked out by man's faulty and oftentimes prejudiced reasoning powers for the facts revealed by inspiration and recorded in the Word of God, that brings God before the tribunal of its mind and requires that He give an account of Himself is disloyal to the denomination it professes to serve.

Is it not a matter of vital importance that the young people going out from our colleges should believe in the absolute authority of the Scriptures, should know that only baptized believers have a right to church membership, that the church government taught in the Bible is congregational and that they should stand irrevocably for separation of church and state?

Dr. Strong speaks of "a magnificent and organic scheme of doctrine made known in the Scriptures, a scheme whose foundations are the nature and decrees of God, whose various parts have fixed and changeable relations to each other, and whose structure towers above all human systems and embraces truth with regard to heaven and earth." He quotes from the Bampton lectures delivered by Mr. Garbett, in one of which he said, "In an age of heresy and conflict Jude exhorts his readers to 'contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.'

"1. He assumes the existence of a definite and well-known body of truth called faith. The belief of the church was not something vague and changeable, but it consisted of a clear and organized mass of religious doctrine, distinctly separable from the errors that assailed it and recognized by all believers as characteristic of the Christian church.

"2. That body of truth is characterized by completeness and finality. It is not susceptible of addition or diminution. It is the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

"3. There is authority behind it. It has not originated in human reasoning or human speculations. It is from above, 'delivered from God.'

"4. Delivered to the saints. We are trustees into whose hands this priceless treasure has been put, to insure, not only its safety and purity, but its universal diffusion through the world."

Surely there has never been a time in the history of the world when it was more important that we "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints."

Churches, associations and conventions have adopted articles of faith setting forth definitely what they believe and what every one who joins those churches professes to believe. Institutions have been founded and they are called Baptist. The conventions have appointed trustees and these, in turn, have selected presidents and teachers. The obligation is binding upon those selected that they be loyal to the denomination, whose servants they are. The colleges are not mere brick and mortar and physical equipment, but the combined influence of executives and teachers, educationally and spiritually, upon the student-body.

In answer to a questionnaire sent out by Dr. W. W. Hamilton with reference to "What our colleges can do for the denomination," one man wrote, "Save our students who must now think for themselves and whose experiences are necessarily limited from teachers who are mentally and morally diseased and who daily infect others with intellectual smallpox, cultural tuberculosis, scientific rabies or
philosophical typhoid.” The language might be stronger and not exaggerate conditions which actually exist. Many who put a question mark after Bible truth might well sit at the feet of Goethe, who said, “Give us your convictions—as for doubts, we have enough of them already.”

No college can truthfully claim loyalty to the denomination if it employs and retains professors known to be teaching in the classroom or out of it doctrines subversive of the distinctive tenets of the denomination.

Last summer I was in correspondence with a very excellent gentleman and had decided to offer him a position which he had already indicated he would accept. I heard he was deaf and wrote the president of his college asking if the deafness of this man interfered seriously with his work. He answered that it did. “But,” he said, “in spite of that, I want to retain him. He is orthodox and it is very difficult to find any one to take his place who can be depended upon to teach the truth.”

Physical defects which sometimes interfere with one’s taking part in faculty meeting or which encourage students to take advantage and sometimes “put it over” are not nearly so hurtful in their influence as spiritual deformity.

It is not sufficient that an institution be loyal to the ideals and doctrines of the denomination. It must be loyal to its organized work. We are educating our young people for business, for the home and the social life, but above everything else for the King’s business.

Our churches have their organizations for attending to the business of the Lord. These same churches give their money to our colleges, encourage their young people to attend, oftimes pay the expenses of some bright girl or boy, with the hope that that student may return home prepared to be a leader in church work. In the home town there is not only the church with its work, but there are non-sectarian organizations in need of leaders and supporters. If the student has found in his college religious activities similar to those in his church, he will come home ready to fall into line. Knowing in detail all the organized work of the denomination, he easily becomes a leader and an invaluable asset to the local church. If, on the other hand, the religious activities in the college are non-sectarian, if he has been taught to believe that it is a mark of littleness and narrowness to be distinctively Baptist, it is more than likely he will continue to cast his influence with undenominational organizations, and the church will lose him as a factor in its organized work.

Any college basing its claims for students and money upon the fact that it is Baptist is honor-bound to be loyal to the ideals, doctrines and organized work of the denomination. When it fails to function as a Baptist institution, it should either die, have a change of heart or cease to make false professions and withdraw its claim for denominational support.
Some of you may ask the ancient question, "Is Saul among the prophets?" I do not belong to this elect group. I am not an educator, in the sense that you are. I am a newspaper man, but am intensely interested in the subject of Christian education, and am grateful to my friend, your president, for inviting me to attend your meeting.

I note that the subject which follows this is loyalty to the Christian fundamentals. It does not come within the province of this paper, therefore, to discuss that phase of the subject.

1. I submit, in the first place, that our Baptist institutions should be loyal to the denomination which has founded and supports them. This statement should be accepted as axiomatic. It is simply a recognition of the right of the denomination, the creator, to control its institution, the creature.

As the faculty of an institution creates its spirit and establishes its standards, to say that an institution should be loyal to the denomination is tantamount to saying that the faculty should be loyal.

2. While every Christian institution should be loyal to the fundamentals which are held in common by evangelical denominations, Baptist institutions should be loyal to the distinctive principles held by Baptists. It is not practicable, or, indeed, desirable, to teach these principles in every classroom, but every Baptist school should have a Bible department in which the Bible is taught, and in this department place should be given for instruction in our peculiar principles. In no department should these principles be spoken of lightly or regarded as of minor importance.

Just here arises a question about pedo-baptist teachers in Baptist schools. Is it ever justifiable to employ other than Baptist teachers for Baptist schools? I do not believe that any one who is not a professor of religion and who does not believe in the great Christian fundamentals should be employed in a Baptist school.

I shall go farther and say that a teacher in a Baptist school should exert a positive Christian influence. He should attend the religious exercises of the institution, and in this way set a worthy example for the students.

That, by the way, lets us return to the question. Is it ever justifiable to employ other than Baptist teachers for Baptist schools? Yes, I believe there are times when it is justifiable, indeed, when there is nothing else that can be done. As a trustee of two Baptist colleges, I know that it is sometimes impossible to secure well equipped Baptist teachers. This is true especially in regard to schools for women. I am sure that you school men have "been up against" that problem, so that simply to state it is sufficient.

How, then, can we expect loyalty to our distinctive principles in teachers who are not Baptists? A teacher who is not a Baptist should not be elected to any position which would require the teaching of Bible doctrine, and no teacher who has a proper conception of the ethics of the profession would do or say anything that would tend to weaken the loyalty of a student in regard to the tenets of the denomination to which the institution belongs.

3. A Baptist institution should be loyal to the expressed policies of the denomination. Though a member of the faculty may believe that a denominational policy is unwise, if the denomination which supports the institution adopts the policy that teacher should use his influence in securing for that policy the support of the institution.

We had a striking example of this in the "late lamented" inter-church movement. The Baptists of the South did not believe it was wise to go into the movement and expressed themselves unmistakably to that
effect. Most, if not all, of the state conventions took similar action. In my opinion, denominational loyalty required that institutions belonging to, and supported by, Southern Baptists should have endorsed the position of the denomination. And yet I heard of students in Baptist colleges who deprecated the narrowness of the Baptist denomination for refusing to go in with other denominations in a great world movement.

No institution should be held responsible for the doctrines and conduct of all who attend it. Some students will go wrong in spite of, and not because of, the instruction they receive at an institution. When the vast majority of the students who attend a school come away with their faith unshaken, I think it is fair to say that the influence of the institution, as a rule, is sound, and the exceptions prove the rule.

On the other hand, it is natural to suspect that there is something radically wrong with a Baptist institution a large percentage of whose students leave its classrooms with an apologetic attitude in regard to the principles or policies of the Baptist denominations.

4. We cannot have an absolutely uniform standard of loyalty, or conformity to certain beliefs and policies.

5. As to doctrines, there is substantial agreement among Southern Baptists, and yet there are many shades of belief. In some states the question of Alien Immersion would be made a test of orthodoxy, and a church that practiced Alien Immersion would be considered out of harmony with the denomination. In other states the question would be left for each church to settle for itself, and a church that practiced Alien Immersion would not be considered out of fellowship with other Baptist churches.

Premillennialism would be made by some a test of orthodoxy. Indeed, a creedal statement was drawn up by a well-known Baptist some time ago, and published in one of our leading Baptist papers, in which the premillennial view was put down as essential to soundness of faith. Now, if we were to undertake to establish a uniform standard of belief, we would certainly meet these shades of difference, and this would lead to endless confusion.

One of the subjects to be discussed here is whether science should be taught in our Christian schools. In some states that question would be answered in the affirmative, in others in the negative, or, at any rate, some states would hedge the teaching about with such rigid restrictions as to practically prohibit its teaching.

While these differences in belief are not so pronounced as to cause a breach in the denomination, they are sufficiently distinct to make a uniform standard of belief impractical, and I do not hesitate to say that the insistence upon a uniform standard of belief would threaten our denominational integrity, and the enforcement of such standard, if such were possible, would certainly cause a breach in the denomination. But here I am anticipating.

6. As with doctrine, so with policy. The Southern Baptist Convention may formulate a general policy upon which the Baptists may so far unite as to make cooperation possible, and yet there must always be room left for each state to exercise its individuality.

In the $75,000,000 campaign an effort was made to fit a uniform plan, like a strait-jacket, on the several states, but it was soon seen that Baptists could not work in such rigid harness. A uniform pledge-card was sent out, but several states discarded this card and had cards printed to suit their conditions, many of which were peculiar. Southern Baptists succeeded gloriously in securing pledges in the campaign, but in no two states, perhaps, was the thing done exactly in the same way, and when an attempt was made to force uniformity it invariably resulted in friction.

Now, as each state must be allowed to make its own policy, it follows that the institutions in any state cannot be charged with disloyalty to the denomination, no matter how widely they may differ from a general denominational policy, so long as
they are in accord with the policy of their own state convention.

A south-wide institution must be loyal to the general policies of the denomination, and its conduct is a legitimate subject for criticism by any Baptist, or any Baptist paper in the South, but, in my opinion, a state institution is amenable to the convention of its own state alone, and is not subject to the control of the Southern Baptist Convention, or to the convention of any other state. Some of our brethren seem not to be able to discriminate here. They appear to think that a state institution, that is, a Baptist institution, owned and controlled by the Baptists of its state, can be made a target for the unfriendly criticisms of self-appointed guardians of the faith. That is a matter of journalistic ethics which each editor, or correspondent, must decide for himself.

7. This leads me to say that the trustees of an institution should be the judges of its standard of loyalty. The trustees are in better position to pass on such matters than any other body of men.

Now, I believe the denomination should control its institutions, and, so far as I know, the Baptist schools in every Southern state are under denominational control. The control is exercised through boards of trustees, but the trustees are answerable to the convention. In my state the trustees are elected for a term of three years, one third going out each year. Members whose terms expire are eligible for re-election. The trustees elect members, but the election must be ratified, or confirmed, by the convention. By this method the convention practically names the trustees, and through the trustees controls the institutions.

If the trustees are not faithful to their trust, if they allow teachers who are not loyal to the denomination to remain in the faculty, the complexion of the board can be changed in two years by action of the convention. I am speaking of the methods that are employed in my own state, and I suppose some such method obtains in the other states.

If the whole denomination in any given state could visit the several institutions, converse with the teachers, and breathe the atmosphere that surrounds them, the opinions of very many of our brethren would be changed. It is impossible, of course, for any considerable number of the Baptists in any state to visit all the institutions in their state and get into their life and spirit. The trustees visit the schools committed to their care every year, and sometimes more frequently. They become intimately acquainted with the members of the faculty, and have an opportunity to learn first-hand what the teachers believe.

A board of trustees becomes the nexus between the institution and the denomination. A trustee should ever bear in mind that his official title is suggestive of the solemn obligation that rests upon him. To the board of trustees of an institution has been committed a sacred trust. They are acting for the denomination and should see to it that the institution committed to their care is loyal to those things for which the denomination stands.

On the other hand, the denomination should have confidence in the trustees whom they select unless those trustees act in a way to forfeit their confidence, in which case they should be removed and others appointed to take their places.

Some of our institutions have been brought under suspicion by criticisms that were not well founded. If a Baptist has good reason to believe that a teacher in a Baptist institution is disloyal, in doctrine or in conduct, if he will report the same to the board of trustees of the institution and will produce evidence to justify an investigation, I do not believe there is a board of any Baptist institution in the South that would not order an investigation.

As Dr. Mullins said in a very fine article some time ago, no teacher can do his best work when he knows he is under suspicion. Constructive criticism should ever be welcomed, but destructive criticism is always harmful.

I was talking about this subject the other
day to a very intelligent gentleman in the city of Raleigh, a man who spent many years of his life as a teacher, but who is not now engaged in that honorable profession. I am sure that all who know this gentleman would say that no more loyal man lives in North Carolina. In the course of our conversation, my friend said, "After all, a desire to be loyal is not the highest motive that impels to service. Before loyalty there must be love. No more loyal man could be found than the apostle Paul, and it was he who said 'The love of Christ constraineth us.'"

Any teacher who owns Christ as his Lord, and has Him enthroned in his heart, will be loyal to Christ, not for the sake of being loyal, but out of love for Him whom his soul adores.

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY

J. B. TIDWELL, D.D., Professor of the Bible, Baylor University, Waco, Texas.

In entering upon this discussion I urge upon you three considerations. First, that some such discussion is needed. There is everywhere much unrest among our people and many of them entertain a fear that modern science and its methods are undermining the Christian faith of our young people. We need, therefore, to think the whole question through that we may on the one hand correct any wrong conditions, and on the other give assurance to the people. In the second place this discussion must be brief. It can do little more than state the case by pointing out the relations and dangers and must not be expected to give much of detail and illustration. In the third place this is not to be a discussion of Darwinian evolution. As for myself, I do not believe that doctrine, but evolution is not a science as some seem to think. It is a hypothesis, a theory. But we are to deal with the achievements of science and not with the speculations and theories of some scientists. We shall try to have in mind the facts of science and not the constructions which some scientists have put upon these facts. So far as the Bible is concerned, we shall think of the facts of science and the facts of revelation, remembering the distinction "between science in a state of hypothesis and science in a state of fact." Holding this in mind, let us consider first:

Our Situation

During recent years, and especially during recent months, there has been much discussion, both in the press and from the platform, concerning the relations that exist between Christianity and the sciences. These discussions have been occasioned by an effort on the part of some to state their religious beliefs in terms of Scripture teaching and have headed up in a discussion of the teachings of denominational schools. Criticism has been freely indulged on both sides. Scientists and their defenders have railed at the defenders of the Bible and accepted Christian beliefs, declaring that they are narrow and afraid of truth and light and that they are against all progress. On the other hand, the defenders of accepted Christian beliefs have called the scientists the enemies of Christianity. They have denounced them as infidel—often publicly. It has even been freely hinted that all scientists who profess to be Christians are hypocrites who claim to be the friends of Christianity so that, under cover, they may destroy it.

Here let me say that I have no sympathy with either of these views. I do not think that our Christian leaders are afraid of truth and light. Their very defense of what they believe to be true marks them as lovers of truth. Nor are these men against progress. They are for the most part broad-minded men who rejoice to aid everything that is good. They may generally be relied upon to forward every movement that aims to forward the moral, social, economic, educational and
religious situation of the people. They are happy in the accomplishments of science and gratefully acknowledge the many blessings that its discoveries have brought to the race. Nor do I believe that scientists as a rule are untrue men, mere side-steppers. I have known some of them and have generally found them to be frank and sincere men. I have thought that some of them were in grave error, but while thoroughly disagreeing with them on some matters, I have found little reason to count them as dishonest tricksters.

But is there some ground for the attitude assumed by both sides? It has not been so long ago since certain scientists did openly attack the Bible and a few who pass as scientists do even yet attack it. For the most part these men have not known much of the Bible. But this scouting of the Bible which they did not know, violated the fundamental method of science which requires investigations and knowledge and need not be charged up to science. At one time a French Society of Science claimed that eighty theories of science were contrary to the Bible. Believers in the Bible had to fight their way out of this condition. Some of the theories were overthrown and others were shown to be in harmony with the Scriptures until now none of them are left to oppose it. This opposition to the Bible and Christian belief, manifested in the beginning of modern science, caused the leaders of Christian work to be on constant guard lest other damage be done. On the other hand, discoverers of truth in the field of science have also suffered. In some cases they suffered derision and persecution, and even died in dishonor, because they announced discoveries that afterward proved not only to be true but to be of great blessing to the race. And the leaders of Christianity were not all clear of these wrongs against scientists. Sometimes even ministers were ready with stiletto and firebrand to do them harm for these announced discoveries. Here was laid the foundation for the present-day charge that religious leaders are unwilling to face the truth and that they are bound by blind tradition. Our present condition is then a situation with a history that must be dealt with wisely. It relates itself to certain foolish teachings and certain false fears that have led some fine people to seriously doubt whether Christian schools should teach science at all, and especially to doubt whether they can become universities and go fully into it.

Cause of the Difficulty

Wherein lies all this difficulty? It is a difference of view that is very natural. The scientist is constantly changing his opinions as he discovers new facts in nature and cannot understand why the theologian should not change also. In this he forgets that Scripture revelation is closed and that there has been no change in the Bible for more than eighteen hundred years. Its teachings on great matters are always the same. On the other hand, the theologian forgets that scientists are constantly finding new facts in nature and must change their opinions accordingly. He, therefore, becomes impatient, and even disgusted with them. Both should realize that one field of truth rests upon an unchangeable revelation of God and the other upon the amount of knowledge of nature that has been discovered by man.

Taken as a whole, it is a problem of two realms—the physical and the spiritual. One is the realm of physical fact and the other is the realm of religious faith. One is in the field of what we may know by sight; the other looks to what we may learn by faith. One appeals chiefly to the intellect, the other to the moral nature. One is mainly tested by the mind, the other by the heart. With reference to man, one has to do with the study of “the dust of ground,” out of which God created him, the other studies “the living soul” which he became when God breathed into him the breath of life. The two are standing in different and separate circles and, being in these different and separate realms, there should be no conflict. It is a question of the different realms from which
we learn truth and the means by which it is brought to us. And both sources—the Bible and science—are limited in what they can teach us.

The Bible is not a book of science and makes no effort to give details that correspond to present-day scientific conclusions and hypotheses. It leaves us freedom for investigation and discovery in Nature. The Genesis story of creation is a good illustration. It is given in two short chapters and could not outline the facts involved in geology, zoology, biology, botany, astronomy, archaeology and anthropology—all of which are involved or suggested. Moses in no way hampers the scientist but leaves him free to investigate or guess as much as he will without having any quarrel with him. But let the scientist know that most of this will be guessing and not science; and that it should not be taught as science. Then, too, no amount of study in the Bible would give us a knowledge of steam and electricity and their laws and uses; nor of disease and germ and remedy and of endless other things which we have learned through science. But the silence of the Bible on these matters does not imply that it is against them. Indeed, wherever it refers to nature’s processes, it has been found to be in harmony with them, but a discussion of these things is not included in its purpose.

And science is equally limited. Nature cannot reveal to us the plan of redemption in the atonement of Jesus. It cannot tell us of the origin of sin, of its penalty and of the means of redemption from it and its consequences. It cannot tell us of the existence of the future life and of the conditions of men in that life. The Bible alone can bring us knowledge concerning these and other spiritual truths that lie outside and beyond the field of spiritual regeneration and the chief purpose of life. But the failure of nature to bring a revelation on these points in no way depreciates the truth that it does reveal. God saw fit to make these known through revelation and not through nature.

Our conclusion then is that the Bible and science are both sources of knowledge. Back of both nature and the Bible is God, who is sufficient and final author of both. Both are true and divine sources of wisdom and what they reveal is in no way contradictory, but if rightly understood is always supplementary.

**Points to Be Guarded**

Just here are some matters to be guarded. So long as the scientist and the Bible student each stays in his own circle of truth there can be no conflict, but as soon as either crosses over into the realm of the other and tries to solve its problems by the methods he has used in his own realm trouble arises. The two must, therefore, be kept in right relation. The Bible student must not use the Bible for a textbook of science and for explaining all natural phenomena, and must not abuse the scientist because he says but little about the Bible in his discussions. Nor must the scientist try to explain sin and salvation and their related truths on the ground of the laws of physical nature. To do this will certainly conflict with the Bible teaching that they are a spiritual condition and work.

Precisely this is the danger point for the scientist. He is accustomed to go by sight. He wants to touch and taste and handle—to see and understand. In his own field he would of necessity walk by sight, but will do his best to arrive at the truth. But there is an unseen world and his danger is in trying to enter that world with no other equipment with which to work than that which he has used in the realm of the seen. In this he is as helpless as if one who is mending a wagon tire should, with the same tools, attempt to adjust the hair-spring of a watch. This is the complaint of the theologian. He is unwilling to this procedure. He believes with Arnold Ure that “religion demands faith,” and that faith has “compelled the human race to aspire to higher ideals and to higher beliefs than can be afforded either by the proofs of science or the reasoning of philosophy.” He knows that, in the field of Christianity, faith and not physical apparatus is the means of investi-
It is no longer a test to be made with physical mechanisms, but in the laboratory of experience. The proper place for the scientists is in connection with what we have in nature and not with how it originated or what is to become of it. When he goes beyond this, he ceases to be a scientist and becomes a philosopher making theories. Indeed these theories often become a sort of speculative theology. The conflict with the Bible does not arise in connection with the facts of nature discovered by the scientist, but in connection with the theories he makes to explain that which is beyond the realm of discovered facts. It is not science but some scientists; not geology but some geologists; not physics but some physicists; not biology but some biologists that oppose Christian or Biblical theology. They teach as science that which is only a theory, forgetting that speculation destroys both science and religion and that speculative ages have always been dark and unfruitful ages. Let the scientist investigate what he can touch and taste and smell and hear and see—everything in the sphere of physical senses. But let him stay out of the spirit world, which he can no more investigate in science than the Bible could be used as a laboratory guide in the study of chemistry. Or let the scientist become a little broader and include spiritual as well as physical facts. Most of the great matters of life, such as love and hope and hate, are in the sphere of the unseen. They are not proven by argument or laboratory analysis, but are recognized experiences of human life. If science would include all this phenomena as well as the physical, it could judge Biblical revelation and Christian beliefs by the spiritual standards by which they were intended to be judged and most of the trouble would be removed. The theologian would then no longer feel that the scientist had become a law unto himself and left the Bible out. Another matter that suggests caution is the fact that there is much more to be learned. No man ever feared science who knew science well and no man who knew the Bible well and had felt its inspiration and regenerating spirit ever put his heel upon the Bible. Let us then learn more of both. I suppose that none of us would claim that we had fully comprehended all the depth and blessing of all of the Scripture. We hope to learn more and more of its wonderful power and spiritual significance. This is all the more true in science where we have in all probability but fairly begun to learn. And as many theories of science that were once accepted and taught have long been abandoned, so many others that are now in use will, as we learn more, no doubt be rejected either as false or inadequate. This fact has a word of advice for both the scientist and the Bible student. It admonishes each to play the Christian and be fair in dealing with the other and his work. It admonishes the scientist not to be too dogmatic or boastful of his knowledge and not to destroy confidence in the Bible with theories that, like many of their predecessors, may soon be changed or discarded. On the other hand, it should quiet the fears of the Bible student and teacher. If science announces a theory that seems to conflict with accepted Bible teachings, let them hold their peace. If the theory is false, some honest seeker after truth will discover the error, and the theory like others in the past will be abandoned. If it is true, we shall as in many former times find its relation to Biblical truth and no damage will be done. This does not prevent the Bible student from defending his beliefs. Nor must we ever censure a religious leader because he defends Biblical truth. It is not right for us to subject Biblical or other truth to abuse or misrepresentation without coming to its defense. Truth can stand any test, but only when true and brave men who believe it determine that it shall have a fair chance. On this principle Paul wrote whole books of the New Testament to defend the truth against false theories. So now when the people's confidence in the Bible is endangered, whether through science or otherwise, whether intended or not, we must come boldly to its
defense. In like manner the scientists will cling to the truth discovered and will defend it against all who would without good reason reject it. And neither should be considered a bad man for making such defense.

_Let Us Teach Science_

Already enough has been said to indicate the value and importance of science and to suggest that we must study and teach it. Neither must there be any fears for the Bible. Let the scientist delve into all secrets and let him know that we have no fears for the divine book. If it is God’s book as we confidently believe it is, and if this is God’s world, and we all believe it is, there can be no conflict in what the two teach us about God. Truth never conflicts, no matter how or where we learn it, and we shall have no fears for the Bible as the search for truth continues.

But do not the teachings of the Bible require that we know science? Do we not need science as a very right arm with which to perform the tasks which the Bible gives us the duty and will to do? If the Bible puts in us the love of our fellows and a desire to serve them, we must have science to show us some of the ways to fulfill our divine mission of mercy to the bodies of men. The very command to subdue the earth seems to make a study of nature necessary. How could we tunnel mountains, traverse the seas, navigate the air, yea, how would we examine the viscera of a dead and buried infant and find the poison with which it was murdered so that we could bring the criminal to justice, but for the study of science. Such illustrations might be continued ad infinitum. In the next place, the church is called “the pillar and ground of the truth.” Its very purpose is to support the truth—all truth. But it cannot support truth which it does not know and it cannot with certainty know what it trusts wholly to others to discover. We must then investigate for ourselves and know first hand. Yet again, Paul says (Rom. 1:20) that the invisible things of God are understood by means of the things that are made. This passage lays much of the dust. It declares that unseen and spiritual things are better understood by a proper knowledge of physical things. Nature, then, is intended to be a stepping stone to a knowledge of the invisible and spiritual things. The study of science and a knowledge of nature are then necessary to the fullest understanding of spiritual truth. As Christians, therefore, and possessed of a desire to know all we can of the spiritual things of God, we must be scientists and learn all we can in these fields of truth.

Another matter of great importance in this connection is that the Bible uses physical things and physical process to teach and enforce spiritual truth. By parable, by simile and by metaphor, Jesus and others taught gospel truth by means of physical illustration. The sower and production of the soil, the leaven and its influence, the rain and its influence upon the earth as well as many other facts of both animal and physical nature are employed to teach profound spiritual truths. Jesus is called the “Day Star” and “The Sun of Righteousness” and calls himself “The Vine” and the “Light of the World.” This use is based upon the fact of similarity in physical and spiritual processes. It indicates that the Bible and nature are in perfect harmony and makes the study of nature necessary.

Here then we take our stand. We must and will teach science. If Jesus call Himself the “Light of the World,” we will go to physics and chemistry and learn all we can concerning light and its influence because what it is and does in the physical world, Jesus is and does in the spiritual realm. We will use both telescope and microscope and will faithfully report all we see. We must study all creation, physical, animal and human. We will endeavor not to fall behind others in any of our knowledge of science. And in all of this we will try to keep before us the Christian purpose of knowing more of God and spiritual truth and of human service. We will let the Bible teaching inspire us.
as Christians to put all scientific achievements to the highest human uses.

But what if Christian schools should refuse to teach science? Would that mean that we were against science as being untrue and harmful? Would it mean that we were unwilling for men to get acquainted with the world in which we live? Would it mean that we were unwilling for mankind to have the blessings that such research has given and will yet give to it? Would it mean the rejection of the modern well-equipped physician and the turning again to the medicine man of the aborigines? Would not some of our brethren who, with loud acclaim condemn the Catholics for keeping knowledge from their people, be leading us to practice a like folly? If we do not teach along these helpful lines, others will and men will rightly condemn us for our failure. They will with truth charge us with being afraid of truth and light. They will also despise our religion which to them will be in an attitude of opposition to some of the best things of this life. Such a course would be to destroy our whole Christian educational enterprise and to commit denominational suicide.

But if this knowledge is needful and men are going to have it, the Christian school is the best place for us to teach. There the atmosphere may be made so Christian as to constantly call the student to think upon God and spiritual things. Whatever is discovered will there be explained on the basis of the existence and nature of God. Over every fact of nature one explanation will be made. That explanation will be God. Study, then, will not be on cold materialistic lines, but will be prompted by a desire to know more of God and spiritual truth. The student will be constantly called back to the great foundations of our faith and in the midst of his doubts and fears will be as constantly underpinned and reinforced by his Christian teacher. Such a spirit alone can open for us the doorway into the deepest secrets and highest glories of physical nature. Such an atmosphere and such a spirit are alone worthy of the noble and inspiring task that lies before the scientist in any field. Nor does the fact that here and there a teacher in our schools fails to measure up change the situation.

**The Christian's Joy**

Here is a field of joy for the Christian. He learns to call all the processes of nature the actions of His Savior. He studies gravity and gets some conception of the vast and sublime force by which the smallest atoms and the biggest worlds are held together and properly related. Then he remembers that the Bible says (Col. 1:17) that in Jesus all things consist (or hold together). He can therefore see in the operation of gravity, even in the falling of every leaf the work of his Savior. He sees the unfolding colors of a flower and is thrilled with the feeling that there in his presence his Savior is doing some more of His beautiful work. He looks upon a new-born babe and rejoices that the living God, who is the source of all life, still lives and works. Nowhere else as in science can the purely mental studies bring the Christian quite so close to God. Here, if we have the right spirit, everything becomes sacred. Eternal divine powers throb all around us and we are consciously in the divine presence.

Nor do any of the facts of nature disturb the Christian. He learns that the volume of expired air is one-fifth less than the volume of inspired air; that plant substance is composed of cells; that Halley's Comet returns to our system every seventy-five years; that Sicily was a part of the Roman empire in the time of Augustus; that certain animals have organs such as lungs and liver and kidneys that have similar or identical functions with like organs of man; but these physiological, botanical, astronomical and historical facts do not conflict with the religious teaching of the Bible and place no burden on his Christian faith. The same is true concerning the so-called laws of nature. We think of the law of gravity, the law of the conservation of energy, the laws regarding gaseous bodies, zoological laws,
physiological laws and psychological laws. Science is set to record and classify these laws and to explain the phenomena underlying them; but a knowledge of all this does not require us to surrender one point of Christian teaching.

Neither does the Christian substitute the knowledge of nature for that of the Bible. The Bible tells him of the Savior and a knowledge of nature enables him to know more of the glory and power and divine working of that Savior. The Bible tells him that there is a Savior and science lets him see the Savior at work in His great domain. Science indicates to him that there is a great and eternal God, who alone explains the nature and existence of this universe, and the Bible teaches him that that God of glory is his Savior. The Bible reveals to him the plan of salvation. He then studies both the Bible and science in order that he may gain the fullest possible understanding of that salvation. To the Christian the Bible teacher and the science teacher enter into a beautiful communion and comradeship in lifting life's burdens. He brings Bible teaching as close as life to science teaching, that the student may hear the whispers of God calling him to the tasks of mercy and to divine enterprises for the physical and spiritual good of mankind. Thus he keeps properly separated and related these two great sources of blessing and light.

But one conclusion is possible—we need both the Bible and science. God gave us both of them and we must accept and use both, and as Christians we must promote the interests of both. Each must be accorded its proper place. Each must have a place in the curriculum of our schools that is comparable to the importance of the truth which it has to teach us. Each must be allowed to bring its own blessing and revelations, and that without objection or interference on the part of the other. The eye cannot say to the hand and the head cannot say to the feet, "I have no need of thee" (I Cor. 12:21). Nor can either the Bible or science say to the other, "I have no need of thee." But while this is true no one must be allowed without protest to look to either for what can only be found in the other.

STANDARDIZATION IN OPINION: LOYALTY; CHRISTIAN FUNDAMENTALS

H. E. WATTERS, D.D., President, Union University, Jackson, Tenn.

I interpret or translate the subject assigned me: "Making our schools loyal to Christian fundamentals."

Candor demands that I confess that I am by no means certain that my statement of the subject expresses the thought that the committee intended me to discuss.

When I received the printed program a few days ago and saw my name on for this discussion, I felt exactly like a student of mine a number of years ago when in an extemporaneous oratorical contest he drew the subject, "Resolved, That the American Congress should establish the parcels post." According to the rules of the contest, the speakers were all on the platform, having drawn for their positions, and the subjects were all in a hat. The speakers were in their turn to draw a subject, read it to the audience, and retire to an anti-room for six minutes' preparation, while another speaker was doing his best to entertain the audience. The only means of help in the room were a tablet, pencil and dictionary. When our friend drew the subject and read it to the audience, it was very apparent to everybody that he had never heard of the parcels post, and the audience laughed in anticipation. But
they were hardly prepared for what they got. After six minutes the young man appeared, read his subject to the audience again and thus defined it: "The dictionary says a parcel is a package, and that a post is a stake to hitch things to. Now I haven't any idea why Congress should have a stake to hitch parcels to, but I am for it." And amid shouts of laughter he regaled the hilarious audience with arguments for the measure and almost won the medal. Now I may have missed my subject as far as Crittenden did, and while I cannot hope to make as successful a discussion, I can say with him that "I am for it." I believe in making our schools loyal to Christian fundamentals, but I frankly confess that the expression "standardizing opinion" in regard to the matter is to my mind a little hazy, and more removed still is any plan for organizing this opinion.

Standardization has long been a word to conjure with, but only recently has it been applied consistently to our educational system. It has its profits and its perils. It is the iron bed upon which many a Procrustean operation has been piteously performed. It would appear that in all the years past when this spirit has arisen among a people concerning anything that they have become obsessed with it and have applied it ruthlessly. Witness the pitiless efforts in the past centuries to make the world conform to certain religious standards. Note the bloody wars to force men to conform to uniform political standards. The very genius of standardization demands the ruthless sacrifice of the exceptional, that all may be made to conform to an ideal. This ordinarily is the average, although as applied to our schools it usually expresses the minimum, or the least below the average, that those above the average can be induced to accept. It is difficult enough to apply this rule to the material side of our schools, but when we come to the spiritual, the lines become much more indistinct and the limits more illusive so that a satisfactory statement, to say nothing of the application of standards, becomes doubly difficult.

There is much criticism of our modern educational system. Many say it has broken down, that it has failed to produce the character demanded by our times. I do not know with what standards the comparison is made, but every reference I have heard or read has evidently used the Christian ideal as a standard. Their criticisms have marked how far short the product of our schools has come. I have wondered if a comparison of the product of our present system with that of the past systems judged by these same standards would not make a most favorable showing and give us greater appreciation for our present school system.

There is much criticism of our Christian schools, calling attention to the fact that our product falls far short of the Christian ideal. Critics point to the fact that many of the boys and girls returning from our Baptist schools take little interest in church and Sunday school work, but they seldom point to the large number who do. They do not recall the fact that only a very few who are brought up in their home Sunday school and church service ever take any active part in these religious services in young manhood and young womanhood. If the churches, Sunday schools and B. Y. P. U.'s which have this for their chief object should so largely fail, why should the schools be so severely condemned for failing when they are not organized or designed for this specific task? A Baptist school is not a Baptist church. It is not a Sunday school, nor a prayer meeting. It is not a series of revival meetings, nor a B. Y. P. U., yet our schools are often condemned for not being all of these at once.

The question, therefore, arises as to how much responsibility may justly be charged to the schools in religious matters. Should the schools dominate the churches, or the churches dominate the schools? One or the other is inevitable if they attempt to operate extensively in the same sphere, and in such a struggle the chances for winning are largely in favor of the schools. The force that trains or directs the mind di-
rects the life. Therefore, the institution that trains the religious leaders of the future must and does determine the religious character of the future. It necessarily follows that if the schools enlarge their religious activities so as to take over all, or nearly all, of the training for leadership in the churches, sooner or later the churches will be completely dominated by the schools. The contemplation of what might follow must give us pause.

Still it must go without question that a Christian school must be unimpeachably loyal to the fundamental Christian ideals, but this raises more questions. What is it to be loyal? What are Christian fundamentals? Who shall say what things in the Christian system of doctrines are not fundamental? I am aware that no statement that I can make would be accepted by many to be at the same time sufficiently inclusive and exclusive. Therefore, I shall not undertake the task, but I suppose all will agree that the following at least should be included:

First—That Jehovah is our God; that Jesus of Nazareth is His only begotten Son, and the Holy spirit, sometimes called the Comforter, is His personal representative on the earth today; that the Bible is His spirit-breathed word, an infallible and all-sufficient guide for man. Around this mighty pillar of doctrines there occur certain other fundamental truths, subordinate, yet hardly less vital:

That man is God's special creation. That by sin in the beginning he forfeited his life and right to God's favor and fell into a hopeless state, but that God's love followed him still and made ample provision for his redemption and restoration through the death of his son and the sanctification of the spirit; and further that the gospel as we now have it is God's means of bringing to men the knowledge of God's wonderful love and salvation. This also suggests the duties imposed upon man by these relations, and that his first duty is to love God supremely and do His will implicitly. This vitally affects his life here and hereafter. This is the highest standard by which man can be judged, and the more nearly he measures up to it the happier and more successful he is to be accounted, both in this world and the world to come.

The schools exist only to teach the people how to attain their highest possibilities in life, and since their highest possibilities, as already expressed, can only be attained through the principles and facts suggested as fundamental, it follows that no school can function properly that is not loyal to these fundamentals. Much less does it have any right to claim to be Christian and certainly not Baptist.

That school is imperfect, therefore, which employs a single teacher whose life or teaching places a question mark after any of God's great truths, or that does not make every possible effort to impress them upon the mind and heart of every student. The test of the school is to be found in the character and lives of the students it sends out. Do they highly regard the Bible as God's word? Do they reverence the church and more faithfully support it? The more nearly the school can measure up to these standards, the greater its claim to loyalty to Christian fundamentals. If all of our Baptist schools should constantly send out such product, they might be said to be spiritually standardized. This is a high ideal, and perhaps no school does or can measure up to it, but who can set the standard lower?

But my subject, as I interpret it, demands that I propose some means of method of attaining, or at least approaching, this standard. This is where I find myself most limited, but I venture to suggest the following:

First—The school itself should openly and publicly and in its literature avow Christian character. In other words, it should reject all such expressions as "independent" and "secular," and boldly announce itself as "Christian," and since practically all Christian schools are supported by churches they ought publicly to acknowledge this relation. This means that every Baptist school should boldly
avow and proclaim the fact that it is a Baptist school. To assume an apologetic attitude in these matters emasculates the Christian character of the school to begin with, and it must apologize for every Christian attitude it may assume thereafter.

Second—Every member of the faculty should definitely and unhesitatingly announce his faith in the fully inspired Bible and at no time offer any apologies for anything taught in it, or that he may believe about it. Apologies undermine faith, because they confess weakness, and there should be no lack of faith or thought of weakness suggested by word or deed in any Baptist school regarding God's Word or any of its doctrines.

Third—In all references in the school, in chapel, or in classrooms, to the name Baptist, Baptist churches, Baptist history, Baptist influence, Baptist doctrines, and Baptist ideals, there ought to be a degree of boldness and confidence that becomes a people sure of their ground and proud of their record. Doubtful expressions on such matters and apologetic attitude are certainly out of place in any Baptist school. No aggressive leadership is possible without the qualities of boldness and confidence. This gives the conquering spirit of victory, and our schools can supply it or destroy it. This is finely illustrated in college athletics. Every body of college students knows well that that team is already defeated, which is not "pumped full of pep" and confidence, or, in other words, with the spirit of victory. Visit that war-dance of civilization, one of your college "pep" meetings, hear the ringing addresses and rousing cheers. Note the pledges of loyalty and the stifling of all discordant notes. Feel the spirit of unity, of confidence, of victory that charges the atmosphere. Witness the enthusiasm and the conquering spirit with which each one leaves the meeting. Oh, that our schools might send out all of our young people with every nerve of their being thus surcharged with the spirit of Baptist loyalty and Christian victory!

But again you ask how can it be done, and I answer by saying: "Use the same tactics that are used to inspirit your football team." Now this suggests that a certain Christian atmosphere must be created, which must be surcharged with all of those elements necessary to produce the results desired. The subconscious mind must be affected. Full use must be made of this subtle, but powerful, and most effective means of influencing character and action. His heart is adamant indeed that is not moved by this silent force. He is a poor executive of any school who does not use it; who does not know how to select and organize a faculty and then so direct it as to create any atmosphere in the school that he may desire and thus in time produce any results he may want. This means that the trustees of a school should carefully select their man for president, be fully assured that his ideals are what they want to characterize the school, and then leave him absolutely untrammeled in the selection of his faculty and in developing his ideals in the school. It means also that the whole matter should not be taken out of his hands by the denominational press and theological busy-bodies—these self-appointed "defenders of the faith."

These remarks suggest a thought in regard to an external phase of my subject, and that is in regard to standardizing the opinion and loyalty of the public with reference to our schools in their relation to Christian fundamentals.

First, a few remarks on how it cannot be done. Public opinion cannot be standardized by negative suggestions. All destructive criticism is negative. It can only tear down, never build up, consequently it can only bring down to standards, never up to standards. It constantly looks toward lowering, not raising, ideals. Destructive criticism is very deceptive, and the conscientious man who indulges in it always does so because of his fancied higher ideals, and acts through his misguided loyalty to them. He mistakes the wreckage he makes as an evidence of a great service rendered. He is like the rat gnaw-
ing the file; he sees the chips and thinks he is making great progress, or he is like the bulldog that wrecked the china shop in pursuit of a mouse and having caught it laid it triumphantly at his master's feet, with a very vain feeling over his achievement. The destructive critic is always vain in his feeling of superior ideals, and boasts of his loyalty to them, but he forgets, or does not know, that he has not lifted up what he has knocked down; that he has not obtained unity by division, and that public opinion is not united by the discord he has made. Therefore, some way must be found either to eliminate these devisive wedges which are constantly being driven by hostile criticism, or else some means of concordant pressure be found that can overcome them and draw all of our people together into one mind and purpose.

I would be far from saying that there are not many evils that can only be removed by the surgeon's knife, but if the patient is to recover that knife must be in the hand of a friendly surgeon, and one who knows how to operate in such a way as to remove the disease without killing or permanently disabling the patient, and certainly by one who knows better than to perform the operation out in the open in an air befogged with sooty dust. The surgeon's knife is too deadly an instrument to be used promiscuously by zealous but misguided ignorance. Therefore, in the process of standardizing thought in regard to our schools, we may appropriate the prayer of the politician, "The Lord save us from our friends."

Second—A few remarks on how it can be done. First, let the schools deliver the product the people have a right to expect of them. Second, let the people know it. This latter calls for wise and systematic dissemination of knowledge in regard to our schools. It also calls for a safe and sane interpretation of this knowledge. Let wise and trusted brethren speak. Let the constructionist come out from cover and take the places of the obstructionist and destructionist, if I may use these terms. Let him boldly champion and defend our schools and exalt them in the thinking of the people.

Public opinion is standardized not by resolutions, rules nor criticisms, but by thinking. Public opinion is only mass thought, yet the mass does not think. The mass only records and reproduces in a phonographic way what a few people think. Public opinion, like animals, grows upon what it feeds. Therefore, if we want a standard product, we must have a standard diet. Is it not time our school leaders were giving some attention to the diet being fed to our people?

Or changing the figure, the people as a mass see only what is pointed out to them. Vultures point out some things, honeybees others.

In the manner of standardizing public opinion in regard to our schools, I would commend the course of the Texas Baptist Standard in contrast with that of other papers in Texas and some other Southern states. One is constructive, the other destructive. Both have the same ideals, and aim at the same end, but one would rally the best thought and loyalty of all of the people to their schools as they strive to attain their highest ideals, while the other would fill the minds of all with suspicion, distrust and discouragement. The result of one will be to inspire both schools and people to do their best, while that of the other will discourage, deaden and kill. The results of both will be seen for many years in the future, written in letters large and bold so that "he who runs may read." May the Lord give us more Texast Baptist Standards.
Under the general topic of "standardization," we have considered in this conference, first, "Standardization of Equipment, Teaching and Curriculum," and "Standardization in Opinion."

Under standardization agencies we consider, first national and, second, southern. It is under the head of southern agencies that I am asked to write on "Boards of Publication."

Further limitation is placed on this paper in that it is to give consideration mainly to an action of this Association at a previous meeting concerning the publication of "Courses and Texts on Christianity."

The problem of placing in our Baptist schools courses in Christian education adequate to meet the ideals of our schools and to meet the needs of our young men and women when we would train for service, has been under consideration in this Association for years past. In January, 1920 a committee was appointed to make recommendations to the next meeting on "Courses and Texts on Christianity."

In January, 1921, the committee reported as follows, through its chairman, W. J. McGlothlin:

Pursuant to instructions of the last session of the Association your Committee beg leave to report the following recommendations as a minimum of religious work to be done in our colleges:

1. That a course introductory to religion be given in the first year. This course should show something of the essential place of religion in the life of man, and the superiority and leading peculiarities of the Christian religion among the religions of the world. It should also contain a treatment of Christian ethics with the purpose of strengthening the student for the peculiar temptations of college life.

2. A course or courses in the Bible, setting forth the outline of Biblical history, the unfolding of redemptive purpose, the life and teachings of Jesus, the interpretation of Jesus in the events following his death and in the teachings of Paul and others.

3. In addition to the above required studies your Committee believes that a number of electives should be offered with a purpose of fitting men and women to function more successfully as Christians and church members. These are four courses as follows:


b. Sunday School Pedagogy and Church Efficiency.

c. Pulpit Efficiency and Pastoral Efficiency.

d. New Testament Greek as Greek 3.

4. These courses may be credited as each institution deems wisest.

W. J. McGlothlin
Rufus W. Weaver
W. O. Carver
J. B. Tidwell.

On motion of Dr. J. B. Tidwell the following resolution was passed:

"The Association endorses the action of its committee on 'Courses and Texts in Bible and Other Religious Subjects,' in its selection of Dr. W. J. McGlothlin as Editor-in-chief to secure the creation of books in this field needed by our colleges and instructs him in cooperation with the Committee to proceed with this enterprise."

Progress Made

With this endorsement the Committee has made a modest but a very real beginning in its work. In the organization of the committee W. J. McGlothlin has been appointed editor-in-chief. All manuscripts are to be supervised by him with a view to securing proper uniformity in the volumes and in the course as a whole. The "Course in Christian History," by W. J. McGlothlin, which has been from the press several years, has been adopted as one of the books in the proposed course.
and is already in use in several institutions.

The committee has reached an agreement in authorizing the preparation of the following manuscripts. One volume on the New Testament by W. R. Cullom, one volume on the Old Testament by J. B. Tidwell, one volume on Missions by W. O. Carver, and one introductory article by R. W. Weaver. The MacMillan Company has indicated its willingness to consider favorably manuscripts on these and other subjects to be used in our colleges. The manuscript on the Old Testament volume by J. B. Tidwell is now in the hands of the editor-in-chief.

**Importance of Textbooks**

Plato conducted a school without books or buildings. It is also true that "the word became flesh and dwelt among us." He was a teacher sent from God. In these days the textbook is a very important part of the school. A textbook which is scholarly and comprehensive in its outline and at the same time sympathetic and adaptable in spirit as relates to the foundation on which our Baptist schools rest is a most valuable asset in our work. Particularly in the department of religious education is it true that our educators here in the south, who know our history and traditions, are prepared as no one else to produce a line of textbooks which will meet the desired requirements.

No one should expect a textbook to meet a ready welcome at the hands of the teachers in our schools, simply because it was written by a Baptist. We cannot state too emphatically that any textbook writer who is looking for success and expecting a general use of his books largely because he is a Baptist is doomed to disappointment surely and swiftly. Very careful editorial supervision should be maintained in order that unworthy manuscripts may not reach the printer or have the stamp of approval of this association.

We have come to a day when we have in our colleges men who possess the scholarship and other gifts necessary to produce a general line of textbooks. In some of our schools it is coming to pass that few of the professors could find the time necessary for such work.

**Our Field**

We now have in the territory covered by the Southern Baptist Education Association 119 Baptist schools. Of these 36 are classified as standard four-year colleges, 122 as junior colleges, 56 as academies and 5 as Bible institutes and seminaries. In these schools are 31,196 students, and the faculties have in them 733 men and 902 women, a total of 1,635. The property and endowment amounts to $33,944,309.

While recognizing the fact that our Baptist men and women have already made very valuable contributions to the lists of textbooks on various subjects now in use in many of our own as well as in other schools, it is the opinion of the writer that our most scholarly and gifted teachers should enlarge their efforts along these lines. The preparation of textbooks that deserve to find a worth-while place requires time. Heretofore most of our schools have been very hard pressed to provide pay for teachers. This has resulted in placing many duties on each teacher. The situation in this respect is steadily improving, and we may reasonably expect to find more of our scholarly men giving time to textbook-making. We may also expect to find these books will come into a large place in all state and denominational schools, not only in the South but in the North as well.

**Our Immediate Field**

Perhaps our largest opportunity for immediate service is in our own schools and in the particular department in which the committee of our association is now working. One of the obstacles in the way of introducing the desired courses in religious courses has been the lack of textbooks which were adapted to use in standard colleges of either the senior or junior grade.

Heretofore in the preparation of the books on courses in Christianity the writers have had in mind training classes in city and country churches. In these classes were gathered together persons
ranging in age from 12 to 90 and whose intellectual training was represented by college graduates and also by those who had not been through the fourth grade in the public school. Manifestly books which were practicable for those conditions were not practicable in a college curriculum, where college students had to be dealt with and college standards had to be met.

This association has rendered a real service and a valuable service to our denomination and to the kingdom by this beginning in the preparation of acceptable textbooks. While these books are written by Baptists, and are quite sympathetic and stimulating in their attitude toward all good causes fostered by our churches, they also will appeal widely because of the scholarship shown in their preparation and their ability to dovetail into the practical conditions in our schools and the standards they must uphold.

DENOMINATIONAL PRESS, A STANDARDIZING AGENCY IN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

VICTOR I. MASTER, D.D., Editor, Western Recorder, Louisville, Ky.

Expert and technical knowledge is required to standardize a farm or store or bank. How much more the work of an educational institution.

I take it that representatives of the denominational press were asked to have something to say on this program of the Southern Baptist Educational Association in recognition of the close relationship that exists, and must continue to exist, between the educational institutions and the papers of the denomination. It was manifestly not included that an editor should discuss the technical problems of education before gentlemen who are experts, where he is only an interested observer.

It should be useful, however, if we may reach a better understanding concerning how our Baptist schools may advantageously use the denominational press and how the papers may more largely contribute to strengthening the hold which Christian Education has upon the Christian public, particularly in our own denominational body.

The function of the denominational paper is varied. It is a news-vender of the churches and their work. It is a medium for increasing the bond of fellowship between the various elements of the brotherhood. It is an educational vehicle for conserving and abetting the nurturing process of the Christian home. It is a forum for gathering in and then scattering abroad again the best thought concerning Christian teaching and life. It is an expounder and defender of the revealed truth of the Word of God.

The denominational paper stands in a unique and responsible position between the denomination and the various agencies which serve the denomination in its work. The nature of that relation is one of educational publicity.

It seeks to reveal the value and significance of the work of the agency to our people, and, what is sometimes at least equally difficult, to reveal the thought and will of the people to the agency. The paper is itself an agency of the denomination, whether owned by it or whether owned by private members of its body who bear the financial burden of running it.

Our comparatively brief experience in the denominational ownership of the papers has not yet demonstrated that such ownership makes them abler, safer, or more devoted exponents of the principles for which our denomination stands. In some quarters, there are tokens in the contrary direction that omens evil for the denominational ownership of papers. There is a growing feeling in some quarters that official control of a Baptist paper that has any other dominant ideals than that of making a paper to serve the
highest religious interests of all our people, is a control likely to cripple rather than help.

But, whatever the method of ownership, its proper function in relation to Christian education is the same. That function is to further the ends of Christian education in every practicable way. Three specific ways occur to me in which the denominational press may strengthen the hold of Christian education upon our Baptist people.

The first is for our denominational colleges to make a larger use of the papers for the dissemination of the college news. There is a vast deal of wholesome human interest in the undergraduate life of a college, as well as in the formal efforts of the institution to perform its nurturing function for its student body. It seems to me a mistake for the authorities of a Christian college to surrender to the popular idea that athletics is all there is in a Christian college worth reporting. The fact is, athletics has only a negative value in its reaction on a significant part of the Christian constituency, while there are scores of things in the life and ideals of the college that would warm the heart and elicit the sympathy and prayers of many a good man or woman, and would awaken in many a dreaming boy or girl the desire to go to that school.

Preachers are sometimes accused of preaching over the people's heads. Editors are even accused of writing over their heads. Conceding that they are not free from guilt, what shall we say of the average educator? Delving forever after a range and orientation of knowledge that shall keep the unstable undergraduate respectfully on the jump exploring new and strange fields of thought, how can the school man come down to the commonplace of detailing scraps of news that are likely to be interesting only to common everyday folk?

But he ought to do it. Why should not the classes in English be required to write stories about the life and work of the college for publication in the press? If they are fit to publish, it will probably be a better test of literary skill than a paper on Grecian Mythology or Egyptian Pyramids. An intimate and sympathetic story about a Kentucky Baptist college, published in the Western Recorder last summer was credited with bringing several new students from other States and arousing renewed devotion to the school among its alumni. I beg that no educator shall despise my suggestion, on the ground that it does not call for the use of unusual abilities. The first one who tries it will have the advantage of exploring a field long neglected, and will reap a reward that shall repay his effort.

2. The denominational paper can render a service of value by publishing contributed articles on Christian education.

Two classes of articles are needed, and a large proportion of each should come from our Baptist educators. One is that class which deals with the larger values and problems of Christian education as they arise. Sometimes such an article would explore fields new to the newspaper reader. But at least the thoughtful readers would follow, and in the end these will spread their convictions to the rank and file of the people.

Another class of articles should forever keep hammering at some of the simple but essential values in Christian education, keeping before the people the fundamentals on which Christian education rests. New people grow up, old ones forget. The writer, as well as the teacher and preacher, must repeat over and over, if he expects to build character, and not merely to amuse with novelty or excite admiration for his profundity. The adequate impartation of those spiritual concepts and principles for which the Christian college and the Christian paper stand will require untiring patience.

A Christian college should, in my judgment, always be ready to open its inmost heart to the denomination from which it gets its support. I have often wondered why our colleges have not oftener, more frankly, and more unsparingly, placed the
story of their financial embarrassments before our people. That, together with a restatement of the tremendously important principles for which the Christian college stands, constitutes a challenge which will arouse the conscience of the constituency when all else fails. The denomination simply cannot resist that appeal, when it is faithfully presented, without stultifying its faith and self-respect. In such a campaign the denominational paper can be a factor of almost measureless value. It can tell the truth and keep on telling it, and vital truth concerning the values of personality is the foundation on which Christian education rests.

3. The denominational press must also be a voice for Christian education editorially. The Christian spirit lies at the bottom of education in America. Christian colleges were the first and for long almost the only sources of higher education. The Christian college has made good in every generation, but latterly it is struggling against great ideals and leaders it nursed to strength and right perception, entered the field of education on the sound principle that a democratic State must have an intelligent citizenship. By grace of public taxation, the State educational system has far outstripped the Christian college in material resources and equipment. With this great dominant advantage, it has gradually come about that educational ideals and standards have tended to find their prime source in other quarters than among Christian educators. And once these new educational ideals had the center of the stage, Christian education had the handicap, not only of having to receive its support from people already overtaxed for the State system, but also of having hard work to keep the value of its ideals prominently to the front in an environment now filled with the acclaim of other ideals.

I only mention these familiar facts to emphasize the large need there is now for the religious press to keep before the Christian public the supremacy of Christian educational ideals.

It is not to the discredit of the State that it cannot educate the spiritual nature of man by teaching the Revelation of God in the Bible. It is a limitation fixed by our American theory of what the separation of Church and State requires. But this limitation on the State places a tremendous, a staggering responsibility on the Christian school. And if the State school should so far forget its limitations, as actually to teach an Anti-Christian pagan religion, under the guise of science and philosophy, it will be actually breaking the law against teaching religion in State schools by teaching an anti-Christian religion.

America cannot permit this without our civilization going to ruin. It ought not to permit it. But I mention it here only because it throws light upon the fearful load of responsibility which has fallen upon the religious press as a voice of Christian education.

These considerations make a more compelling plea for the Christian college than we have ever had before. Anti-Christian influences in secular education have actually reached even the common schools in some States and agitation is already beginning among some serious Christian people in favor of the denominations placing their children in schools supported by themselves, where these pernicious influences shall be avoided.

This situation places a serious responsibility on the religious press. It cannot do less than cry aloud, when need indicates, concerning the grave spiritual danger that has been precipitated by the new theories of life-origins and the minified relation of God and Christ to creation and man’s salvation. If it shall find on reliable testimony that some teacher of the new infidelity has crept into a Baptist college, it dare not be merely a negative factor in connection with that fact. If it is charged with destroying confidence in all our colleges because it finds it necessary to point out evils where they exist, it can only reply, that you had as well charge a physician with injuring all the homes of a
community because he has placed a quar-
tantine about a dwelling in which a case of small-pox has been found. The best way to assure our people that they can, with absolute confidence, trust their children in our denominational colleges is to hold these up as altogether the best place for their children, but just as readily to sound the warning, if there should be evidence that teaching that is logically anti-Christian in its bearing has entered a denominational college.

This is a tremendous responsibility for a Baptist editor. But an editor has no more right to shirk the responsibilities that belong to his place than others have.

It is my deepest belief that our Baptist colleges in the South have kept themselves exceptionally clean from the miasma of the recent rationalistic craze in education. But their relation to the educational system of the country, in securing new teachers, and in the flood of text-books that teach the new theories, is such that they have had grave difficulty in doing so.

As one editor, who with his whole soul believes in Christian education and in our Baptist institutions of learning, and who holds in the highest consideration the distinguished and devout men who lead educational interests for our Baptist people in the South, I am ready and anxious to boost every Baptist college in the South with my whole heart, and that I shall do, as God shall give me strength and judgment. It cannot be too strongly affirmed or too often repeated that present educational conditions call for a far stronger emphasis on Christian education than ever before.

But I cannot, I dare not, do less than cry out against those evils of modern education which discredit the revelation of God. The spirit which urges our Baptist people to do their best for our Baptist colleges is identical with that which commands them to object to any Baptist college keeping in its faculty any teacher who teaches the evolutionary development of man from lower animal forms, and who thus, by implication at least, denies the Bible teachings of creation and of redemption by the blood-atonement of Christ.

May every college supported by our Southern Baptist people keep itself clean from the infection of this modern false learning. In doing so they shall in the present stress elicit a support they have long merited but have not received. By not doing so, they shall violate the conscience of God's people, whose favor has been and must ever be their greatest asset.

THE DENOMINATIONAL PRESS AND STANDARDIZATION OF COLLEGES

L. L. GWALTNEY, D.D., Editor, Alabama Baptist, Birmingham, Ala.

If I understand what is meant by the "standardization of colleges," it is that the Southern Baptist schools shall be brought to a similarity of ideals, aims, aspirations; that the attainment of these would necessitate a certain co-ordination and correlation between the schools with reference to personnel and ability of teachers, curricula, material equipment, and probably the distribution of educational funds in ratio to the needs of the several schools.

But I do not take it that I am to suggest what the standard shall be. This would properly fall within the province of the school men. I assume, I am asked to suggest some ways the denominational press may help toward the attainment of such a standard as your body may decide upon.

To come at once to the point, I say, first, that if our papers are to be effective in any phase of our denominational life and activities they must be widely circulated. Mark you, this primal problem
of the papers themselves is entirely germane to what you as school men are striving to do. You set your college standard; you call upon the papers to help you attain it, and I am to tell you how the papers are to assist in your noble enterprise. Very well, it will be easy if you will first tell us how to circulate the papers. The total circulation of all the Baptist papers in the South would not reach 150,000, whereas if a copy of the various state papers went into every home, in the Southern Baptist Convention not less than 1,000,000 copies would be circulated weekly. Give us this boon first and your educational and other problems will be on the way toward adjustment.

In Alabama there are approximately 240,000 white Baptists. Fifty-five per cent of all the people that belong to any church belong to our churches, yet not as many as 40,000 of the 240,000 Baptists in the state ever see a copy of the Baptist paper. It is safe to say that fully 50 per cent of our people neither know where Howard College and the Judson are located, nor the names of the presidents of our two great institutions. Nor need you think that Alabama is the worst Gallilean in this respect. With the exception of Virginia and a few of the older states, doubtless the same thing is true.

Secondly, where the papers are not circulated, neither is there pastoral leadership sufficiently informed to be of much help to you in the standardization of your schools. I go farther and say that where the papers are not circulated, to at least some degree, neither are the people enlisted in any other worth-while denominational enterprise. The consensus of opinion among the field men in this state is to the effect that where the Alabama Baptist has no circulation among the churches, neither have those churches ever been enlisted in the $75,000,000 campaign.

Now if these things in justice to the truth must be said, they are said in no spirit of unkind criticism on the part of the speaker. People, as a whole, largely correspond to the opportunities they have had. What they accomplish in spiritual work is on parity with what they know of spiritual values.

The scope among Baptists in politics runs from presidents and stately celebrities to the plainest and simplest among the humble citizens; the scope in finance runs from billionaires to paupers; the scope in education runs from Christian philosophers to fools of the first magnitude.

Thank God for them all! If they are high up, they are but men after all; and as some have said, "if knots on a log, they are Baptist knots," which means to say some very fine things about them, viz., they are patriotic and freedom loving; they ask liberty without license in church and state and grant it to all others. It is also well to remember in this diversity of Baptist citizenship in America, that we are no wiser and no more wealthy and no more influential than the average man among us. To bring the average up is the business of the schools and papers, boards and institutions, churches and the proclamation of the everlasting gospel itself.

Now the speaker, after studying the paper problem for nearly three years, is convinced that none of our papers, at the present price of subscriptions, will ever have a circulation their importance demands. The Alabama Baptist for instance, to reach our constituency should have a circulation of 60,000. This will never be reached even at the $1.50 rate per subscriber in clubs or when churches adopt the budget plan.

Remember also that many of the secret orders, the W. C. T. U., the Anti-Saloon League and many other organizations, send their periodicals free of all charge as soon as one is identified with such organizations. The same arguments that induce such organizations to send their periodicals to their members free, would at least suggest some plan whereby our denominational papers should be reduced to a very popular price.

As an example of what could be done in all the states, suppose the Alabama Baptist should be reduced in price to fifty cents
per copy. We could within a year or two put on a circulation of 50,000 subscribers. Practically every church in the State would put it in its budget at that rate. The present actual cost of the paper is $2.00 per copy but as the circulation increases, the relative cost of production decreases, so that a 50,000 circulation on our present stock, would cost including all items of expense, office and otherwise, about $50,000 per year, or $1.00 per copy. (These are figures worked out by our practical printers.) At fifty cents per copy $25,000 of this original cost would come from the churches; our advertising would be increased 200 per cent or would certainly amount to $15,000. This would leave only $10,000 of the total cost of a 50,000 circulation to be provided by the Boards of the Convention. The States in doing much of the work of all of the boards and institutions have to contribute to the papers any way and a much larger proportion than is their due in view of the fact that the papers exist for the general boards and institutions as well as the local work.

If our four or five general boards could be brought to see the benefit that would accrue to these institutions from a wider circulation of the state papers and could in some proportionate way bear the deficit on the papers, it would be the best money they spend for educational, missions, and benevolent purposes.

If some such scheme appears too idealistic and fanciful to appeal to you and other leaders, the alternative is that we shall go along at the poor dying rate and utterly fail to reach our people with stimulating and helpful information. The denomination must pay for its propaganda either positively or negatively; either in what it costs to run the papers above their income or lack of spiritual and monetary returns due to limited circulation.

My apology for mentioning this matter at such a meeting as this is twofold; First, a deeper consciousness must be created with reference to the denominational press and secondly, it is thoroughly germane to what you are striving to do.

But waiving a further discussion of a subject that touches our whole denominational life, you ask what can the denominational press, with its present circulation do to assist in the standardization of our colleges? It can do much. Even with limited circulation it is still your most powerful, single agency. It is through the printed page, largely the denominational press, that the Board of Education and college executives must reach our leaders. It is at least true that all our pastors who do things, in a large way, read the denominational papers. The papers are the clearing houses of programs and policies as well as mediums of communication and inspiration.

First, send us your articles, dealing in a concise way, with the fact of standardization you wish to transmit to the people. We editors are interested in the whole work of the Kingdom and we recognize the 119 schools of the Southern Baptist Convention as a most important phase of it. But be kind enough to remember when you pick up your pen that there is somebody else writing, and clamoring for admission to our columns.

Secondly, send us data for editorials. State your ideas in letters and permit us to incorporate them and express the same in our own language. Save your postage on catalogues and bulky literature that would require of the editors two hours reading to get at the facts and perhaps another hour to write them down.

Thirdly, send the editors weekly news items from your schools. These serve to keep the colleges constantly on the minds of the people and are always read with interest.

And finally, brethren, if there are other things that you think of that do not now occur to the speaker, make known to us your wants and we will strive as best we can to serve you and your great cause.
WHAT IS A CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

In the consideration of this subject it is to be borne in mind that the question has already been thoroughly considered as to what constitutes a college. The object of the present inquiry, as the speaker conjectures what the mind of the program committee must have been, is to seek out that which is distinctive in an institution that is pre-eminently Christian. In seeking to define a Christian college, however, it will be impossible to avoid altogether the ground that has already been covered.

It is bold to launch right out into a definition. There are two dangers that confront us, namely, first, that we shall merely repeat what has already been so well said, or secondly, that we shall lapse into the platitudes. After all, it is better to delineate than to seek perfectly to define.

There are three fundamental elements that enter into a Christian college. First comes the faculty. This is composed of educators who, having studied and found the truth (a big word, and I venture to suggest that just here we have the crux of the whole problem), have also acquired the skill to impart it. In the second place, there will be certain seekers after the truth. And in the third place, the effort will be pitched on a plane of scholarly endeavor, which presupposes a certain thorough preparation on the part of the seekers after the truth, who are the students.

These elements serve to differentiate a Christian college. An ideal definition is given, or, to express the matter differently, the delineation is made of an ideal Christian institution. Nothing is gained in the consideration of the question except as the norm is kept before the mind. The thought is constantly to be emphasized as to what a Christian college should be after all the ideal conditions are fulfilled. In other words, we are not seeking to separate the Christian institutions round about us from those which are not Christian, but rather to discover what the underlying differentiating elements must necessarily be.

It may help us in the elucidation of the subject rather briefly to state what a Christian college is not. In the first place, it is not an encyclopaedia. It is not a lot of information stored up in the minds of men with large brains much as canned heat is stored on the shelves of grocery stores. Secondly, it is not a book store, where information is handed out like books are passed over the counter of a public library. In the third place, it is not even a mental cafeteria, with the elective system carried to the extreme. A college is not a place where one comes and selects certain dishes of mental pabulum ad libitum. In the fourth place, a Christian college is not explained in the buildings, no matter how beautiful and well ordered these may be, nor in the grounds, no matter how extensive and inviting these may be, nor in its endowment, no matter if this mounts into the tens of millions, nor in its reputation, no matter how great this may be, nor in its history, even though that leads back to the earliest colonial days or to the medieval period, nor in its alumni, no matter how numerous these may be or how influential. It must be said, however, that these desiderata usually accompany a Christian college, and that they are exceedingly important factors. We must go back, therefore, to the elements that are essential, and those which together constitute the kernel round about which there may be ever so important accompanying elements, corresponding to the protecting and nourishing shell of the nut.

Modern psychology has shown that man grows up in an environment. By environment we do not mean simply that which is round about us, as people, books, buildings, walls, the stars, the hills, flowers, birds, etc. We mean that which enters into our consciousness and becomes vitally
related to our inner life. Only that is environment which produces a reaction in us, or to which our spirit responds.

The point of relevancy in all of this is that in a Christian college the faculty constitutes the ponderating part of the environment of a student. The faculty make the college. The students sing their song, "We are the college." In a way this is true, but it is far more correct to say that the faculty make the college. The students are the advertisement of the college, but the college will be what the faculty make it to become. Allowing sufficient time, the class of students will be drawn to any institution that is in keeping with the faculty of that institution. If the quality of the faculty is below par, the quality of the student body will also be below par. But if a college has a faculty composed of members possessed of a strong personality and Christian character, when sufficient time is allowed, the student body will certainly be of the corresponding type.

An illustration may help. An atmosphere of character is to the production of character what magnetism is to the production of electricity. Electricity may be produced without magnetism, but with the cord and the whirl in the electrical field, electricity will certainly be produced. So if the elements of character are brought into the right environment, these elements will surely develop into an enlarged and strengthened character. If it ever has been felt in the past that one institution is about as good as another for the education of growing youth, with the more intelligent understanding produced by modern scientific investigation, the day for such a nonchalant attitude is gone forever.

So that we are the better able to appreciate our first essential element of the distinctively Christian college, namely (to repeat), educators who, having found truth—and this means in the light of God’s revelation—are also skilled in imparting it. Character that has become fixed and is outstanding will be communicated to the youth, just as the radiating heat of the sun is communicated to the rose, with its colors of beauty, and its fragrance of sweetness, or as that same heat in a different form is stored up in the stalwart oak of the forest.

Already that which is essential in the paper has been said. Besides the faculty, there must be the seekers after the truth, who put themselves in a responsive attitude toward their instructors. There can be no college without those who are taught as well as those who teach. Just as truly there can be no essentially Christian college without those who will respond to the appeal that is made by the instructors from a strictly pedagogical, but also Christian, standpoint. Every college president knows how essential it is to the welfare of his institution that there be students in attendance! It is well just here for us to be reminded again, however, how that the genius of a Christian college goes back to a Christian faculty. Like priest, like people; like sire, like son; like faculty, like students. Plato became like his teacher Aristotle, in his quest after a profound interpretation of the world and the universe; Peter, James, John, and Paul—these became like their Master and teacher, Jesus Christ, in their exemplification of the principles of the Kingdom of Heaven. And so have pupils always tended to be made into the likeness of their teachers.

The third requirement suggested was that the efforts of the instructors should be pitched on the plane of scholarly endeavor, which presupposes a thorough preparation on the part of the student. Here again we hark back to the first consideration, because the question of the impartation of knowledge will be cared for if proper provision is made for those who impart that knowledge. A Christian college is not a Christian high school, because the thorough preparation that the high school offers is presupposed for admission to the college. The scholarly endeavor of a college faculty certainly on the average would exceed that of the preparatory school faculty.

In addition to the three elements of instructors, the students, and the impartation of knowledge, one may ask the questions,
"What of the field of activity?" or "What of the atmosphere of the college?" These matters care for themselves. In this discussion the speaker has had in mind as a matter of course an academic institution which is offering culture for its own sake just as truly as for the sake of possible use. The question of vocational preparation, or the question of the emphasis upon the classics, or the question of whether or not the Bible should be taught, etc.—these questions will all find their solution in the light of the elements already discussed. And just so the atmosphere of the institution will be determined by the three essential elements.

As a further statement, on the pragmatic side, it is to be suggested that, when the proper emphasis is placed upon these elements, the practical matters of patronage, financial support, curriculum, influence, coordination, and all kindred problems will one by one be faced, and if not conquered, at least held at bay. If the steersman can see the lighthouse, he can at least direct the ship in the direction of safety.

In the light of all that has been said, it is superfluous to suggest that the ideal is found in that one who was man and God, Jesus Christ, and that the pattern of all truth is given to us in God's Word, and that the attestation of the truth comes through the Holy Spirit. A Christian college has no apology to offer. It is conscious of a great call as it contemplates the ills of humanity, which it can do so much to correct. It is also mindful of the responsibility that belongs to it because of the young lives that have been committed to it by fond parents who have chosen the Christian college for their sons and daughters because the Christian college has claimed to offer that which is distinctive and most worthy.

In a word, I venture to suggest that a Christian college is an institution of learning which is engaged in developing character under Christian auspices.
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