

# FRASER'S MAGAZINE

247

---

NEW SERIES. VOL. XII.

---

JULY TO DECEMBER 1875



LONDON  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
PATERNOSTER ROW  
MDCCLXXV

No. LXIX.—NEW SERIES.

# FRASER'S MAGAZINE

SEPTEMBER 1875



LONDON  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
PATERNOSTER BOW

MDCCLXXV

HALF-A-CROWN

*The right of publishing Translations of Articles in this Magazine is reserved*

# FRASER'S MAGAZINE.

SEPTEMBER 1875.

## ON NATIONAL UNIVERSITIES.

WHILE Mediæval ecclesiastics stood at the head of literary cultivation, they were naturally invited into principal posts of the civil government; a fact which in itself constituted a definite connection between the service of the State and the institutions in which these ecclesiastics had their education. No establishments known to us in ancient history have any external similarity to these. Ancient Greece was familiar with the idea of National Education, but it was developed out of the military principle of training to arms, nearly as among the North American Indians. Martial exercises, with dancing, wrestling, running, were the foundation: to sing to the lyre the verses of Tyrtæus, Solon, Empedocles, or Simonides was a later softening: the study of geometry or dialectics never became National. But Aristotle was well aware, and definitely maintained, that no schools could reach their highest perfection until they were organised by the State, and that, like gardens, they must first attain a good old age. Private establishments, as an Academy of Plato, might be conducted by teachers of first-rate ability; but they, of necessity, depend on the energies of single minds. No guarantee can be offered that, upon the removal of one man, a great or total change for the worse may not ensue. We need the public confidence, the earnest interest of so-

VOL. XII.—NO. LXIX. NEW SERIES.

ciety, permanent rules, and continuity of principle. However valuable we must confess private schools to be, the establishments which aspire to impart the highest culture must necessarily be *public* and *permanent*, and in general ought to be under national control and enactment.

The form which will be assumed by an institution for teaching will of course depend upon many circumstances, and particularly upon the *age* of the pupils. In this country we are accustomed to speak of three gradations of these seminaries, under the title of Preparatory Schools, Public or High Schools, lastly Colleges and Universities. The word *Lyceum* is used on the Continent nearly as in English a High School or Public School. To give definiteness, we may regard a Preparatory School as retaining pupils up to the age of twelve; a Lyceum as receiving them from twelve to eighteen; and a University as not admitting them before the age of seventeen, and ordinarily retaining them from eighteen to twenty-two. It is true that the Scotch Universities, as did anciently those of England, receive students at a much earlier age: but this is only a mark that the full form which characterises a University is not yet assumed. As there was a time when the same practitioner was indifferently Surgeon, Physician, and Apothecary, though with the

progress of art and science a division of labour has arisen; so there was a time when the same institution served for High School and College equally; but increasing culture brings about a separation. Unless we keep steadfastly in view the average age of the students, we cannot get clear ideas of the objects at which an institution may aim, and the general arrangements which are practicable. The nature of the studies, the mode of the teaching, the liberty to be enjoyed by the pupils, must essentially vary with their age. We must not, then, be misled by such names as *Colleges*, to aim at something unattainable. Youths of seventeen and eighteen cannot profitably aspire to the same performances as young men of twenty-two; and an institution will work under numerous disadvantages which endeavours to be a College when it ought to be a High School.

From a University we must distinguish those institutions which aim to impart strictly professional training, as contrasted with general culture. Hitherto it has appeared that such schools may with much advantage be engrafted upon Universities, and to a certain extent incorporated with them, while preserving their separate existence. These are often called *Faculties*. Such are the Faculties of Medicine and of Theology in old Universities. They are little corporations in themselves, and regulate their own studies and degrees, though standing in definite relations to the University in which they act. In this way the transition is not too abrupt from general to professional culture. A young man after commencing his Professional course may continue to attend such general lectures as either conduce to eminence in his profession or are on other grounds acceptable to him. The co-operation of those Professors who teach Chemistry and Botany as abstract sciences, is, of course, highly valu-

able to the practical Physician. So to the Theologian or the Lawyer the lecturers on History, on Literature, on Languages, on Morals, and on Jurisprudence must be regarded as almost essential. Still, it must never be forgotten that the general cultivation of the mind is one thing and professional knowledge is another; and in the highest and best state which Universities have yet attained, while general culture is made the basis, facilities are also given for certain kinds of Professional study.

No State that aspires to systematic rule can dispense with institutions for training its future civil officers. To what age any scholastic teaching shall continue, will depend mainly on the state of knowledge in the period and the quality of the government; but with the advance of art and science, and the increasing complexity of the State-machine, a more extended course of study may be counted on as necessary. To speak generally, a difference will arise in Universities, according as the predominant influence in them is that of an imperial power, a hierarchy, or an aristocracy. The imperial principle aims chiefly to attain in its officers administrative ability. An imperial University, then, if good of its kind, is likely to furnish abundant means of purely specific culture. Persons will frequent it in order to become skilful in law, wise in medicine, competent ambassadors or administrators, prudent magistrates, ready surveyors, accomplished architects or astronomers, and modern linguists. Every special occupation which the service of the State needs, whether civil or theological, naval or military, may be expected to find its representatives among the teachers of such a University. This is the first type which pure monarchy tends to gender. In the second place, when a University is developed under the pa-

tronage and influence of a powerful ecclesiastical body, all studies will be regarded as subordinate and subservient to that of Religion; and if the notions current in the age concerning religion be in any important degree erroneous, it follows almost inevitably that every science and art is distorted and depraved, by forcing them into harmony with preconceived views. Nevertheless, such sacerdotal establishments, until they fall into decay, impart an elevation of sentiment to their best members, greater than can often be found in the more utilitarian institutions of despotism; and in times in which the religious or priestly body contains all the knowledge of the age, perhaps no other system for the schools of learning is in any way practicable. A third influence under which the public educational institutions sometimes grow up is that of aristocracy; and the result is widely different. The rich and honourable, who enjoy abundant leisure, in a rude and active age love the sports of the field and the use of arms, but in more luxurious or refined times call for the enjoyment of polite literature and elegant science. They cannot bear the drudgery of ecclesiastical lore, nor do they much trouble themselves about responsibility in public office. Neither Theology in its formalities, nor Professional and Practical Study, is likely to find much encouragement in the institutions which are shaped by their influence. Literature may be cultivated, but with the taste of the amateur, and with no great depth of learning. Their Universities will be places of fashionable resort, where elegant accomplishments may be acquired with gentlemanly manners; but, unless other agencies are at work, Science will with difficulty strike any deep root. Politics, as a study, will have no existence. Its rules will be those of Party, and it will be practically held that whoever has en-

joyed a certain amount of general liberal culture is at once fit to administer any of the high offices of State. Office, it is felt, is the natural right of the aristocracy. Such in fact was the state of feeling at Rome under the later republics. No Universities, indeed, existed there; but the aristocracy instead frequented Grecian schools, and maintained in their private houses learned Greeks as companions of their social hours.

The old Universities of England were of a mixed character. Originally they show themselves under the patronage of the clergy, and—whether or not of ecclesiastical *foundation* in the strict sense of the word—were very soon subjected to a strong ecclesiastical pressure. To this day they bear—for good and for evil—the marks of a sacerdotal origin. But from the reign of Elizabeth downward they became the nursery of the youthful members of aristocratic families, and thenceforth the aristocratic influences which I have been describing have blended with the primitive sacerdotal element. Accidental causes have led to a peculiar cultivation of Mathematics at Cambridge, as of Metaphysics at Dublin; but the Mathematical course has not been of any specifically professional kind, on which account it is praised by some and censured by others.

At present let it be remarked that all political analogies combine to persuade us that *mixed influences* are much to be desired in the University. Even if it be intended peculiarly for the youth of the aristocracy, or peculiarly for the clergy, it ought not on that account to be singly aristocratical nor singly clerical: but as in real life the parties will find a world where State and Church, King and People, Lords and Commons, High and Low are mingled, so in the University, as a Microcosm, some image of all these things should

appear. We take for granted that Aristocracy—that is, the influence of hereditary rank and wealth—must and will exist in England; and we ask what are the functions which it may perform and ought to perform in a well-ordered State. The reply is clear: it ought to win and retain popular confidence, and having that confidence, to conduct the executive government both central and local: if it cannot do this, it were better that it should not exist. But in order that it may fulfil this office, it needs an education which both intellectually and morally shall be adapted to it—intellectually, in regard to the training of mind and knowledge acquired directly or imbibed indirectly; morally, in that genuine and affable nobleness of mind which can conciliate the people without degrading itself, because it has learned the people's strength and weakness. It has been reckoned a benefit in our constitution that the sons and brothers of Peers are Commoners; so that our peers themselves while young often fulfil the duties of commoner statesmen. In like manner, while any *such* democracy of principle in a University is to be deprecated as would constitute young men the controllers of study or discipline, yet it seems to be not amiss that the junior part of the academicians should have their own understood rights and certain powers of organisation, by which a portion of democratic spirit should become blended with that aristocratic rule which needs to be predominant in every University.

Many persons are apt to imagine that the direct instruction imparted at a University is the sole advantage to be gained from University-residence; and that if equally able teaching could be obtained under a private roof, the benefit would be as great. But such a view does not embrace all the elements of the question. In great and permanent corporations, such as are the Uni-

versities of England, under institutions where the expression of thought is free from the dictation of either the secular or the priestly power, there are valuable advantages which may be retained by those who, from local defects or even general error in a curriculum, fail to receive good teaching. The assembling of youths makes in itself a little world—a theatre of various experience and emulation—while the blending of many minds among the elders, especially if individuals of high rank and refinement are found among them, exerts a combined and harmonious influence on the pupils which cannot be measured by a scholastic test. It is indeed a great fault in a University, for it is a wanton casting away of one peculiar advantage, if a student is forced to look to a single teacher for his instruction. He ought to have access to the lectures of a numerous yet select band, such as it is absolutely impossible to find in less massive corporations. Even so, the benefit to the student by no means depends solely on the teaching. The arrangements which facilitate study to the studious, and allow all to accept friends and associates of study from a large and various society, are an immense advantage. Much less does the benefit depend solely on the *erudition* of the teachers, strictly so called; that is, on the accuracy and soundness of the learning: it depends on zeal for knowledge, for truth, for justice, for wisdom—in short, on the spirit of the place; on the enthusiasm which is stirred up by persons and things around. When the intellect of youth is opening to an understanding of the great world; when the mind begins to awaken to its own powers, and its action to become delightful to itself; its sympathies need to be kindled on the side of everything generous, noble, and true. Excellent were it if it could see in every teacher how fervently he loves truth, how keenly he

pursues it; how he lays aside prejudice, and abandons detected error; how he lives to learn, and by learning enlarges his charity; how he sympathises with justice, and hates all wickedness and oppression. This is the best of sermons to a young mind. It is true that a large diversity will necessarily exist in the different subjects taught; nor can the same moral influence arise equally out of all; and in any case it is beyond the measure of human perfection to expect that all the public teachers will ever enforce such lessons by their conduct. Nevertheless, if such is, *on the whole*, the pervading spirit of a place, its effect on the mind is more valuable than any inculcation of detailed knowledge. In defect, however, of such influences on the part of public teachers, there is a wholesome stimulus afforded by the young men to one another, unless the University regulations are deplorably bad. Of course they may corrupt one another. Even in periods when the great majority used to pass their time in listlessness, voluptuousness, or roaring debauchery, yet out of so great a number there would always be a select few who loved and cultivated knowledge, and would be drawn together by similarity of tastes. The generous rivalry and mutual encouragement of young men cast together yield advantages so great, that hardly any eminence in a public instructor, or only one of a very rare order, can compete with them or supply the want of them. Each student finds out his own deficiencies far more readily by comparing himself with his equals in age and companions than by that narrower amount of intercourse which alone he can have with his teacher. He better learns, also, what is attainable by him, and is excited to aspire; nor is it so easy for a young man of superior mind to be proud of his advances

and satisfied with them in presence of numerous equals in age, among whom he is sure to find many equals in talent. In many cases also friendships are formed between those who are of like attainments, and study is pursued in company; whereby they not merely stimulate, but to a great extent actually instruct each other. It may even be added that they conduce to the improvement of their public teachers. The celebrated Niebuhr is said on one occasion to have addressed his class with the words: '*You are my wings.*' In a University which is thronged by numbers, zealous learners, it is to be expected, will be proportionately more numerous; and the teacher will more cheerfully undergo new labours for the sake of his class, under a sense that his exertions have a greater result. In fact, it is in such a case easier to get eminent men in each department to accept the appointments. It is an error to suppose that large salaries are *everything*, and that mere money-power will assuredly command able teachers. Money undoubtedly will do much; talents it will generally command, but certainly not genius; and the best talents are apt to stagnate and pine in a place too cramped for them. Eminent teachers hate a post which, being well paid and ill attended, bears too much the aspect of a sinecure. For all these reasons it is of importance to the tuition itself that the classes be fully attended; then no small and isolated institutions will permanently be able to rival large institutions equally well conducted.

Besides this, the *local associations* of a great and especially an ancient University give it peculiar advantages. They bestow a dignity on the ruling body, as the inheritors of authority revered far and wide, which aids in upholding such rules of discipline as general good order

or the interests of science demand. The pupils, from their first arrival, feel that they not merely are coming to receive certain advantages of teaching, but that they are about to be admitted as members of a great Society, to which, for all the rest of their lives, it will gratify them to have belonged. Under judicious restrictions, such as repress the development of haughty feelings to those *without* the University, there is a value in the corporate spirit of an academical body. As it is to be desired that each of us should be proud of his country, great as are the abuses to which the principle of patriotism is liable, so it is decidedly to be wished that every student should be proud of the institution of which he forms a humble part; should appropriate its honours as his own; should see on its walls the portraits of men who have adorned it either in a directly scholastic line or more generally in civil life. If security is taken that the new generations shall be unable to repose in indolence on the credit won by their predecessors, it will be exceedingly conducive to the general interests of the institution that the connection of the present with the past should be distinctly felt. It need hardly be mentioned that the possession of Academical Buildings, which have from age to age been appropriated to the same objects, eminently assists this feeling, as well to actual students as to those who have long since passed off from the University into the great world without. When the man of business or letters, the country gentleman or peer, in later life revisits the halls and rooms in which his academical years were spent, although nearly all his contemporaries may have left those abodes, he recognises an entire identity in the place itself, and feels that the institution is the same. On this peculiarly depends the permanent

interest felt in an institution by old pupils. It is important that every student should feel not merely that he is connected with one or two teachers—in which case, as soon as they have left the place, his sympathy with it may decay—but that he is connected with a great and continuous Institution, and through it with hundreds or thousands of great men who have there laid the foundations of their future eminence. Thus, with the progress of time, the influence and ability of a University continues to accumulate; and if it be true to its calling, its public services will be proportionably greater.

There is another national use, not to be omitted, in great educational establishments where the youth of all parties may freely mix—namely, it gives them one more point of united sympathy, and tends to soften the asperities of public opposition. It has been observed that no free constitutions can last long, unless the contending factions which are certain to arise have fixed interests in common, about which there can be no controversy. Such have been among ourselves the prerogative of the Crown and privileges of the House of Peers; such was the existence of an Established Church. Yet more strong and permanent, though less talked of, is the influence of *property*, and the consequent dread of convulsions by which its loss may be risked. But it can hardly be doubted that the common sympathies imbibed at our Universities by the two great parties who, ever since the great Revolution, have divided the administration of the British Empire, have exceedingly tended to soften the extremes of faction. Perhaps this now belongs to the past. By reason of the growth of our nation—our Universities having a long while ceased to grow—large masses of the community have been excluded from them, who are likely

to exercise increasing influence on national concerns. In a general and political point of view it does appear desirable that the youth of the whole nation (so far as pecuniary circumstances permit their receiving a prolonged scholastic education) should be, as it were, fused together in common schools of learning, where they will imbibe common associations of interest, love, and pride. If in public life they *must* come into collision, it should be as citizens who desire in a different way to uphold or improve national institutions, not as enemies who are aiming to destroy. At present, unhappily, partly through religious and partly through scientific reasons, a large and highly influential portion of the English nation is estranged from the national Universities. The absence of common sympathies hereby diffused through a sensible fraction of the entire nation is an evil which is not remedied by any erection of new Universities, however desirable, on their own grounds, such new institutions might be judged; much less by scattered Colleges, feebly united by common examinations in a distant centre.

A point of much importance was darkly alluded to above, which occasionally divides the opinion of husband and wife. It is impossible for masses of young men to be congregated for the purposes of study, without danger of a lower standard of morality becoming current among them than could be endured in the bosom of families. Young men are prone to wink at young men's peculiar excesses. When the mild and sweet influence of mothers and sisters is removed, male natures become uproarious. After close study will follow violent exercises; after exhausting labour, intemperate eating and drinking; and if drunkenness can be tolerated, we have no security whatever against worse debasements. Certainly our own

Universities, and many of those on the Continent, have been or are so bad, in every moral point of view, that the whole question most justly demands serious enquiry. Are Universities necessarily foci of immorality to young men? Are they worse than the mixed world, into which most parents must entrust their children at that critical age? If they *are* so, I must add my vote on the side of the Mothers against the Fathers, and prefer, for the majority, local establishments, which will allow the students to live at their parents' homes, in spite of the great intellectual disadvantages. But is it true that a University is necessarily a place of moral contagion? It will doubtless always contain immoral members; so do all our towns, our banks, our merchants' houses, our factories, our colonies, our army and navy. We are not called on to maintain that a University will ever be a Utopia, but that, under ordinarily good management, it need not be worse, and may be a little better, than the world at large. In considering this subject, there are one or two facts that ought not to be forgotten. Many of us have heard and read, if we have not known, scandalous affairs concerning the youth of Oxford and Cambridge, more especially in reference to the past century; and a traditional belief is often founded on this that the then prevalent immoralities are the standard and almost inevitable state of things. But it must be remembered that if the young men of the last century were drunken, so were their fathers. The country squire, and very often the rector or parson, in country or town, took many a bottle of wine or jug of ale too much. Sensual excess was the order of the day, from the Restoration of Charles II. until it was checked by Methodism outside the Church and by Evangelicalism within. It is only within living memory that the drunken-

ness of old men, Fellows of Colleges and Clergymen, has been extirpated at our Universities; and can any-one wonder if many youths of the same institutions ran headlong into that vice, and into all those which spring out of it? It was only in a degenerate and transitional state that the senior members of these Universities were so often disreputable persons; this state is past and gone, one would hope for ever. The reign of Charles II. evidently depraved England terribly. We have not yet recovered from the mischief of its giving to the Exchequer a direct interest in the drinking habits of the nation.

This is scarcely the occasion to discuss the causes or the remedies of academic irregularities. It may be sufficient to say that there are two powerful agents for enforcing decorous conduct on all, whether their principles of virtue be strong or weak. The first is an aid with which no young men can afford to dispense; namely, *full occupation*. If the mind is kept on the stretch by various and profitable exercise; if relaxation is confined within the limits which health requires; we have abundant proof in every walk of life that common morality is no very severe effort. But if to this be added, we need not say *poverty*, but a *purse only moderately filled*, we have a second great guarantee of moral behaviour in those who have to keep up the appearance of gentlemen. One may indulge base desires in many ways at a very small expense; but systematically to follow an immoral course in such a way as not to disgust one who retains any gentlemanly feeling, to say nothing of gentlemanly associates, is a very expensive affair. Hence, for the general morality of a University, two things of chief importance are to be exacted, over and above the direct influences for good which, it may be hoped, will proceed from the senior members.

One is, that no systematic idleness shall be allowed (for which purpose strong means of discipline are essential); the other, that every discouragement should be offered to parents giving to their sons too great a command of money, and barriers be set up against the contracting of debts by young men. To the latter end some legislative help may be needed. If, for instance, it were enacted that all bills, when a month old, should be sent in to the University Authorities, and formally acknowledged by them; and that no tradesman or moneylender should be able to recover any moneys on debts of longer standing without producing such acknowledgements; this, I apprehend, would go far to extinguish the miseries which arise from College debts. It would then be in every parent's power to limit his son's pecuniary means, and a large fraction of the still surviving immoralities might vanish.

It must not be forgotten by mothers that a time must come when their sons will be called to make trial of manly liberty; and although individual parental wisdom must be exercised not to expose prematurely to danger those natures which are least likely to resist temptation, yet we must not desire to debar our sons from solid advantages merely because they are to be purchased by a certain measure of risk. In fact, there are many youths who at the age of nineteen are as able safely to come forth out of family life (as far as personal morals are concerned) as they will become at five-and-twenty. For such, a University residence is, in every intellectual sense, greatly superior to any other system.

Suppose now that, instead of such bodies as Oxford and Cambridge, separate towns had their own Colleges, with the intent that students should reside at their parents' homes. For argument's sake supposing that possible, the consequence would be that thirty

petty Universities would exist, few of which could command public influence or win permanent and widespread attachment; could have a sufficient number of Professors to secure eminence in various branches, or fulfil any of those conditions without which a University will never realise its highest idea. Nor is this all: but, with the exception of a few great towns, it is certain that only a small fraction of the students would, in practice, be able to live at home. The most plausible project would be to fix the site of a College close to a railway station, in order that pupils might be able to attend from a distance. But unless their parents also lived near another station on the same line, and within twenty miles, the loss of time would be such as to make attendance on College lectures very unmanageable. Something, indeed, might perhaps be done of this sort, to accommodate such parents as were near enough to make this arrangement expedient; but, looking at the question from a national point of view, is it not more important to strengthen Universities by keeping them few, than to multiply them under the hope (which will assuredly be disappointed) that the *Day School* system can ever become the predominating one, without an entire loss of all that characterises University influence? Many persons are misled by confounding High Schools, or Specific Professional Colleges, with Universities. Large towns may with great advantage have Day Schools or Colleges under superior management in which youths should continue till the age of seventeen or eighteen; but, whatever the excellence of these institutions, they do not hold the place of Universities, to which, nevertheless, they are very useful—indeed, essential—*subsidiaries*. In the modern development the age of students at Uni-

versities is from eighteen or nineteen to twenty-two; and the peculiar spirit of such institutions cannot be sustained, if any are allowed to be admitted at all who are boys and not young men. Instead of two Universities, we may now need five or six; but let them be on the old scale, not mere Lyceums:

Among men of business, especially perhaps in the manufacturing districts, there is often a vague idea prevalent that there is no practical utility in Universities. Some think themselves very liberal in allowing that the general cultivation of the mind by direct tuition may be advantageously continued till the age of seventeen or even eighteen; but to continue it any longer they regard as lost time. Professional education, they hold, should begin at the age of eighteen; and such education is best carried on in the private chamber, in the counting-house, in the laboratory, in the workshop, in the courts of law, or in the open field. And in this view they are strongly confirmed by a feeling that our old Universities are quite a failure. There is no use in blinking this argument. The nation has great and serious complaints to make concerning the state of our Universities; but this is so far from proving that such institutions are *not* needed; as to be only one way of setting forth their paramount importance.

In the present century it has become abundantly and painfully manifest how a great, industrious, inventive, and well-principled nation is exposed to severe suffering through the ignorance of its rulers. Is it necessary to insist on the facts which illustrate this? Is it not notorious that for seventy years after Adam Smith wrote on the Wealth of Nations our statesmen persisted in denying or ignoring the plainest truths which he had demonstrated? The restrictions on

trade, with which our Statute Book overflowed, were an infatuated self-infliction of loss and ruin. What is to be said of the Game Laws, blighting cultivation, and of the Land Laws, emptying whole regions of men? Our whole commercial code has been a mass of barbarism and injustice. Our schedules of taxation were a scheme of mere blind grasping; the sole principle being this, to get as much for the Exchequer as possible, without any regard to the loss inflicted on the people or the demoralisation directly or indirectly caused. No doubt our leading statesmen were acquainted with this; but the mass of the aristocracy were in the dark—were prejudiced and densely ignorant—and the leaders did not dare to outstep their followers too fast. And why have our aristocracy been so lamentably misled? Plainly because their political education was utterly neglected; and, in fact, in the Universities which they frequented the pervading influences were directed to confirm error and to repress the dissemination of practical science that affects the moral and political welfare of man. This is but one case; yet it is a most weighty one in the present connection; for there is no moral and political science so demonstrative as Political Economy; none which is so adapted to University teaching. Look at the scandalous fact concerning the currency. Sir Robert Peel (under the influence, it is supposed, of Lord Overstone) induced the House of Commons to pass, in 1844, a very gratuitous Bank Act, which, every time it has come into operation, has had to be suspended because of the great mischief it caused by crippling the free action of the only Bank which all England trusts. This Act has been condemned by all the first authorities in Political Economy; it stands on the Statute Book simply because, of the whole House of

Commons, scarcely half-a-dozen members dare to avow that they understand the topic of Currency. So ill are public men still educated. It has been doubted by some whether Politics can ever become a Science: and unquestionably in its applications it so needs the aid of practical experience that no very young man can be a good politician, though he may be a good chemist or a good astronomer. But Political Economy in this respect is like Chemistry or Astronomy. The laws of the Market are peculiarly uniform in their acting. In application the Science makes certain hypotheses concerning fact, no doubt, as must always be the case; but it is not more difficult to ascertain whether the hypotheses are really verified than in a case of practical Mechanics. There is, then, no excuse for a University not succeeding in teaching Political Economy. It is a study to which all young men of University age are perfectly competent; a study which leaves the same full conviction on the mind, as to all its main conclusions, which can be gained from Chemistry or Mechanics; a study which, once learned in youth, abides in the mind for ever. This nation, then, has a clear cause of complaint that it has been subjected to severe suffering and countless loss (to say nothing of indirect evil results) through the want of education in its rulers; and the evil must be traced home to the fault of our national Universities, and their incompetence to the task which they have undertaken.

In this remark we do not forget the meritorious exertions which have been made, and are still made, by an energetic minority in Oxford and Cambridge. Their progress in thirty years is such as no one could have anticipated, in enlarging the studies, in giving new life to the Professorships, in reducing sinecures, and in relaxing the stiffness of ancient regulations. But, with all praise to

the reformers, the reform manifestly comes cruelly late in time, and cannot overtake the necessities of the day. Not to rest too much on a single study, let us advert to several forms of mischief entailed on us by false notions or negligence of Constitutional Law and natural rights as to Land and Water—matters quite vital in every State.

It does not need scholastic science to teach certain elements of Politics any more than to teach Morals; but each needs inculcation. If the young are allowed to see immorality prevalent without rebuke, it seems to them the natural and necessary course of the world. So if political neglects pass unrebuked, these too fail to touch the political conscience. It is no matter of doubt, whether we need local government, whether towns can be healthy without strict enforcement of sanitary law, whether local revenues ought to be husbanded and local taxation made just. Yet for perhaps a century many of our greatest towns were left without municipal constitutions, and the old municipalities were deliberately allowed to sink into a most corrupt form, and become a sort of family heirloom by the self-election (that is, by the *co-optation*) of a local clique. For more than a century and a half it might literally have been supposed that municipal authority was a mere invention for controlling the Parliamentary elections, so that where there was no election to Parliament it was not wanted. Surely it belongs to the very rudiments of Political Science to know that a dense population needs an anxious, active, ever-present administration to defend the rights of the public against the perpetual encroachments of individual cupidity; to claim or buy up the town land, and dictate everything needful concerning the buildings and the disposal of refuse, so that neither the air nor the water shall be poisoned. Otherwise, all those national rights are ravished

from the poor which they would have possessed in a wholly savage condition, and free citizens are made lower than barbarians. But to the politicians in the reigns of our Georges what did it signify that new and vast towns grew up at random, with no restriction on unwholesome dwellings and pollution of the streams? Sicknes, general weakness, premature death, orphanhood, indigence, prostitution, widowhood—in short, all misery—followed, unnoticed by the State. Even now, near forty years since the Act for reforming the Municipalities, we inherit the consequences of this monstrous neglect, and of other malversations: the population is degenerate. Moreover, when, after the legal reform, a cry arose for healthier towns, a 'sanitary' self-appointed clique, confident of its own wisdom, diverted the movement into a most noxious channel; persuading Parliament (in 1848) not merely to *legalise* the pollution of the natural streams, but to make this odious practice *compulsory*. In London the evil was of very old standing below the point where the Fleet Ditch emptied itself into the Thames. It was enormously aggravated, when gas was invented, by the lawlessness of the Gas Company, which (about 1816) so defiled the river that salmon could not come up it at all. After 1848 it was systematically defiled by command of Parliament, until Parliament itself was almost poisoned. Then at last came reaction; but, as Dr. Rumsey—himself a sanitary authority—informed the Social Science Association in 1868, these sanitary gentlemen have made the problem of the Health of Towns more difficult than they found it twenty years earlier, and have poisoned the villages too, which of old were healthy.

Nor can it be pretended that the study of *History* in our Universities has been conducted in such a way as to impress on the gentry and

clergy any of those great lessons which it is so eminently calculated to impart. Such are the following, which the lamented Arnold of Rugby ardently desired to enforce on all who came within his influence: That widespread discontent through the mass of a nation is an unfailing proof that there is, or has been, gross misgovernment; that the injustice of class to class is uniformly punished by factions and resentments, by national weakness, or by the ultimate depression of the unjust party; that slavery is a self-ruining abomination; that pauperism is an odious national disease, not an institution to be acquiesced in; that when new classes spring up in the growth of society, it is a positive injustice not to enlarge the national institutions for their reception; that power which exists for itself alone has in it the seeds of its own destruction, while power which is exerted for general benefit is sure to grow stronger and stronger; that exclusiveness is justifiable, if at all, only in exceptional and temporary cases, and then, only for the general safety; that our perpetual duty is to *improve* our institutions, not tamely and literally to 'keep things as they are,' but to elevate them with our own advancing morality; and when every element of society is altering its forms, earnestly to remember that *our organic growths ought to grow*. On the contrary, to this day there remains in our whole aristocracy a horror of 'organic change,' that which ought to be ordinary, yearly, and so gradual as to be almost insensible, is postponed as long as

possible, so that at last it becomes convulsive; from which, as from the damming up of a mighty river, one must expect a dangerous flood. Even our mercantile classes, not excluding those who were called the Manchester School, have prevalently forgotten healthy traditions of common law concerning the purity of the streams and public rights in land, and popularly speak of property in land as identical in nature with property in movables. Facility of transfer, as of Bank Stock, is their great desire: few seem aware that town-land ought only exceptionally to be in private hands, and that the vast increase of rent on building-land ought to be reserved as a fund for general benefit. Thought, knowledge, experience, on all these matters are very old, and close at hand to all who seek them; yet our legislators and public men, who nearly all in the days of worst neglect were reared at our old Universities, have been deplorably ignorant or reckless; evidently, because neither the truth nor their own responsibility was ever inculcated upon them.

This remark points to the conclusion that the *Curriculum* of our Universities has been grievously deficient; has continued in the *aristocratic* and *sacerdotal* groove long after the era at which the Universities had become the training-school for statesmen, for whom *imperial* institutions were needed. This opens a separate question, concerning the *Curriculum*, grave enough and difficult enough to be reserved for a second article.

F. W. NEWMAN.

