

V.1 nos
20 p.1

HESPERIAN STUDENT.

VOL. I.

University of Nebraska.

NO. 5.

JUNE,

Qui non Proficit, Deficit.

1872.

"WHERE THE MEN COME FROM."

A somewhat remarkable paper, under the above caption, appeared in the last number of the *STUDENT*. The paper was perhaps not more remarkable for its *ex parte* presentation of facts than for the deficiency of its theory. Designing to show that Yale, Harvard and Michigan Universities have done little or nothing in the training of the leading minds of our country, our author first passes in review the names of certain men, some eminent and some quite obscure, who were not graduates of either of these great Universities, then, with sweeping assumption, avers that they are the only ones worth mentioning, and finally presents a striking theory in explanation of such a result. On first reading, we were sure the paper contained within itself its own antidote or corrective. From those not acquainted with the facts in the case, its astonishing statements must provoke investigation; while from those who are conversant with the facts, these statements might provoke a little merriment, possibly a little indignation. It is for the benefit of the former class that we submit the following comments, and not, be it understood, with the slightest intention of copying the wittily impertinuous task of interposing a defence of these justly celebrated institutions of learning. We quote: "Yale and Harvard have hardly had the honor of sending forth a single representative of the highest class in any department of thought or action. Their part is, at best, but second rate. Let us see!"

To begin with, we will take the department of history and of historical investigation. In this connection, the name that presents itself first to every American is, of course, George Bancroft. This is the name of a man hardly less eminent as a statesman than as an historian. Whether as member of the Cabinet at Washington, as Minister to England, or as at present, to Germany, the foremost State of Europe, or as the great historian, he has conferred imperishable luster on the American name. He is, of course, a graduate of Harvard. Could not America have better spared a score of Frank Pierces than one Geo. Bancroft?

A graduate of Harvard is, also, John Lothrop Motley, the eminent historian of the Dutch Republic and of the United Netherlands. For graphic description, he is the equal of Macaulay; for comprehensive discernment and careful statement, he is not surpassed by Hallam; while, by reason of his Catholic sympathies, his generous enthusiasm, his intuitive perception of the tendencies of events, he is at the head, *facile princeps*, of the historians of the age.

Of Harvard, too, is Wm. H. Prescott, fifteen of whose solid, instructive, volumes enrich the library of our State University.

Samuel Elliot, the clear-headed, far-sighted historian of Liberty, is also from Harvard. John G. Jalfrey, the able and

candid historian of New England, is one of her sons. Jared Sparks, whose untiring research has collected and collaborated most of the materials of American history, is not only a graduate of Harvard, but one of her former Presidents. Francis Parkman was of Harvard, while Richard Hildreth, Cooper and others were of Yale.

Not one eminent American historian from any of the lesser colleges so much lauded by our author! Surely here was a strange oversight, indeed, in one who was estimating candidly the comparative merits of different institutions! "Yet Yale and Harvard have hardly had the honor of sending forth a single representative of the highest class in any department of thought or action!"

Let us try again! We are correctly informed by the writer that Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, Benton, Buchanan and Taney were not of Yale or Harvard, while he seems quite oblivious of the fact that Samuel Adams, Jas. Otis, Jos. Warren, the two Presidents, John and John Quincy Adams, Judge Story, Edward Everett, Robert C. Winthrop, Presidents Felton, Walker and Hill, *ad libitum*, were all of Harvard; while of Yale were ("of those who are dead") Chancellor Kent, without the two great lexicographers of the country, Webster and Worcester, Presidents Edwards, Dwight, &c.

The author should have borne in mind that, of the men he mentions, (of those who are dead) only two were from the same institution, while altogether, their number is not equal to the number of those, certainly not less eminent, from Harvard alone.

Let us look a little further. Our government in casting about among the great and powerful legal minds of our country for those best qualified to present our claims for damages before the high court of arbitration at Geneva, selected Chas. Francis Adams, Caleb Cushing, Geo. T. Curtis, of Massachusetts; J. Bancroft Davis, Wm. M. Evarts, of New York. Of these eminent men, all but one, Mr. Evarts, are graduates of Harvard, and he received his LL. B. after a three years course in the Harvard Law School, having previously received his A. B. at Yale. Harvard and Yale alone then, it seems, in the estimation of our government, could produce men, fitted by their training, their scholarly attainments and general ability, to cope successfully with the great minds formed by Oxford and Cambridge.

To these names of Harvard men, eminent among lawyers, might be added those of the two Parsons, whose works are an indispensable adjunct of every lawyer's library; of Theodore W. Dwight, of the Danas, the Quinceys, and—but we forbear since an end must be made somewhere.

In the Department of Divinity, the great names, such as Edwards, and Dwight and Clark, and Thompson, Storrs, Hedge and

Channing and a host of others are indisputably of Yale or Harvard.

Indeed, in looking through Sprague's "Annals of the American Pulpit," Vol. II., we found that of the one hundred and forty-one Congregational ministers whose biographies are there given, seventy-six are of Harvard and Yale, and only sixty from all other colleges combined!

In the department of magazine literature, Dr. Holland, an Amherst man, seems to our author, *par excellence*, the leading representative.

Gladly do we recognize, so far as we may, his peculiar merits. The stream of his thought is shallow indeed, but it is usually pure and sweet. He has written much that is good, even if rather common-place; about life, manners and morals. A strong or deep independent thinker, he is not. Who would think of comparing him to that peerless critic, scholar, essayist and poet, Prof. Lowell? or to that great master of pure and vigorous English, Col. Higginson? or to that most genial, witty and humorous of essayists, as well as poet, whose "lyrics ring and sparkle like cataracts of silver," the fascinating, charming Dr. Holmes? or to the graceful and facile Donald G. Mitchell? or to Emerson, Alcott, Hale, Fields, Howells, Story, the Adamses, and others, the editors and most of the contributors of the great magazines of the country—the *New Englander*, the *North American*, the *Atlantic*—all from Yale or Harvard?

To embellish his list of names, our author has added those of Henry Clay, John Marshall and Chancellor Kent. He should have added, though this was not to his purpose, that neither Marshall nor Clay was of any institution, while Chancellor Kent, as we have said, was of Yale.

But perhaps, after all, it is the Michigan University, whose celebrity appears to our author so ridiculously disproportioned to its merits.

Again, we quote: "We have never learned the name of a single graduate of that institution by reason of anything he has done, although it has been graduating men for more than thirty years!" Our author, albeit he knows nothing of the graduates of Michigan University, *ought* to have known that the last assertion is incorrect. So grave an error, upon so important a point, is hardly excusable. He should have known that Michigan University never had a president or a distinctive officer or a substantive existence at Ann Arbor until 1850, twenty-two years ago! From 1850 dates the real history of that institution. It is true, that the nucleus of the present great University was formed by the union at that time of two or three schools then existing in different parts of the State; but even though we call these schools, one or all of them, the Michigan University, we have only to go back to the year 1845, *twenty-seven years ago*, not "over thirty," to

find her first graduate! It becomes a writer to be careful in his assertions in regard to facts! Now then, to the question, what has she done? Is she indeed, as implied by our author, a mere mushroom, filling a large space with little substance, or is her growth a substantial one; her work solid, earnest, enduring? Even with her comparative youth, remembering that her oldest graduate is yet in the prime of life, is it true, as our author asserts, that her graduates are excluded from "the pulpits, the professorial chairs," and other responsible positions, "that they are led and fed by men more happily moulded?" Looking over into the State of Iowa, we find her flourishing Agricultural College presided over by a graduate of Michigan, President A. S. Welch, an accomplished scholar and an author of no mean reputation.

T. B. Cuming, Governor of Nebraska in 1858, is one of her graduates, also, the President of the Ohio Female College, Dr. Donelson; the President of Chicago Medical College, Dr. Johnson; Governor May, of Michigan; O. P. Stearns, United States Senator; Congressman Phelps; Congressman Becker; Gov. Hinsdale, of Colorado; the President of Fiske University. Besides these, *fifty-five* of her graduates are occupying professorial chairs in different colleges and universities, from Maine to California. Hundreds of her young men are filling responsible positions, as School Superintendents, &c., throughout the West and East. Prof. Watson, a member of the National Academy of Science, is generally regarded as the leading astronomer of this country. He is author of a powerful astronomical work, accepted as an authority on that work. Profs. Evans, Adams and others are writers of a national reputation, as every reader knows.

It is impossible here, in our limited space, to make anything like an adequate showing of what Michigan has accomplished. Suffice it that not only has she far surpassed any other institution in the West, but she is threatening to take the laurels from Yale and Harvard. Why is it that Michigan has done so well and so much in so brief a time? The reason is quite obvious. From the first, under the guidance of the wise and philosophical Dr. Tappan, she took broad, high and catholic ground. Himself and the remarkable faculty which he called around him, chanced to be, as no faculty ever were before, emancipated from many of the narrow and exclusive dogmatism of the past, and to entertain somewhat of a profound idea as to what a University should be, in order to be adapted to the American people, to American needs, and to our own times. They were men broad-minded enough, without ignoring, to act independently of the educational experience of Europe and the past, and to build for the present and future. On the very threshold they set aside the absurd prac-