

ture. It may well make us shudder when we think how many more of the same kind, perhaps, are now in training through a similar course of education, or that system, which, not content with neglecting, openly proscribes all religion, and all morals grounded on religion, as wholly alien to the *earlier* culture of the human soul."

3d. "So it appears that from our state institutions is, or is soon to be excluded that theological instruction which is at best but an intellectual matter." I fail to see how "theological instruction" is an "intellectual matter," when he has previously said "That intellectual training tends to moral culture." That theological instruction does not amount to much in the gentleman's estimation is plainly to be seen. He should be more careful to state just what intellectual training will reach the desired end, moral culture, for surely instruction in theology is just as much training the intellect as Philosophy, Latin, Greek, the sciences and mathematics.

But to the more direct point at issue. If he means by "theological instruction" the instruction in the tenets, dogmas or creeds of some particular church, he is crying against an evil that does not exist in our state institution. If he means, by "theological instruction," instruction from a Christian standpoint, then I claim that the state, above all others, is bound to furnish such. Why? Is not the aim of all education for the best? Is there a grander, truer, nobler conception of character than the Christian? No. Then, as Christian character is the noblest for which to strive, the loftiest at which to aim, be he teacher in our public schools or Professor in our Universities, he is morally bound to mould the students under him after such a standard. He violates a most sacred obligation who fails to impart such instruction. I care not how faithful he may be in other respects.

Chancellor Fairfield must surely know what he is talking about when he says, "God's moral government, as well as nat-

ural, is a fitting thing to be taught throughout the whole course of American education. Ethics, Christian ethics, belong eminently to the American University."

Again, I question very much whether that "true nobility of character," of which the gentleman speaks, would ever come from a "purely secular course of instruction." Is not education three-fold in its nature—physical or natural, social and intellectual. Has not a man a body, a mind, and a soul or spirit? Develope his body to the utmost, to the Grecian standard of manhood, train the mind to the fullest capacity conceivable, does that give us a perfect man? By far, no—when "we leave the noblest and mightiest element out."

"Not by the power of selfish purpose can the soul of man rise to the sublime fulfillment of its destiny. Not by the knowledge born of its own reason, or gained by its own insight, can it light its way through to the heavens of truth. Not by the warmth of self-inspired and self-seeking affections will it ever burst forth into the glory and fruitfulness of a beneficent and heroic life. Celestial motives must move it, heavenly wisdom must illuminate it, and a divine love must warm it."

M——.

CONSERVATISM.

Conservatism naturally continues to the old; sometimes not caring whether it be good or bad. But we do not believe in the rejection of a theory because it is new and untried. Some people steadfastly hold to their old opinions, preferring to protect and preserve from decay existing institutions, though aware of their many defects, rather than surmount the many difficulties, which they believe to be in the way of a change. Thus it was in the south with the slavery question. 'What can be done,' these people would say. "Slavery may not be exactly right, but, then, what some would bring about may be for the worse instead of for the better. Our fathers up-