

as found in the charter, should be observed as it reads. And if so observed, the department can claim no more than the college of Literature, Science and Art. And no one would advocate compulsion in this department. The Military department, then should be made to stand upon its own merits. If it must employ law to build up and sustain itself, it is but a proof of its own weakness. We have, at all events, failed to find the authority for coercion. For how *coercion* can be inferred from *including*, is beyond our knowledge of language. Moreover when it took the Regents five years to ascertain that military tactics were even demanded by the charter of the land grant, and when two more years elapsed before they became aware that drill must be compulsory, we have little faith in the stability of a decision consummated by so many wavering steps.

There are some, who think a military company in connection with the University a fine thing, regardless of cost and time. But we are not that "Some." We believe that it is unnecessary, we know it is an impediment.

We would not speak without proof. Why is it that three fourths of the students in the University, the better ones at that, shun this military drill? Circumstantial evidence speaks for the department itself.

We ask why not make Greek coercive as well as military tactics, they are both included in the same charter? Why not make the students wear plug hats as well as military caps, there is as much authority for the one as the other? The University is supported by a direct tax upon the people. And when it clothes itself in imperial robes and dictates to the student his studies and uniform it is no longer an American institution.

A TENDENCY IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

It is an unmistakable fact that the opposition to the teaching of Latin and

Greek in our colleges is steadily on the increase. Public sentiment has insisted on the formation of courses of study in which the classics shall be wholly absent, or present only to a limited extent. Many of our colleges have accordingly modified their "classical" courses and established others in which the student is not required to study the dead languages.

The advocates of the old method of instruction declaim much against the "utilitarianism" of the age. It is urged that the money-seeking propensity of the American people leads them to retain only those studies which are of direct use in money-making, and so to discard much that is of greater value. It may be true that the generality of people are not competent to speak with authority on the merits or demerits of classical education, and are therefore extreme and unjust in their views; but when we see an increasing number of men, of undoubted learning, question the alleged value of classical culture, we may well hesitate before pronouncing the gradual subordination of the classics a misfortune.

The prevalence of a custom is not always sufficient proof of its intrinsic value; nor is it alone a sufficient reason for its continuance. Latin, Greek, and the mathematics formerly monopolized collegiate instruction, because there were few works of literary merit in the spoken tongues, and natural science was unknown. Popular education prevailed only to a limited extent, and Latin was a very important means of communication between the learned men of different nations. But these conditions no longer exist. Popular education is general in many of the European Countries. Their languages possess valuable literature, and natural science has assumed majestic proportions. As a medium for producing new works, the dead languages have all but fallen into disuse. Yet they continue to engross the chief share of attention in the leading courses of study in our colleges.