

The Armenian Question¹

By Lyman Abbott

And the men of Ephraim said unto him, Why hast thou served me thus, that thou calledst us not, when thou wentest to fight with the Midianites? And they did chide with him sharply.—Judges viii., 1.

THE Children of Israel were not at this time a nation. They were twelve separate peoples, each with its separate territory. The Midianites, neighboring pagans, had oppressed some of these tribes. Gideon had gathered the tribes together and gone to war against Midian. Three hundred men had put the great Midianite army to flight. Ephraim had not been called on to share, and Ephraim complained. Why have you treated us thus? said this stalwart, brave little tribe. We wanted a share in this honorable warfare. You have dealt with us unfairly.

Men tell us that this book of the Judges describes a barbarous time—and so it does; and that its notions are barbarous notions—so some of them are; but I think to-day, as one looks on the map of Europe and at the attitude of the so-called Christian Powers of Europe, he may well question whether Christendom in the nineteenth century might not learn something from Judaism in the days of the Judges. He who is practically, though not nominally, the pagan of the East is persecuting Christians in Turkey with a rancor, a bitterness, a devotion of hate absolutely never equaled before in the history of the world, and the Christian Powers are not taking counsel with one another how they may put a stop to it, but each Power is interfering with every other Power's interference; each Power, in its jealousy of other Powers, forbids war against the pagan for the protection of the Christian.

I have not spoken to you before on the Armenian problem because I have not wished to stir your emotions, or my own, fruitlessly, and speak to-day only because I think I have a little light in answer to the question, What can we do? and wish to point out to you, not what is the duty of England or Russia or Germany, but the duty of America and Americans.

In the first place, we ought to know the facts. The fact is that the persecution of Christians in Armenia is the worst, the most cruel, the most barbarous religious persecution the world has ever seen. It is estimated that two thousand Christians were slain in the persecutions of Diocletian; that between five and six thousand Protestants were put to death under the persecutions of Torquemada in Spain; that thirty thousand were slain in the massacre of St. Bartholomew; that a hundred thousand Protestants were put to death in the wars of the Duke of Alva against the house of Orange—but that includes those who were slain in open battle. Those who have perished in Turkish Armenia in the last four years nearly, if not quite, equal the sum total of all those slain in previous persecutions. Eight thousand seven hundred and fifty is the number officially reported as massacred in three or four days in Constantinople itself, while some estimates put the total number of massacred men, women, and children at the present time since 1894 at one hundred thousand. And this is probably an underestimate.

I would not, if I could, recite the horrors of these persecutions; I would not repeat the tale of blood; I would not recount the monstrosities, the cruelties, which have accompanied them. I am not here to stir your blood to feverish heat. I try to keep my own moderately and reasonably cool while I speak to you on this crime of the centuries. I desire to give light, not heat.

In the second place, we ought to know that this persecution is not the result of sporadic acts of mob violence. We ought to know that it is a definite, pronounced, established policy, patiently, persistently, remorselessly pursued. We ought to know that the causes of it are partly race hatred, partly trade jealousy, partly religious animosity. We ought to know that the Turk in Turkey is not synony-

mous with the Mohammedan, any more than American is synonymous with Christian. The word Turk is significant of a race; the word Mohammedan is significant of a religion. The word American is significant of a race; the word Christian is significant of a religion. Most Americans are Christians—that is, they are not pagans; and most Turks are Mohammedans—that is, they are not Christians; but the Turk may or may not be a Mohammedan, as the American may or may not be a Christian.

In his birthplace and cradle the Turk is Asiatic. He came to Europe centuries ago with his drawn scimitar. He came murdering and to murder, plundering and to plunder. He came a barbarian, a robber, a brigand, and he has stayed in Europe ever since, a robber, a murderer, and a brigand. He is as barbaric to-day in the heart of him as he was in the centuries gone by. Whatever evolution has done for other races, it has not done anything for him. He is a Turk still. The Turkish Empire is composed of heterogeneous populations under the subjection of the scimitar of the Turk. He has never made any attempt whatever to affiliate these populations, to bring them into fellowship with himself, or to do them equal justice: he has simply held them by the throat with one hand, while he has rifled their pockets with the other. The Turkish Empire has used its power simply in taxing men; and it has taxed them, not that it might give them a good government, but that it might rob them for its own purposes. It is true that the Turkish order is a government, and it is true that the American order is a government, but it is a misnomer to use the same word for both. The object of the American Government is to protect the life and liberty of all its citizens. That is not the intent of the Turk. The idea of the Turk is the idea of the old Roman imperialism—subjugate the province, that you may take as much out of it as possible.

Now, this Turk has seen in successive years these subject populations improving in spite of him. They have grown wiser, more intelligent, more virtuous, more prosperous. He has seen the Greek and the Nestorian and the Syrian and the Bulgarian, and now the Armenian, enter into places of profit, of industry, of advantage, and his race hatred has been intensified by his trade jealousy. This massacre of the Armenians is not a new thing in Turkish history. "In 1822 not less than 50,000 Greeks were massacred in the Islands of the Aegean Sea; in 1850, 10,000 Nestorians were butchered around the head-waters of the Tigris; in 1860, 11,000 Maronites and Syrians perished in Mount Lebanon and Damascus; in 1876 upwards of 15,000 were slaughtered in Bulgaria." That is the Turk. That is what he has been doing all the time.

And this race prejudice, this trade jealousy, have been intensified and embittered by what we are pleased to call his religion. What is religion? If it is consecration, devotion, enthusiasm, regardless of the One to whom the consecration is made, regardless of the object of devotion, regardless of that which excites the enthusiasm, then the Turk is religious. Then the Phœnicians, who inspired themselves to lust by their religious rites and caused their own children to be sacrificed to their cruel gods, were as religious as the Israelites. Then Torquemada, in lighting the torch and presiding over the tortures of the Inquisition, was as religious as the men who burned beneath the flames or were tortured on the rack. Then the Duke of Alva, with his unsheathed sword putting thousands and tens of thousands to death on the plains of Holland, was as religious as William of Orange fighting for patriotism and his native land. Then Catherine de Medici summoning to *le Deums* over the slain was as religious as the massacred martyrs whose bodies filled the streets of the European metropolis.

Religion is of two kinds—the aggressive and the non-aggressive. And of the aggressive religions there are two—the Mohammedan and the Christian. The Jewish religion did not seek to make converts; it simply built a wall around itself and protected itself from other religions. The

¹ Sermon preached at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., Sunday, November 15, 1896. Reported stenographically by Henry Winans, and revised by the author.

Brahmanical religion does not seek to make converts; all the Brahmins desire is to be left alone. But the Christian and the Mohammedan religions do seek to make converts. The one does it by the cross, the other by the sword; the one by love, the other by hate; the one by assimilation, the other by subjugation; the one does it for the purposes of service, the other does it for the purposes of selfishness. Now, you may call them both religion if you like, but they are as far apart as heaven is from hell.

Says James Freeman Clarke in his account of "Mohammedanism": "When God—so runs the tradition—I had better said the blasphemy—resolved to create the human race, he took into his hands a mass of earth, the same whence all mankind were to be formed; and in which they after a manner pre-existed; and, having then divided the clod into two equal portions, he threw the one half into hell, saying, 'These to eternal fire, and I care not;' and projected the other half into heaven, adding, 'And these to paradise, and I care not.'" That is the theology of the Mohammedan. That is the God who is the center of their religion. Calvinism was serene and lovely and flowering spring as compared with the theology of Mohammedanism, which is based upon a faith in a remorseless God who cares not whether this half the human race lives in eternal torment and this half in everlasting paradise. The Mohammedan religion knows nothing of the fatherhood of God, and it knows as little of the other fundamental truths of Christianity. "Stress is laid on prayer, ablution, fasting, almsgiving, and the pilgrimage to Mecca. Wine and gaming are forbidden. There is no recognition, in the Koran, of human brotherhood. It is a prime duty to hate infidels and make war on them. Mohammed made it a duty for Moslems to betray and kill their own brothers when they were infidels; and he was obeyed in more cases than one."

Thus we have these three elements together in the Turkish heart: first, race prejudice; second, trade jealousy; and, third, religious rancor and hate. The Mohammedan knows only one way by which to extend his religion—this: kill the men, kill the women, kill the older children, and educate the babes into Mohammedans. Mohammedanism has never varied from its first starting-point in Asia. It has always run this one consistent course: a persecuting power because it is an aggressive power, believing in a God of indifference, making a worship of lust and cruelty.

Now, we ought to know these facts. We have no right to shut our eyes to them. We have no right to be ignorant of them. And, knowing them, we ought to be intolerant of all apologies, excuses, distinctions, or eulogies. I mean exactly what I say—*intolerant*. I hate the tolerance that is indifferent respecting moral character and moral distinctions. I hate the tolerance that knows no difference between virtue and vice, cruelty and humanity, honor and dishonor, courage and cowardice. Purity ought to be intolerant of impurity. Honesty ought to be intolerant of dishonesty. Heroism ought to be intolerant of cowardice. Love ought to be intolerant of hate. Consider for a moment the defenses offered for the murdering, massacring Turk. The Armenian has provoked it all: it is all his fault. Oh, *Æsop*, come to life again, and tell us the story of the Lamb and the Wolf! I have heard this charge before: negroes provoking the massacres of the Ku Klux Klan in the South, and always the negroes the victims, and always the white men safe. How many Turks have been killed by Armenians? Whose sword is red with blood? The lamb has devoured the wolf. The lamb has muddied the water the wolf was drinking. The Turk is a gentleman! Ah, this Turk is a gentleman! I have met that, too, before. This corrupt politician, it is true, bribes congresses, buys votes, manipulates primaries, miscounts votes—he does all that; but then he is a good father, and he is a good husband, he does not beat his wife, and he does not maltreat his children! This Turk has killed Christians—unoffending Christians—by the thousands and the tens of thousands, but he is a gentleman. Yes, so Mephistopheles is a gentleman. So the Duke of Queensberry was a gentleman; in his veins putridity instead

of pure blood, but he was one of the finest gentlemen of England. Probably the Duke of Alva was a gentleman. Doubtless Torquemada was a gentleman. O Rachel, Rachel, mourning for thy children and will not be comforted, for they are not, weep not. Herod is a gentleman! O Armenian exile, with thy cottage in ashes, and thy wife violated before thine eyes, be not wrathful: if he that did it was not a gentleman, he that set him on was one! O childless widow, who cannot close thine eyes in sleep without seeing thine husband brained before thine eyes and his blood spattered on thy robes, weep not: he that did it was a gentleman! And we hear these things and our blood does not boil!

But the persecutor is religious. And he has as much enthusiasm for his religion as the Christian has for his religion. The Christian missionary believes in his religion of the Cross, and this Turk believes in his religion of the Crescent. Why sit in judgment between them? Fanaticism harnesses its two steeds of lust and cruelty, flings the reins of self-restraint upon their backs, lashes them with the devil's own conscience, and as the wheels go over the crunching bodies of its victims, tolerance stands by the side of the course, takes off its hat, and honors—religion! We ought to know the facts, and in the knowledge of those facts we ought to be intolerant of every excuse and apology that is made for them.

We, as an American nation, can do something more than know the facts, and something more than feel rightly about them. We either ought with the whole power of our Government to protect American citizens on Turkish soil, or we ought frankly, publicly, openly, to declare that we have not the strength to do it, and call our Ambassador home.

Nations, like individuals, are sometimes too weak to do what they ought to do if they were strong enough. Poland could not resist Russia. But we ought to look the question fairly in the face. We have in Turkey over two hundred Americans, engaged in what is ordinarily regarded as lawful business. I know they are missionaries; I know they are teachers; I know they have not gone there to make money. They are not consecrated to the work of getting on in the world. That much may be said against them. But still Americans generally will recognize the fact that a man who has gone to another country, inspired by a desire to aid the men, women, and children there, is entitled to as much protection as the man who goes there to sell them scimitars or rum. I am not going to enter into the question to-day whether the missionary service is right and wise, or wrong and unwise. It is an honest and an honorable vocation, and Americans have gone into it. We have 621 schools, including five colleges. We have 27,400 pupils in those schools. We are spending half a million dollars a year in the work of civilization. Those are American interests. I will not say Christian interests; I will not say missionary interests. They are American interests. And the men engaged in this work are entitled to have this country say one of two things—either, We cannot protect you, you are at your own risk, or else, God helping us, we will spend our last dollar and our last man, but we will protect you. And that is what I would like to have the United States say. We are strong enough to think of putting back on her throne in Hawaii a recreant Queen who had undertaken to tear in tatters the constitution. We are strong enough to say to Great Britain, The interests of Venezuela are our own; you must not encroach on them. We are strong enough to threaten war when there is a possible danger to a few American interests in a South American Republic. But we let our property be burned, our schools and colleges be closed, our men and women live in terror of their lives, and have as yet done nothing more than present a gentle protest.

In 1815 the Algerian pirates had for twenty years been preying on the commerce of Christendom in the Mediterranean Sea, and the Christian Powers did not dare to do anything to prevent them, because England had made a treaty by which practically she pledged herself not to inter-

ferre, that France might be injured. Each government was afraid to interfere with the *status quo*, and the commercial interests were helpless. In 1815 this then little United States said, We will stand this no longer. We had stood it; we had paid thousands of dollars in ransoms for the American. We had submitted because we could not help ourselves. But when the war of 1812 closed, we sent out one of our Commodores; we engaged the fleet of Algiers, we defeated it; we took the chief robber, the Sultan of Algiers; we made him there give his submission; we made him there pay back damages; and the robbers were swept from the Mediterranean Sea. O for an America like the America of 1815! I believe myself that if this American Government were to say to Turkey, You shall not threaten the peace, the prosperity, the lives, the well-being of American citizens on your soil—you shall not—I believe if America were to say that to the murdering, massacring Turk, America could do to-day what America did in the same section of the globe in 1815. And if a gun was fired at our flag, or a drop of American blood was shed, that gun would unite all America, as the guns on Sumter united the North, and that blood would cement in one great National party all Americans, as the blood that reddened the streets of Baltimore united all the North, and this Nation would move to the consummation of its purpose, unbroken, a united people; and the conscience of Europe would respond. It is not true that Germany or France or England or Austria would set itself up in armed defense of murder, when the United States Government, having no territory to acquire, no prestige to win, no advantage to gain, no balance of power in Europe to break, had interposed and said, "This crime shall go on no more."

There is another thing we can do. We can follow the precedent of 1824. In 1822 the Turks were massacring the Greeks. The Greeks were not like lambs led to the slaughter. They unsheathed their swords and rose in rebellion. There was a revolution against Turkish authority in Greece; and then, as now, all the Christian Powers kept off. Every Power was jealous of every other Power. Christian Powers, we call them! What is a Christian Power? You remember in "Faust" how men with raised swords in the form of a cross advance upon Mephistopheles, and before the raised cross he retreats and falls upon the ground, apparently vanquished by the mere symbol. Ah! it is a pretty picture, but it is not a true one. The devil does not retreat before the mere raised cross. A Power is not made a Christian Power because it has cathedrals with crosses on them, or crosses on the priests' robes, or crosses on the breasts of the women, or crosses on the covers of prayer-books. The cross in the heart and in the life makes a man a Christian; the cross in the heart makes a nation Christian. Only those Powers are Christian that dare risk something, that dare endure something, for Christ's sake and for humanity's sake. These Christian Powers did not dare in 1824; they do not dare now. Then it was that one of America's greatest statesmen pronounced one of his most statesmanlike utterances. He called on America to issue its protest against the wickedness that was oppressing Greece. I read from Daniel Webster:

The time has been, indeed, when fleets and armies and subsidies were the principal reliances even in the best cause. But, happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced; and the public opinion of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction to the progress of injustice and oppression; and as it grows more intelligent and more intense, it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it cannot be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible, and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassable, inextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which, like Milton's angels,

Vital in every part,
Cannot, but by annihilating, die.

Last spring our Congress passed resolutions of protest against the Turkish atrocities in Armenia. They were sent to the President of the United States. He was to communicate them to the Powers—the Christian Powers—

of Europe. Is there any man in this audience who knows whether he has done it or not? If he has, he has not let his right hand know what his left hand has done. Those resolutions should have been so uttered to the Christian Powers of Europe that the sound of our voice would have gone round the world. We ought not to have spoken our condemnation of wholesale massacre in a whisper—we should have spoken it with thunder tones. At least we may speak to the consciences of mankind. It is time we did.

Finally, we can afford relief and succor to those who have suffered from this wholesale persecution. We can open our gates to all fugitive Armenians. I do not find fault with our Administration that it closed them the other day and left the fugitives waiting on Ellis Island until bonds should be given. It is not the business of the Administration to make laws or set them aside. But we should so alter our immigration laws as to provide clearly, definitely, and positively that this land is the harbor for the politically oppressed of all countries, however empty their purses, and we ought to reach out a helping hand to the widows and the orphans on Turkish soil.

The American Board has indicated the presence of a statesman as its practical administrative head in its ready adaptation of its methods to the changed conditions. I received last week a letter from its Foreign Secretary, Dr. James L. Barton,¹ saying that it is proposed to take the dismantled and unoccupied houses of the Armenians and gather in them, so far as it can be done, the orphans whom the Turkish scimitar has spared, under the care of Armenian widows, and thus save the girls from the harem and the boys from beggary, and both, by Christian education, to the faith of their fathers.

I am proud of the Christian ministry. I thank God to-day that in all this time of terrible torture and horrible experience not one single man or woman in the missionary service in Turkey has fled. Our own American Minister there has advised them to leave their posts; such counsels have gone to them from America; but one and all they have said, We will stay with those who are themselves martyrs for our faith; we will live with them; if need be, we will die with them. The Christian Church can at least do this: It can say to every brave Christian minister and every brave Christian woman in Turkey, You are right; stay where you are; our prayers shall go with you; our contributions shall go with you; our help to the enlargement of your work shall go with you. If I were both Government and Church, I would buy every house in Armenian Turkey that could be bought; I would wrap the American flag around it, or hoist the American flag above it; I would gather as many orphan children and as many widows into those homes as I could; and I would say to the massacring Turk, You lay your finger on one of them at your peril.

What will Plymouth Church do? How many such homes will it take? For how many orphans will it provide? What word of greeting will it send across the sea to its martyred kinsmen in Christ?

Bits of Wisdom

The true strength of every human soul is to be dependent on as many nobler as it can discern, and to be depended upon by as many inferior as it can reach.—*John Ruskin.*

The right human bond is that which unites soul with soul; and only they are truly akin who consciously live in the same world, who think, believe, and love alike, who hope for the same things, aspire to the same ends.—*Bishop Spalding.*

It could only be in a world like Alice's Wonderland that one could expect to reap anything except that which he had sown. We depend upon this principle of uniformity in nature. We build all our plans upon it. If caprice were allowed to enter at any point, so far as we can see, physical and mental life would be impossible. St. Paul says that the same thing is true in the spiritual area. In the human soul a seed of evil suggestion or of good is seized upon by the forces of the soil itself, is compelled to unfold until it produces fruit after its kind.—*Rev. S. D. McConnell, D.D.*

¹ See this letter, published in full in The Outlook for November 21, page 924.

Clark University

By George Willis Cooke

Though we may have many universities in this country, we have as yet but one on the German and French model, with only post-graduate students, and making original research the most important requisite for a degree. The French are putting forth strenuous efforts at the present time to attract American students to their universities; but why should it be necessary for one to go abroad in order to complete his education? This was the query which was in the mind of Mr. Jonas G. Clark, of Worcester, twenty-five years ago, which led him to study the European universities for a number of years, and then to found the institution which bears his name.

In January, 1887, a charter was secured for Clark University, and it was opened with formal exercises October 2, 1889. In the spring of 1889 Professor Granville Stanley Hall, then at the head of the department of psychology in Johns Hopkins University, was called to the presidency. He spent the following year in a thorough study of the universities of Europe, visiting those of every country except Portugal. The objects had in view in Clark University, as set forth by the President in his first report to the Trustees, were to do educational work of the highest and most advanced grade, to select a related group of sciences for careful organization at first, and to draw together the most talented and best-trained young men to whom to impart its instruction. The University at once put itself in line with modern ideas and methods, and gave its attention wholly to the most important of the sciences. Those selected were mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology, and each of these was made a department by itself, with its own equipment of professors, library, and apparatus. More recently a sub-department of pedagogy has been created as subsidiary to psychology. These five sciences were selected because, as Dr. Hall said, "nowhere else is man brought so close to the primitive revelation of God in his works."

When Clark University opened, it had nine hundred applicants, including graduates from forty-eight colleges and universities. Out of this large number it selected only sixty for admission, so high was the standard it proposed to maintain. First of all it was required that a candidate for admission should be a graduate of some college or university, that he should be able to read French and German with ease, that he should show some genuine talent for advanced work, and that he should be able to carry on original research with promise of success. Here was a standard higher than any which had been before insisted upon in this country, but it was necessary to maintain it if work was to be undertaken equal to that of the European universities.

One of the requisites of the work undertaken by Clark University was that every student should come directly into contact with his instructors and work under their personal direction. For the kind of teaching proposed it was necessary that the students should be personally aided, "guided," as Dr. Hall said, "to the best literature, and advanced by every method that pedagogic skill and sympathy can devise. They should feel all the enthusiasm, understand all the interests and all the methods, of the instructor. He should confidently share with them all his hopes and plans for research."

In accordance with this theory of the most advanced instruction, no clearly marked line exists between students and instructors at Clark University. Those students who in some degree attain mastery of a special line of work are at once added to the teaching force, and give brief special courses of lectures. Those men whose work has marked a distinct advance beyond what is requisite for the degree of doctor of philosophy, and who wish to engage in research, are given the annual appointment of Docent. They are not assistants, but they are provided with individual rooms and the special apparatus which is required by their work. While they are expected to deliver a limited number of lectures on some special subject connected with their department, their time is mainly reserved for study

and research in a way best adapted to qualify them for scientific instruction or investigation.

The emphasis which Clark University lays on original research separates it more distinctly than anything else from the other universities of this country. While all the universities which have post-graduate courses insist upon investigation as an important feature of advanced instruction, no one of them makes this so essential as it is made at Clark University, where it is the chief aim of all the work from beginning to end. The student is shown how to become an investigator for himself, how to enlarge the realm of knowledge by his own personal effort. In order to accomplish this result it is requisite that only those men who are capable of independent thinking should be retained as students, and that every student admitted should have the closest personal contact with his instructors. Class lecturing will not answer the purpose, but the professor must admit the student to intimate association with him in his own work until he catches the spirit and the method of free inquiry on his own account. This makes it requisite that the number of students should never be greatly in excess of the number of professors and instructors.

With the methods followed at Clark University, stated lectures become the smallest part of the work of instruction. Elbow-teaching in the laboratory is constantly followed, direct experimentation is carried on under the guidance of the professor, and the student is brought into first-hand contact with his subject. He follows step by step the processes of a man who is not only an expert, but one who is striving to settle problems of importance by means of the experiments he is always carrying forward, and in this work the student becomes his intimate assistant, with whom every step of it is discussed and explained. The student is directed to the best works on the subject he is investigating; he meets regularly with his fellows to discuss his reading, to hear what others have found out in other branches of the same subject. In club and conference meetings the information, criticism, insight, and point of view of every student are contributed freely for the benefit of the others.

According to the official announcement of the University, "no entrance examination is required, but, by testimonials, diplomas, personal interviews, or written specimens of work, the authorities must be satisfied that the applicant has scholarship enough to work to advantage, and zeal and ability enough to devote himself to his chosen field." The one degree conferred is that of doctor of philosophy, and this is given for work in each of the departments and sub-departments, including anthropology. It usually requires two or three years to secure this degree. Examinations for it are held at any time when, in the judgment of the University authorities, the candidate is prepared. The first requisite for this degree is a thesis upon an approved subject, to which it must be an original contribution of value. This must be printed at the expense of the candidate, and one hundred copies presented to the University. An oral examination before the President of the University, the head of the department, and two other members of the board of instruction in some special topic is also required.

The tuition fee is two hundred dollars a year, and that for the doctor's degree twenty-five. Students who reach a certain grade are given a scholarship, and the tuition fee is remitted. Those reaching a less advanced rank secure a junior scholarship and have one-half the fee deducted. Work of a higher order brings a junior fellowship, with remission of tuition and a payment of two hundred dollars yearly to the candidate. A higher grade leads to a senior fellowship, remission of tuition, and a payment of four hundred dollars. The highest rank the student can reach is that of docent, which connects him with the teaching force of the University.

Such an institution as Clark University is not without practical results. One feature of its work is that of preparing young men for professorships in the colleges and universities of the country, and in this it has been eminently successful. A thorough course in advanced educational methods is not only given, but the work of first-hand