

THE
BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1839.

ART. I. — *Second Annual Report of the Board of Education, together with the Second Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board.* Boston: Dutton & Wentworth. 8vo. pp. 79. 1839.

WE can hardly be expected at this late day, in this ancient Commonwealth especially, to go into any labored argument in favor of popular education, either as a matter of right, or as the only firm foundation of a free government. For ourselves, we hold that every child, born into a community, is born with as good a natural right to the best education that community can furnish, as he is to a share of the common air of heaven, or the common light of the sun. We hold also that the community, which neglects to provide the best education it can for all its children, whether male or female, black or white, rich or poor, bond or free, forfeits its right to punish the offender. We hold, moreover, that a popular government unsupported by popular education is a baseless fabric.

But, while we bear our unequivocal testimony in favor of universal education, and assert the duty of every community to provide the best education in its power for all its children, we are very far from regard-

ing everything which passes or may pass under the name of education, as something to be approved and never condemned. Education may be bad as well as good, a curse as well as a blessing; and in general its quality is a matter of even more importance than its quantity. Educated, in some sense, all our children are, and will be, whether we will or not. Education, such as it is, is ever going on. Our children are educated in the streets, by the influence of their associates, in the fields and on the hill sides, by the influences of surrounding scenery and overshadowing skies, in the bosom of the family, by the love and gentleness, or wrath and fretfulness of parents, by the passions or affections they see manifested, the conversations to which they listen, and above all by the general pursuits, habits, and moral tone of the community. In all these are school rooms and school masters, sending forth scholars educated for good or for evil, or what is more likely, for a little of both. The real question for us to ask is not, Shall our children be educated? but, To what end shall they be educated, and by what means? What is the kind of education needed, and how shall it be furnished?

As to the quality of the education to be furnished, we apprehend our community, like most other communities, has no very clear or worthy conceptions. Education, in that sense in which it deserves the grave consideration and the earnest efforts of the community, is something more than the mere ability to read, write, and cypher; and something more too than what is commonly meant by moral and intellectual culture. It is properly defined, The fitting of the individual man for fulfilling his destiny, of attaining to the end, accomplishing the purposes, for which God hath made him. The system of education, which doth not take my child from the cradle, and train him up to go forth into the world a man, in the deep significance of that term, to comprehend the end for which he was made, and the surest and speediest means of attaining to it, is defective, and can never answer the legitimate purposes of education.

We suppose it will be generally admitted, that man has an end, that he was created for a purpose. This has always been believed. It is implied in the first question of the Catechism: "What is the chief end of man?" Man's worth, perfection, is in exact proportion to the steadiness and success with which he pursues this end. Education is properly that which discloses to him this end, and prepares him to pursue it, points out to him the road he must take, and furnishes him with provisions and strength for his journey.

This end is twofold, corresponding to man's twofold nature, individual and social. Man has a destiny as an individual, and also a destiny as a social being, as a member of society, and in this country as a member of the body politic. Education divides itself therefore into two branches; 1st, that which answers the question, What is my destiny as an individual, and fits me for attaining it; and 2dly, that which answers the question, What is the destiny of society, and fits me to coöperate in its attainment.

As an individual I am something more than the farmer, the shoemaker, the blacksmith, the lawyer, the physician, or the clergyman. Back of my professional character, there lies the man, that which I possess in common with all my species, and which is the universal and permanent ground of my being as a man. This education must reach, call forth, and direct, as well as my professional pursuit. Individual education is divided then into general education and special, — my education as a man, and my education as a doctor, lawyer, minister, artisan, artist, agriculturist, or merchant.

Special education appears to be that which we at present are most anxious to make provision for. Few people think of anything beyond it. The popular doctrine, we believe, is that we should be educated in special reference to what is to be our place in society and our pursuit in life. We think more of education as a means of fitting us for a livelihood, than for any-

thing else. The tendency has long been to sink the man in what are merely his accidents, to qualify him for a profession or pursuit, rather than to be a man. Special education has no doubt its place, and its utility, which must by no means be thought lightly of. In a community where hereditary distinctions obtain, where professions and pursuits are transmitted from father to son, it must ever be the main branch of education. In India, the son of a Bramin should be educated to be a Bramin, because he can there, according to the established order of society, be a Bramin and nothing else. The son of one of the warrior caste requires to be educated as a warrior, and nothing else. So of the children of the other castes. For in Indian society there are no men; Humanity is not admitted; a common nature is not recognised; therefore a general education as men, the education of Humanity, is inadmissible. But in our community it is different. Here professions and pursuits are merely the accidents of individual life. Behind them we recognise Humanity, as paramount to them all. Here man, in theory at least, is man, not the mere artisan, farmer, trader, or learned professor. Professions and pursuits may be changed according to judgment, will, or caprice, as circumstances permit, or render necessary or advisable. Consequently here we want an education for that which is permanent in man, which contemplates him as back of all the accidents of life, and which shall be equally valuable to him, whatever be the mutations which go on around him, the means he may choose or be compelled to adopt to obtain a livelihood.

General education, which some may term the culture of the soul, which we choose to term the education of Humanity, we regard as the first and most important branch of education. This is the education which fits us for our destiny, to attain our end as simple human beings. But in order to impart this education, or in order to educate our children in reference to this destiny or end, we must know what

is our destiny or end as human beings. The character of the education will depend almost entirely on the view we take of man's destiny, on the answer we give to the question, "What is the chief end of man?"

If we look upon man as a mere child of earth, born of the dust, and returning to the dust again, possessing no lofty and deathless energies to be called forth and set at work, the education we shall seek to furnish must of necessity be essentially different from what we should seek to give, did we believe man was created in the image of God, immortal, endowed with a moral nature, made capable of endless growth in knowledge and love, and destined one day to stand higher in the scale of being than the tallest archangel now stands. If we believe man accomplishes his destiny on this earth, in the narrow compass of this transitory life, then for this world only shall we seek to educate our children; but if we believe that this world is but the cradle, in which our infancy is rocked, this life but our entrance into existence, but the beginning of a life never to end, that the faculties, the germs of which make their first appearance here, are to be developed elsewhere, and the destiny begun in time is to find its completion in the fulness of eternity, then for eternity, for eternal existence, and everlasting growth must we educate our children.

Now what is that which answers the question, What is the destiny of man? What is the chief end of man? With here and there one it may be philosophy; but with mankind at large, it is religion. Religion is the solution to man's soul of the problem of his destiny, the answer he gives, or rather which is given him, to those solemn questions which do ever and anon rise within him; What am I? Whence came I? Whither do I go? How came I here? Why am I here? What is the purpose of this frail existence? this life of trial and sorrow? These are questions, which all men at some period of their lives are forced to ask.

A thousand incidents occur to force these questions upon our attention. Our life here is not a calm and unbroken stream, bearing its undisturbed course onward into the great ocean of being. All things around us change. Nothing is permanent. The flowers fade and disappear; the grass withers and dies; the fashion of this world passeth away. We everywhere encounter enemies to our peace, obstacles to our enjoyment; perpetually are our desires thwarted, our plans defeated, our hopes blasted. We are wounded often in the tenderest part of our nature, our purest and holiest affections are sported with; we love and find no return; we love and are beloved, and yet must not embrace the one we love; we are disappointed in those to whom we have given our hearts; our friends on whom we leaned pass away, and we are without prop or support; those we love suffer, and we cannot relieve them;—these and ten thousand other things force us to pause in our career, throw us back upon ourselves, and raise within us the problem of our destiny.* When this problem is once started, we suffer the deepest sorrow till we find its solution. We weep much that no man is found able to open the book. Religion is the solution of the problem, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, that prevails to open the book and to loose the seals thereof. Hence its value, and the reason why men cling to it with such tenacity, and hold him their worst enemy who would arraign it. The love and reverence men have for Christianity grow out of this fact, that it solves for them this problem, which is so torturing in its nature, and gives them a clear view of the destiny which God has assigned them. Hence, too, the impotence of all those

* For an able and eloquent discussion of this subject, see Jouffroy. *Mélanges Philosophiques*, p. 423, et seq. *Du Problème de la Destinée humaine*. The substance of this interesting article may be found in Mr. Ripley's introductory notice to his translations from Jouffroy, in his *Philosophical Miscellanies*, a work of which we have heretofore spoken in terms of high, but not too high, commendation.

who war against religion, and the folly of all those who fear such warring may be successful. So long as there is sorrow or aught to cause sorrow in this world, so long as man meets with obstacles to his instincts, and is interrupted in his march to his destiny, so long there will, there must be religion. There are but few moments in one's life when he is prosperous enough, successful enough, strong enough, happy enough, to dispense with religion. The human heart is a fountain of tears, and from the innermost being of whomsoever lives, sorrow is ever welling up. They are fools who say,

“O happiness! our being's end and aim.”

Man, in this life at least, has nothing to do with happiness, and, were he wise, he would cease to trouble himself with its vain pursuit. Let him seek to fulfil the purpose of his being, and he may find at times solace and refreshment. But the word *happiness* should have as little place in our vocabulary, as it has in our hearts. Man has a destiny, an end he should seek to gain, and religion is the answer to the question, What is this end, this destiny? According to the principles we have laid down, then, education, to be complete, to be what it ought to be, must be religious. An education which is not religious is a solemn mockery. Those, who would exclude religion from education, are not yet in the condition to be teachers; long years yet do they need to remain in the Primary School.

Man is also a social being, and needs an education corresponding to his social nature. He is not a mere individual. He stands not alone. “It is not good for man to be alone,” said his Creator, and brought forth from his side Eve, blooming in beauty, blushing with charms, full of tenderness and love, to break the solitude, clothe the dusty earth with soft verdure, give the flowers of Paradise their varied hues and sweet fragrance. In Eve Adam found the complement of his being, and rose to manhood. He, who has not

loved, who has not felt that love which melts two human beings into one, and of the twain makes one flesh, has not yet attained to manhood. He has perceived none of the deep mysteries of his being; of the immortality of the affections he has conceived nothing; and the infinite fulness of his nature lies shrouded in deep night. It is not till one loves, that he receives intimations of a higher nature, of the wonderful capacities with which he is created, is raised from himself, and permitted to see and taste something of that Fulness from the bosom of which the universe proceeded, and in whose embrace it reposes. It is then that he begins to attain to manhood. He is then a child no longer. He is alone no longer. He belongs now to the universe, and has a place in it. Love unites him to Eve and Eve to him, and from all-creating love springs the Family, and from the Family Society, crowned by the State. Love makes him a man, and multiplies his relations and ties without number, links the first man to the youngest child of the latest generation, and gathers and cements all individuals, however scattered over the face of the globe, sleeping beneath the earth, or riding in sun-chariots through the heavens, into one round, compact, and indissoluble whole. Thus love gives each individual an interest in the whole, a part and a lot in all, and what is better yet, a work. Proceeding from love, made capable of loving with a love that can triumph over time and all its mutations, over pain, sickness, sorrow, death, and the grave, and bloom in immortal beauty when all else has become withered and dry, man has a social nature, is a social being, and needs a social education.

Other problems now come up. What is the mission of the family? What is the mission of the state? What is the destiny of society, of the human race itself? Great problems are these, weighty, and no doubt of difficult solution. But how give man a proper social education without solving these weighty problems? That deserves not the name of a social

education, which leaves untouched the problem of society, the destiny of the race. And the social education must needs vary precisely as vary our solutions of this problem. In Russia they solve this problem in their fashion. Society has there for its object, the accomplishment of the will and the manifestation of the glory of the Autocrat. Hence, the Russian children are carefully instructed in their duty to the Emperor, carefully taught, by authority, that they and all they may possess are his, and that they must love him in their hearts, and honor him as their God. In Austria the problem is solved much in the same way, and so also in Prussia. Absolutism has its solution, and educates accordingly; Liberalism has also its solution, and its corresponding education.

In this country we do not solve the problem as they do in Russia, Austria, and Prussia. We deny that it is the end of society to manifest the glory and accomplish the will of the Emperor, or even of the State. Here society does not exist for the government, but the government exists as an agent of society. The mission of the government is to aid society in working out its destiny. The education then approved in Russia, Austria, or Prussia, cannot be approved here. Which solution is the true one, ours, or the one given by Absolutism?

Again. What is the destiny of society? Has it attained its perfection? Is its organization perfect? Does it give free scope to man's whole social nature, and bring out all his social instincts? Shall we labor to keep it precisely where it is? prevent it from going backward or forward? Or is society imperfect as it is? Is it progressive in its nature? Is there room to hope for a more perfect arrangement for man's social instincts? Is it our privilege to hope that the evils we now see and deplore may be at length lessened if not removed; and is it our duty to labor to realize that social Ideal which haunts the souls of the Prophets and Seers of Humanity? Here are questions of immense magnitude, which the educator

should be able to answer, and which in some way every social educator does answer.

Still other questions are involved in these; on which element should society be based, the aristocratic element, or the democratic? If the aristocratic element be the true foundation of social order, then should our schools be under the control of the aristocracy, be aristocratic in their basis and superstructure, and be nurseries of the aristocratic principle. But, if the democratic element be the true basis of society, then should the social education give the democratic solution of the problem, create a love for democracy, and discountenance every aristocratic tendency. It should, also, not only accept the democratic element, but disclose the means by which it may insure the victory, and make all other social elements subordinate to itself. It must, then, touch the nature and organization of the state, determine the mission of government, and the measures it must adopt in order to secure or advance the democracy. It rushes into the midst of politics, then, and decides on national banks and sub-treasuries. An education, which does not go thus far, is incomplete, and insufficient for our social wants.

Education, then, must be religious and social, or political. Neither religion nor politics can be excluded. Indeed, all education that is worth anything is either religious or political, and fits us for discharging our duties, either as simple human beings, or as members of society.

If, then, we are to have in the Commonwealth a system of popular education, which shall answer the legitimate purposes of education, we must have a system which shall embrace both religion and politics. Religion and politics do, in fact, embrace all the interests and concerns of human beings, in all their multiplied relations. Nothing can concern me as a man, as an individual, or as a member of society, which cannot be arranged under one or the other. That education, then, which does not embrace either,

must be worthless, because in no sense fitting us for performing our part, either as men or as citizens.

Assuming now the absolute necessity of religious and political education, and the worthlessness of every other kind of education, when taken alone, the great and the practical question becomes, How is this education to be provided? In what schools, and under what schoolmasters?

We have looked into the Reports before us, with the hope of finding an answer to this question; but here, as everywhere else in this world, we have been doomed to disappointment. The great problem, education is to work out, the end we have stated education should always contemplate, the Honorable Board, and its learned and eloquent Secretary, seem never to have conceived of. We find no leading idea, no enlarged views, no comprehensive measures; nothing, in fact, to inspire us with the least confidence in the Board, or its labors, as a means of aiding us to an education worthy of a free and Christian Commonwealth. That the Board does, indeed, propose to advance the cause of education, we do not deny. It proposes, for this purpose, two measures; 1st, improvements in the methods of teaching, and 2dly, the establishment of Normal Schools, or schools for teachers. The first measure is, doubtless, well enough, as far as it goes. The machinery of teaching, if we may so speak, should be perfected, and the best possible methods of imparting knowledge found out and adopted. But, however perfect may be our machinery for teaching, it will amount to little, unless we have somewhat to teach, and also somewhat to teach, which is worth the teaching. The Normal Schools, which the Board proposes to establish, will do nothing to impart such an education as we contend for. The most we can hope from them is some little aid to teachers in the methods of teaching. Beyond improving the mechanism of education, they will be powerless, or mischievous.

Schools for teachers require in their turn teachers, as well as any other class of schools. Who, then, are

to be the teachers in these Normal Schools? What is to be taught in them? Religion and politics? What religion, what politics? These teachers must either have some religious and political faith, or none. If they have none, they are mere negations, and therefore unfit to be entrusted with the education of the educators of our children. If they have a religious and a political faith, they will have one which only a part of the community hold to be true. If the teachers in these schools are Unitarians, will Trinitarians accept their scholars as educators? Suppose they are Calvinists, will Universalists, Methodists, Unitarians, and Quakers be content to install their pupils as instructors in common schools?

But the Board assure us Christianity shall be insisted on so far, and only so far, as it is common to all sects. This, if it mean anything, means nothing at all. All, who attempt to proceed on the principle here laid down, will find their Christianity ending in nothingness. Much may be taught in general, but nothing in particular. No sect will be satisfied; all sects will be dissatisfied. For, it is not enough that my children are not educated in a belief contrary to my own; I would have them educated to believe what I hold to be important truth; and I always hold that to be important truth, wherein I differ from others. A faith, which embraces generalities only, is little better than no faith at all. Nor is this all. There is, in fact, no common ground between all the various religious denominations in this country, on which an educator may plant himself. The difference between a Unitarian and a Calvinist is fundamental. They start from different premises. Their difference does not consist in the fact that they come to different conclusions, but that they adopt different starting points. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is "another gospel," as expounded by the one, from what it is as expounded by the other. No Calvinist can teach Christianity, if he be honest, so as to satisfy a conscientious and earnest Unitarian. No Unitarian, if he be an earnest and con-

scientious Unitarian, can discourse on religion so as to satisfy a Trinitarian. The solution of the problem of human destiny given by the one is not that given by the other. The one embraces a philosophy which the other rejects.

If we come into politics, we encounter the same difficulty. What doctrines on the destiny of society will these Normal Schools inculcate? If any, in this Commonwealth, at present, they must be whig doctrines, for none but whigs can be professors in these schools. Now the whig doctrines on society are directly hostile to the democratic doctrines. Whiggism is but another name for Hobbism. It is based on materialism, and is atheistical in its logical tendencies. That all whigs are aware of this, we do by no means assert; that any of them are, is by no means probable; but this alters not the fact. Whiggism denies the internal light; it denies that there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding. In religion, the whig must depend upon the uncertain ground of history and criticism; in politics, also, upon history and criticism. In neither does he recognise in man the criterion of truth, the universal reason, whereof each man is made a partaker, the ultimate authority in all matters pertaining to religion and politics. In his creed all is imposed, nothing is generated; all comes to us from abroad, nothing from within. Hence his reverence for antiquity, his regard for precedents, and his distrust of the people. Now, we need hardly say, that all this is directly contrary to the faith of the democrat. Democracy is based on the fundamental truth, that there is an element of the Supernatural in every man, placing him in relation with universal and absolute truth; that there is a true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world; that a portion of the spirit of God is given unto every man to profit withal. Democracy rests, therefore, on spiritualism, and is of necessity a believer in God and in Christ. Nothing but spiritualism has the requisite unity and universality to meet the

wants of the masses. Now, whoever teaches one of these systems, must of necessity offend the advocates of the other. I am a Democrat. Can I entrust my children to the care of those who are to me virtually Atheists? All ideas are connected. The whig educator may, indeed, refrain from teaching my children the importance of whig measures, but he cannot refrain from teaching them the whig philosophy. Imbue them with this philosophy, and they are secured to the whig party, to the whig cause. Establish, then, your whig Board of Education; place on it a single Democrat, to save appearances; enable this Board to establish Normal Schools, and through them to educate all the children of the Commonwealth; authorize them to publish common school libraries, to select all the books used in school, and thus to determine all the doctrines which our children shall imbibe, and what will be the result? We have then given to some half a dozen whigs, the responsible office of forming the political faith and conscience of the whole community. We have done all that can be done to give Whiggism a self-perpetuating power; all that we can do to make a community of practical infidels. Are we prepared for this result?

The truth is, we have, in the establishment of this Board of Education, undertaken to imitate despotic Prussia, without considering the immense distance between the two countries. The craft of the king of Prussia is altogether more admirable than his love of the people. He has seen, what European kings are beginning to see, and what the French Revolution has made quite evident, that the people will have education, and that they cannot much longer be kept in submission to their masters by brute force. "The schoolmaster is abroad," and cannot be sent home again. What, then, remains for absolute kings? Simply to shake hands with the schoolmaster. They must enlist the schoolmaster in their cause. In order to do this effectually, they must have the forming of the schoolmaster, make him their stipendiary, and prohibit

him from teaching aught, except what they dictate. Hence, the Prussian system of education, a skillful attempt of Absolutism to steal the march on Liberalism, to fight Liberalism with its own weapons.

Let it be borne in mind, that in Prussia the whole business of education is lodged in the hands of government. The government establishes the schools in which it prepares the teachers; it determines both the methods of teaching, and the matters taught. It commissions all teachers, and suffers no one to engage in teaching without authority from itself. Who sees not then, that all the teachers will be the pliant tools of the government, and that the whole tendency of the education given will be to make the Prussians obedient subjects of Frederic the king? Who sees not that education in Prussia is supported merely as the most efficient arm of the police, and fostered merely for the purpose of keeping out revolutionary, or what is the same thing, liberal ideas?

Let us glance at what is actually taught in these much admired Prussian schools, and we shall find confirmation still stronger, if possible, of what we assert. What, then, does Frederic William allow his dear subjects to be taught? First and foremost, the catechisms of the two established churches, that is, the catechism of the Lutheran church to the children of Lutherans, and that of the Catholic church to the children of Catholics. Then they are taught the private and domestic virtues, and their duty to their lord the king. Have they lessons on the rights of man, their duties to the public, and the duty of governments to the people? Let an imprudent schoolmaster but broach these topics, and how long, think ye, he would be permitted to teach? Let a teacher, or let the parents of the children taught, but introduce into a school a book not designated by the government, especially a book which should agitate somewhat profoundly the great problems of the destiny of man and of society, and would the government, think ye, acquiesce? No; the whole system of Prussian edu-

cation, which is well adapted, in many respects, to form the Prussian youth to the love and practice of the several duties of private and domestic life, is mainly designed to implant despotism in the intellect and the heart, to forestall the craving of freedom, and to make man, born to be free, to stand up a man amongst men in the image of his Maker, contented to be a slave, and a supporter of Absolutism on principle.

And this is the system of education, in principle, which the fathers of our Commonwealth are seeking to establish here. They have taken advantage of the alleged deficiency of good teachers, to demand what they choose to call Normal Schools. In default of good common school libraries, they have undertaken to prepare a series of publications, which they will at first take the liberty to recommend, and which afterwards they may ask of the legislature authority to enjoin. They assume the authority now to recommend the proper books to be studied, and soon they will try for authority to dictate. As soon as they can get their Normal Schools into successful operation, they will so arrange it, if they can, that no public school shall be permitted to employ a teacher who has not graduated at a Normal School. Then all liberty of instruction, the evil so complained of in France, and which was not among the least of the causes which brought about the revolution of 1830, will be felt here in all its force. Adieu then to republicanism, to social progress.

A government system of education in Prussia is not inconsistent with the theory of Prussian society; for there all wisdom is supposed to be lodged in the government. But the thing is wholly inadmissible here; not because the government may be in the hands of Whigs or Democrats, but because, according to our theory, the people are supposed to be wiser than the government. Here, the people do not look to the government for light, for instruction, but the government looks to the people. The people give the law to the government. To entrust, then, the

government with the power of determining the education which our children shall receive, is entrusting our servant with the power to be our master. This fundamental difference between the two countries, we apprehend, has been overlooked by the Board of Education, and its supporters. In a free government, there can be no teaching by authority, and all attempts to teach by authority are so many blows struck at its freedom. We may as well have a religion established by law, as a system of education, and the government educate and appoint the pastors of our churches, as well as the instructors of our children.

This is not all. The theory of our institutions rests on the progressive nature of man and society. Our institutions everywhere recognise the principle of progress. In most, if not all other countries, progress involves revolution. Here it is the established order, and we have made constitutional provisions for improvement. All our State constitutions contain provisions for amendment, when the people come to judge amendments necessary. In fact, we regard the end of society to advance. There is always a future before us, a good, not yet reached, to be attained. Hence, to be true to our theory, we must be always looking ahead, struggling to advance. To this end should all our systems of education, whether devised for the district school, the academy, the college, the university, directly or indirectly tend; but to this end they cannot tend, if left to the management of the government.

Introduce now a system of Normal Schools, under the supervision of a government Board of Education. These Schools must have professors. But who will these professors be? They must be popular men; men of reputation, not men who have the good of the people at heart, and are known only by their fidelity to popular interests, but men who are generally regarded as safe; in whom the mass of the active members of the community have confidence. But on what condition does a man come into this category of pop-

ular men? Simply on the condition, that he represent, to a certain extent, the opinions now dominant. A man, who represents the past, is not a popular man, nor is he who represents the future, but he who represents the present. The man, who has the misfortune to think in advance of his contemporaries, and to crave a good for Humanity beyond that already attained, is necessarily unpopular. If he venture to translate his thoughts into words, and his cravings into deeds, he will be called hard names, deemed an enemy to God and man, or a well-intentioned dreamer, who, whatever be thought of his intellect or motives, is never to be trusted. Men, who have faith in the future, whose mental vision sweeps a broader than the vulgar horizon, whose souls burn to raise up the low, to break the fetters of the captive, to open the prison doors to those that are bound, to preach glad tidings to the poor, hope to the desponding, consolation to the sorrowing, and life to the dead, must always count, — whatever the hold they may take on men's higher nature, — on being distrusted, and, to no inconsiderable degree, discarded by their own age. They cannot but be misinterpreted. They must pass for what they are not, and would abhor to be. They cannot, therefore, become professors in Normal Schools, unless it be by accident, and if by accident they become professors, they will be forthwith silenced or dismissed; a fact of which Professor Cousin is an eminent witness. What theological seminary would have selected Jesus, Paul, or John, in their lifetime, for a professor of theology? Nay, what Board of Education on earth, would make the editor of the *Boston Quarterly Review* a professor in a Normal School?

In order to be popular, one must uphold things as they are, disturb the world with no new views, and alarm no private interest by uttering the insurrectionary word, Reform. He must merely echo the sentiments and opinions he finds in vogue; and he who can echo these the loudest, the most distinctly, and in the most agreeable voice, is sure to be the most

popular man,—for a time. Men of this stamp do never trouble their age; they are never agitators, and there is no danger that they will stir up any popular commotion; they are the men to be on Boards of Education, professors in colleges, constables, mayors, members of legislative assemblies, presidents, and parish clerks. Such men look for in colleges, and, therefore, look rarely to colleges for reforms or reformers. Colleges, as a general rule, are the last place to which you should look for new ideas, or inspiration to devote one's self to the cause of spiritual and social progress. If one can survive his college life, and come forth into the world with a free mind, an open heart, and power to do the work of a man for his fellow men, he must possess originally a nature of noble constitution, and rare endowments. New ideas are placed in the world by those whom the world knows not, or disowns. Reforms come from the obscure and the unheeded, or from the jeered and the persecuted; a crucified peasant and his fishermen followers; not from the men of Reputation, and Respectability. The weak things of this world are chosen to confound the mighty, and foolish things to bring to nought the wisdom of the wise.

In consequence of this invariable law of Providence, the men who can be placed at the head of these Normal Schools, if established, will not be men who represent the true idea of our institutions, or who will prepare their pupils to come forth educators of our children for the accomplishment of the real destiny of American society. Their teachings and influences, so far as they amount to anything, will be far from such as are needed. They will not make their pupils living men, bold to conceive and strong to effect a good as yet unrealized. They will be instant in season and out of season, to teach them to respect and preserve what is, to caution them against the licentiousness of the people, the turbulence and brutality of the mob, the dangers of anarchy, and even of liberty; but they will rarely seek to imbue them with a love of liberty,

to admonish them to resist the first encroachments of tyranny, to stand fast in their freedom, and to feel always that it is nobler to die, nay, nobler to kill, than to live a slave. They will but echo the sentiments of that portion of the community, on whom they are the more immediately dependent, and they will approve no reform, no step onward, till it has been already achieved in the soul of the community.

We confess, therefore, that we cannot look for much to meet the educational wants of the community, from the favorite measures of the Massachusetts Board of Education. In the view of this respectable Board, education is merely a branch of general police, and schoolmasters are only a better sort of constables. The Board would promote education, they would even make it universal, because they esteem it the most effectual means possible of checking pauperism and crime, and making the rich secure in their possessions. Education has, therefore, a certain utility which may be told in solid cash saved to the Commonwealth. This being the leading idea, the most comprehensive view which the Board seem to take of education, what more should be expected from their labors, than such modifications and improvements as will render it more efficient as an arm of general police? More, we confess, we do not look for from their exertions. The Board is not composed of men likely to attempt more, and if it were composed of other men, with far other, and more elevated and comprehensive views, more could not be effected. Boards of trade may do something, but boards of education and boards of religion are worthy of our respect, only in proportion to their imbecility. To educate a human being to be a man, to fulfil his destiny, to attain the end for which God made him, is not a matter which can, in the nature of things, come within the jurisdiction of a Board, however judiciously it may be constituted.

Nevertheless, the Board may, perhaps, do something. There is room to hope that it will do something to improve the construction of school-houses,

and to collect the material facts concerning the state of education as it now is ; and, judging from the accompanying Report of its accomplished Secretary, it may also effect some progress in the methods of teaching our children to spell. This will be considerable, and will deserve gratitude and reward. But, notwithstanding this, we must still adhere to our opinion, that the Board will do nought to increase or improve the facilities which already exist for acquiring an education, in the only sense in which education is of much value ; because of education in this sense it has no conception, and no power to labor for it, even if it had the conception. No system of education, no system of schools, which can be instituted and sustained by government, can be adequate to the educational wants of the community. Nothing desirable in matters of education, beyond what relates to the finances of the schools, comes within the province of the legislature. More than this the legislature should not attempt ; more than this the friends of education should not ask. Let the legislature provide ample funds for the support of as many schools as are needed for the best education possible of all the children of the community, and there let it stop. The selection of teachers, the choice of studies, and of books to be read or studied, all that pertains to the methods of teaching, and the matters to be taught or learned, are best left to the School District. In these matters, the District should be paramount to the State. The evils we have alluded to are in some degree inseparable from all possible systems of education, which are capable of being put into practice ; but they will be best avoided by placing the individual school under the control of a community composed merely of the number of families having children to be educated in it.

For ourselves, we adopt the democratic principle in its fullest extent ; but we believe that Federalism — we use the word in its etymological sense — is the method by which its beneficial working is best to be se-

cured. The individual State, as well as the Union, should be a confederacy of distinct communities. Our idea of the true form of a republican government for this country is, 1st, that the few material interests common to all parts of the whole country, should be confided to a General Congress, composed of delegates from all the States; 2dly, that the class of interests, under these, common to the largest extent of territory, should be confided to a State Congress, composed of delegates from Counties; 3dly, the next more general class of interests under these, should be confided to a County Government, composed of delegates from the several Townships, or Wards; 4thly, the next most general class to a Township or Ward government, composed of delegates from the several Districts of the town or ward; 5thly, the remaining interests, which may be subjected to governmental action, should be confided to all the citizens of the District, which should always be of size sufficient to maintain a Grammar School. This is nothing but the actual idea of our government, freed from its exceptions and anomalies, and would require no new divisions to be introduced. Our legislature, in this Commonwealth, is composed of delegates from corporations, or communities, and we hope the hand of innovation will never succeed in giving it a different basis. We would, if we could, revive the old practice of each corporation's paying its own delegates; and we think it would have been an improvement in the constitution of the United States, if the members of Congress, instead of receiving their pay from the Federal Treasury, had been left to receive it from their respective States.

Now, to the smallest of these divisions, corresponding to our present school districts, among other matters, we would confide the whole subject, — with the exception heretofore made, — of common school education. This exception relates to the finances; but we would make even this exception as narrow as possible. The more exclusively the whole matter of the school is brought under the control of the families

specially interested in it, the more efficient will the school be. If the town manage part of it, and the state a part of it, the district will be very likely to be remiss in managing its part, and so in fact no part, in the end, will be well managed. This results from a common principle. Where responsibility is divided, there is always a greater or less want of fidelity in its discharge. Wherever there is a power to be exercised, there should always be a concentration of it in as few hands as possible; and, to counterbalance the centralizing tendency of this, the community should be so divided into sub-communities, that the power should in fact affect but a small number, and matters should be so arranged that this small number should be able to obtain speedy redress, if wronged. We would have as little government as possible; but where we must have government, we would have it lodged in few hands, and empowered to speak in a tone of absolute authority. Experience, we think, bears ample testimony to the soundness of this principle. At any rate, experience proves, that when the powers of the school district were greater, and the interference of the state and the township were less than now, the common school was altogether better than it is at present. In this view of the case, we regard the Board of Education as an unwise establishment. It is a measure designed to reduce yet lower the powers and responsibilities of school districts, to deprive them of their rights, and to bring the whole matter of education under the control of one central government, controlling it in the nature of the case for the children of others, not for their own. In the District, we manage the school for our own children, but the Board of Education have no children in the district school. They are removed to a great distance from it, by the fewness of their number, and the populousness of the community for which they act, and can never take the deep interest of parents in each individual school, and, therefore, must want that which has thus far given to the common school its charm and

its efficiency. To confide our common schools to the Board, is like taking the children from their parents, and entrusting them to strangers. I want no Board of Education to dictate to me concerning the education of my children, and cannot every father say the same? But the Board owes its origin to the warm interest which our community takes in the subject of education, and it is supported, because it is thought that it may give more efficiency to our common school system, and elevate its character. Well will it be for us, if we discover our mistake before it is too late, before we have parted with that system of common schools, which we hold as one of the richest of the legacies left us by our pilgrim fathers.

But, having disposed of the Board of Education, and its Secretary, it is time to return to the question, How is the education we have described to be furnished, in what schools, and under what schoolmasters? This question is a grave one, and deserves a more extended answer than we have the space or the ability to give it. We can do little more than throw out a few loose hints, which, perhaps, may not be without result.

In the first place, we remark, that the education we contend for, as may be guessed from what has already been said, we do not look for from any system of government schools. Government is not in this country, and cannot be, the educator of the people. In education, as in religion, we must rely mainly on the voluntary system. If this be an evil, it is an evil inseparable from our form of government. Government here must be restricted to material interests, and forbidden to concern itself with what belongs to the spiritual culture of the community. It has of right no control over our opinions, literary, moral, political, philosophical, or religious. Its province is to reflect, not to lead, nor to create the general will. It, therefore, must not be installed the educator of the people.

In the second place, we would also remark, that education, in the sense in which we have commended

it, can be only approached, not perfectly realized. To impart an education, answering to the idea we entertain of it, we should need a knowledge far surpassing what mortals can attain to, and resources which superior beings, and only superior beings, can be supposed to possess. But this should not discourage us. If we could not take in an ideal beyond what is actualized, if we had no powers of conception, which out-run our powers of execution, we should not be progressive beings. Our life consists in struggling after the Unattained, and even the Unattainable. The artist attains to excellence, not so much by realizing his ideal, as by struggling to realize an ideal which he cannot. The greatest excellence of a work of art does not lie so much in what it actually embodies, as in its dim revelations of a beauty or a worth the artist struggled after, saw in his soul, but could not seize, embody in his song, transfer to the canvas, or breathe over the marble. So all greatness is enhanced by the conception it always gives of a greater yet beyond, which does not appear. In accordance with this law, in all our doing, we should have an ideal which is above and beyond all that we can do, — an ideal, which haunts us day and night, forbidding us to be satisfied with anything achieved, and compelling us to be ever putting ourselves forth in new and stronger efforts. Grant, then, that the education we contend for cannot be wholly realized. Still, by effort, we of this generation can realize somewhat, which will be so much stock in advance for our successors, who, in their turn, may realize somewhat more.

No system of schools which can be devised can supply this education, because there can be no more knowledge and wisdom embodied in schools, than is already in the community, and because chiefly, the education which our schools can furnish, in their best organization, is the smallest part of the education we do and must receive. The influences which go out from the school-room are weak in comparison with the general influences of society, of Nature, and of Provi-

dence, which are constantly acting upon us. Shut up your school-houses, and in all essential matters your children would grow up about the same, they would were they open. This is a consideration which it is not wise to overlook. No matter what your schools are, the characters of your children will be determined by that intangible, invisible, indescribable, but very real personage, called the Spirit of the Age.

But, pass over all this. If there be education, there must needs be educators. The character of the educators will determine the character of the education. The greatest care, then, belongs to educators, our greatest concernment must be to seek out or rear up well qualified teachers. This, we suppose, is the conviction of all those, who are interested in Normal Schools. Hence their efforts and contributions to their establishment. Yet, not in Normal Schools are we to look for educators, since it may be as difficult to find good teachers for Normal Schools as for any other schools, and since school teachers, in the technical sense, are by no means the real educators of the community.

The real educators of the young are the grown-up generation. The rising generation will always receive as good, as thorough an education as the actual generation is prepared to give, and no better. The great work, then, which needs to be done in order to advance education, is to qualify the actual generation for imparting a more complete and finished education to its successor, that is to say, educate not the young, but the grown-up generation. This educating of the grown-up generation is what we mean by the EDUCATION OF THE PEOPLE. Society at large must be regarded as a vast Normal School, in which the whole active, doing, and driving generation of the day are pupils, qualifying themselves to educate the young. Our question now changes its aspect, and becomes, How, by what means, may the education of the grown-up generation be advanced? It will be seen, from this form of the question, that we regard the improvement

of the adult as the means of advancing the child, rather than the education of the child as the means of advancing the adult. We shall probably be told, that in this we put the cart before the horse; but we respectfully suggest whether it be not possible that they, who may be disposed to tell us so, have not made the slight mistake of deeming the horse a cart, and the cart a horse? Verily, to our eyes, their horse looks to us as much like a cart, as Lord Peter's shoulder of mutton did like a twopenny brown loaf to his hungry brothers, whom he had invited to dinner.

What, then, are the means at our disposal for educating the grown-up generation? We can specify but a few, and as in duty bound, both professionally and otherwise, we begin with the clergy, who are really, did they but know it, *ex officio*, educators of the people. The true idea of the Christian Ministry is that of an institution, designed expressly for the education of the people, and it is to the profound sentiment which mankind have of the vast importance of an institution for this purpose, that the Christian ministry is indebted for its origin and support. To the education of the people this ministry in all lands has contributed not a little. Faults, doubtless, the clergy have had, faults they doubtless still have, but there is as little justice as religion in the general condemnation of them, indulged in by but too many of our professed Liberals. If the clergy have been less successful educators of the people than they might have been, it has in some measure been owing to two mistakes, into which they have fallen, in regard to the nature of the clerical office. Affected by reminiscences of Jewish and Pagan priesthoods, the Christian clergy have too often regarded themselves as priests, standing as mediators between God and men. They have felt that it was their peculiar province to offer up prayers and supplications in behalf of the people, and to make intercession for them with the common Father of all. But they should have borne in mind that there is but one mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ, who gave

himself a ransom for all, and, therefore, that no man has any occasion to seek a priest to mediate between him and the Father, to offer up prayers for him in a particular place, because it is now proper for all men to pray themselves wherever they may be, or whatever their profession, "lifting up holy hands without wrath, or doubting." Also should they have borne in mind that a priest, to present the offerings of the people, and to superintend the sacrifice, has become unnecessary, since Christ has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself as a sin-offering. No priest is now needed to enter into the Holy of Holies to obtain judgment for the people, because one is our High Priest, even Jesus Christ the righteous, who hath entered into the Holy of Holies, not made with hands, but into the heavens themselves, and seated himself at the right hand of the Majesty on high, where he ever liveth to make intercession for us. When the veil of the temple was rent in twain, and the Holy of Holies laid open to the gaze of the multitude, when Jesus exclaimed, "It is finished," bowed his head, and gave up the ghost, as a sin-offering for Humanity, sufficient for all time, and for every man, the old priestly office was abolished. Henceforth, if any man sinned, he was not to go to his priest with a lamb, a he-goat, or with fruits and flowers, but to bear in mind that his advocate with the Father is he, who gave himself to death, that he might be the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. The Christian clergy have not always kept this distinctly in view. They have at times felt that they were priests, to a certain extent, in the old sense of the word. Hence a chief cause of the errors they have committed, and of the opposition they have in modern times encountered.

Another mistake, into which the clergy have fallen, and which grows out of the one already mentioned, is that of supposing it their province not merely to discourse on the destiny of man, but to discourse on it dogmatically, to insist on it, that their solution of the problem of human destiny shall be

taken as final, as the only true solution, and that another cannot be entertained, nor even sought after without sin. The clergyman has, in fact, no authority to preach beyond that which his teachings carry in themselves. He speaks to men, who, if they be his equals in intelligence, have the same right to command him, that he has to command them. When he placed himself in a high pulpit, above the people, from which he was to command the people what to believe, he forgot his true position, and encroached on the prerogative of Jesus. He assumed to be lord and master, where he was in truth only a brother, and should have wished only to be a servant. Much evil has resulted from this assumption. But the assumption has now become ridiculous. Knowledge is no longer the exclusive possession of the clergy; their monopoly has been broken up; and it is no rare thing to find their superiors, even in theological matters, in the ranks of the laity. The day for authoritative teaching is gone by. Instead of enjoining and enforcing, the clergy, willingly or not, must hereafter labor to explain and convince. They have no longer any anathemas to fulminate; their quiver is exhausted of its thunderbolts, and their heads can no longer bear the triple crown. They must henceforth speak as men to their equals, and subject what they utter to the free action of reason, which all men possess in common.

Correcting these two mistakes, the clergy may contribute much to the education of the people. Freed from these two false notions, the Christian Ministry will survive all the mutations of time, all changes in men's creeds, social institutions, and arrangements. There is a deep and permanent necessity for its continuance, in the nature of man and the will of Providence. No institution can ever wholly supersede it, or take its place. It must last as long as man lasts. Let the clergy, then, understand their mission. They are set apart as special educators of the people. They should, then, study attentively the nature of man and society, and arrive as nearly as they can at the true solution of the problem of both.

Some, we are aware, will start at our doctrine, and ask us, if we would have clergymen meddle with politics. They will tell us that clergymen belong to the kingdom of God, that their kingdom is not of this world, and that, therefore, they should keep clear of the field of politics. This is more specious than solid. All man's duties are intimately connected, and there is, and there can be, no such separation between religion and politics, as the doctrine opposed to ours implies. Religion and politics run perpetually into one another. A religion which neglects man's social weal, is defective in the extreme; and politics separated from religion are not only defective, but mischievous, degenerating of necessity into Machiavelism. Politics, rightly understood, are nothing but the great principles of Christianity applied to our social relations and arrangements, and are, therefore, as much within the legitimate province of the clergyman, as are the private and domestic virtues. On neither politics nor religion do we ask of the clergy dogmatic instructions, for they are but men, and often as ignorant as the rest of us of the true solution of the problem of our destiny. What we ask of them is, that they direct our minds to the problem of society, as well as to that of the salvation of the individual, and that they enter, in their public communications, into its free and full discussion. This they ought to do, did they contemplate only the salvation of the individual in the world after death. The sinner is saved only by being redeemed from all sin, and we know no reason why sins against society should not be as impassable barriers to salvation, as sins against the Church, or against individuals. Man's whole nature must be developed and perfected, in order to fit him for heaven, and the social element is as much an element, as essential an element of his nature, as the religious. All error is more or less prejudicial, and we know not why error in relation to the problem of the destiny of society should be thought less prejudicial to the growth and perfection of the soul, than error in

relation to the destiny of man, as an individual, or simple human being. We say, then, let the pulpit be opened to all subjects of general and permanent interest. Let it speak a free, bold, and earnest voice, and not fear to grapple with the weightiest problems, only let it speak to free men, or to men who have, at least, the right to be free men.

We are aware of the usual objection made to the interference of clergymen in political matters. He may give offence, may disturb the harmony of his parish, and diminish his means of usefulness. Be it so. We are never afraid of giving offence. They, whom the free, bold, and earnest utterance of one's honest convictions on any subject of importance can offend, deserve to be offended, and it would be criminal to please them. The harmony of a parish, which would be disturbed by the kind of preaching we demand, ought to be disturbed, for it is a deceitful harmony. Peace is a good thing, but justice is better. We would rather have war, and war to the knife, than a hollow peace, founded on the sacrifice of truth, or duty. Suppose, then, that the kind of preaching we call for should disturb, should agitate, nay, should to some extent call forth angry feelings, better so than the present deadness of our Churches. Give us the noise and contention of life, rather than the peace and silence of the charnel-house. Men live in the storm, in the tempest, where they must put forth all their efforts, and use all their wits to keep above water, not in the calm, rocking on a tideless and rotting ocean. Whoso would live and be a man, should joy to snuff the battle from afar, and leap to rush in where blows fall thickest and fall heaviest. Nothing is so much to be dreaded as that calm, respectable state, which our respectable clergy contend for. Be cold or be hot, not lukewarm, lest the Almighty spue thee out of his mouth. Let the clergy, then, preach on politics. If they give offence, they may be sure that they have preached on the subject they should. If they stir up commotion, let them "thank God and take courage,"

for they have at length found out one subject, at least, in which their congregations take an interest.

Next to the pulpit, in this country, as a means of educating the people, we mention the Lyceum, under which general term we include, not only the associations called Lyceums, but the popular Lectures, scientific or otherwise, which are beginning to be so frequent, and so fashionable. The Lyceum is as yet in its infancy. We cannot say much for its actual performances thus far; but it possesses a capacity, which, when fully developed, will make it an institution of immense power. It has grown up from the feeling of the age and country of the necessity of greater exertions for the education of the people, and to the education of the people, we believe it destined to contribute not a little.

The Lyceum has hitherto done not much, because it has discussed topics too remotely connected with life, its hopes and affections, trials and duties. It has dealt with facts, rather than with ideas, with physical science, rather than with moral and intellectual philosophy. Facts gratify to a certain extent our curiosity, and fill our memories, but taken disjoined from the principles which unite and enlighten them, they make us no wiser, nor more knowing. There are deeper wants in most men than curiosity, and somewhat beside the memory to be filled. Ideas interest the people more than mere facts, and appeal to far deeper and more enduring wants. Whoso would take a firm hold of the popular heart, must speak on great and everlasting principles, which lie at the foundation of all science, and which come into play in every day life. You may please a popular audience by a lecture on bugs, or fishes, by a description of St. Peter's, or York Minster, by the details of the battle of Agincourt or Poitiers, by discourses on chemistry, astronomy, geology, electricity, but you please them only for a moment. You give them a few facts to be remembered, not great principles, to be used. You have gratified curiosity, but you have furnished few materials for

thought. You have not awakened the mind, and set it at work.

There is a great mistake in our age and country on this subject, growing very naturally out of our infidel tendencies. We believe in matter, not in mind ; in mechanics, but not in ethics ; in geology and chemistry, but not in religion. Hence, the paramount attention we pay to the natural sciences, and our sneers at metaphysics. But, in truth, the natural sciences are little worth without the moral and intellectual. Be never so thoroughly master of all the physical sciences, and you are a fool in all that really concerns men, if you are instructed in nothing else. Religion and politics are the two great concernments of human beings, and in relation to these we are not necessarily instructed at all by the study of physical science. The study of Nature, we are sometimes told, tends to make us religious ; "an undevout astronomer," some fool has said, "is mad ;" just as though there was anything more in the heavenly bodies to convince us of the being of a God, than in the grass that springs up under our feet, or the flowers that bloom along our path. The man who already believes in God will, no doubt, become more devout by the study of astronomy ; but he, who goes to that study without a belief in God, will, however far he may push his researches, find only confirmation of his atheism, and say, in the end, with Lalande, "*Je n'ai jamais vu Dieu au bout de mes lunettes.*" In herself, nature is mute and unstructive. She is to us very much what we make her, and the voice she utters is but the voice we give her. To the religious, she is of a religious tendency ; to the unbeliever, she is a teacher of infidelity. The wisdom you call hers is your own projected, and the beauty you ascribe her is the beauty of your own souls. Strike out the beauty within you, and you shall see none in the starry heavens, none in those sweet flowers you love so well ; none in those distant mountains, with their harmonious outlines, nor in the tranquil ocean, sleeping so gently beneath the moon-

beams which play upon its unruffled bosom. Without the beauty which our own souls project, all nature were to us but an huge, ill-shapen, drab-colored jumble of earth, stones, and water. It is the spirit of God, that breathes out from the soul over the weltering chaos, which brings light out of darkness, order out of confusion, and beauty out of deformity. Nor does the study of the natural sciences tend in the least to solve the political problem. The men whose lives are spent in poring over outward nature, are not the men who will feel the deepest interest in the destiny of society. Was there not an ancient mathematician, who was found quietly solving some mathematical problem, while the enemy were battering down the walls of his native city, and butchering or leading captive his countrymen? Tyrants have no dread of the physical sciences. When your Napoleons remodel French Institutes, they preserve the classes devoted to natural science, and exclude only the class devoted to moral and political science; exile your De Staëls, but patronize your Cuviers. They have no dread of the facts of external nature. The disclosure of these facts throws no dangerous light on the worth of the soul, and the rights of man. It tells the people nothing of their wrongs, nothing of the manner in which they have been cheated, nor that they are regarded by the government only as a sort of tax-paying animals, useful in proportion to the amount of taxes they pay with the least drawback in police expenditures for the purpose of keeping them in order. People may dig into the bowels of the earth, they may speculate on the revolutions of the globe, and seek to reconstruct from a few fossil remains the huge animals of an earlier time. This shakes no throne, changes no dynasty, and makes no absolute monarch feel insecure. But let them once become busy with the problem of society, let them once attempt to investigate the foundations of the actually existing society, and to search into the manner in which the world is governed, and for whose benefit, and forthwith the tyrant

turns pale, absolute kings stand aghast, hierarchies give way, nobilities fall, and there is heard a sound as the "crack of doom." The people indignant rise, and swear that they are, and will be men; and wo to whomsoever dare gainsay them.

The physical sciences may be studied under any form of society, and they can adapt themselves to the service of the tyrant, as well as the father of the people. They necessarily involve no social revolution. But with ideas the case stands different. The study of the moral and intellectual sciences, necessarily brings up the great religious and social problems, and acts directly on existing social relations. All who fear the people and distrust the democracy, encourage them as little as possible. To this fact we supposed it was owing, that our Cambridge University was for so many years without a professor in the moral and political sciences; and it is not one of the least encouraging signs of the times, that it has finally been forced to fill the long vacant chair, and with a man, too, from whom the public may hope somewhat. It proves that a confidence in the people, and in popular institutions, is beginning to find its way into old Harvard. Who can henceforth doubt the triumph of democracy?

Whoever would act on the masses, produce changes for good or for evil, must deal, not with facts merely, but with ideas, and the profounder and the more universal the ideas he puts forth, the greater shall be his power, the more wide and lasting his influence. Who-so has an idea is always a king and a priest. Ideas work all the revolutions which affect the moral and political world. One day in an humble town of a mountainous district in Lesser Asia, an obscure carpenter's son stands up in the synagogue, and reads, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," and the veil of the tem-

ple is rent, idols and idol-worships pass away, and the whole moral and political world is changed. Whence this result? The carpenter's son uttered an idea, and that idea has made the world after its own image. An obscure Wittenberg monk, possessed with an idea, is more than a match for the whole religious and political organization of his epoch. Possessed of an idea, a few pilgrims, landing on Plymouth Rock, are able to found an empire, and ensure liberty to the world. Ideas are the sovereigns of the Universe. Whoso would educate the people must do them homage. The Lyceum must represent this truth. Its lectures and discussions should be on subjects connected with what is deepest, and most enduring in human nature. When they shall be so, it will not only add to its interest and popularity, but become one of the most efficient agents desirable in the education of the people. But, it must put away its childish tricks. It must become serious and manly. It must aim higher, and strike deeper. Instead of wasting its strength on questions, such as, Which is the more useful element to man, fire or water, it must bend all its energies to the solution of the problem of human destiny, — to the questions, What is my destiny, as a man? What is the destiny of society? And how may I best fulfil my own destiny, and contribute to the fulfilment of the destiny of society?

One more agent in the education of the people, and only one more, we have space to mention. This agent is the press, by which we mean mainly the periodical press, newspapers, magazines, and reviews. In this sense, the press in modern times has become a power, a sort of "fourth estate," and the most efficient agent in our possession for acting on the opinions of the people. It has, in a great measure, superseded the stage, and to some extent even the pulpit. Whoever has a doctrine to advance, or a measure to carry, writes, or causes to be written, a leading article in a Daily, or an essay in a Quarterly. The increasing number of periodicals, their ever-widening circulation,

owing to the constantly increasing number of readers, make, and must make, for a long time to come, the periodical press, or *journalism*, if you please, the first object of consideration with all who take any interest in the opinions entertained and acted on by the people.

The press must, undoubtedly, to a great extent, reflect public opinion, collect and utter what is already believed and cherished by the public. But it may do more. It has the capacity to be a leader of public opinion, in some degree to originate it, to correct and elevate it. How great this capacity is, it is impossible to say. We have no means of measuring it. But that it exists, cannot be doubted. The great value of the press, as an educator of the people, depends almost entirely on the proper unfolding and exercise of this capacity. The mischief, or inefficiency of the press, hitherto, has consisted in its attempt to follow, rather than lead, public opinion. Editors have inquired WHAT IS, rather than, WHAT OUGHT TO BE? In this inquiry, too, they have consulted a few individuals, just around them, instead of taking enlarged and comprehensive views of the whole community; and have, therefore, given out as public opinion, what, in fact, was only the opinion of a coterie, a faction, or a few noisy partisans, or sectarians. In this way it happens, often, that party papers do by no means express the real sentiments of their party. Your party paper, again, instead of speaking out honestly what its editor holds to be true or desirable, utters only what the same editor, or his advisers, have concluded to be what the party will be most likely to approve. "That is a noble measure," said one day a distinguished Senator in the State of New York, to the present writer, "and if adopted would be attended with the most beneficial results." "Will you support it in your place, as Senator?" said we. "If it is a measure of my party, I will," was the reply. This is the principle on which party politicians and party editors too often act. The Independent Treasury scheme was originally a Whig measure, and then it

was opposed by the opposing party. It is now advocated by the Democratic party, and all the Whigs oppose it, and in most cases, we apprehend, simply because it is not *now* a measure of *their* party. In this way the press fails, on the one hand, to lead public opinion, and on the other even to reflect it.

It will easily be seen, from these remarks, that we look upon its want of freedom and independence, as the chief cause of the inefficiency of the press as an educator of the people. We call our press free, but, in truth, the press is very little, if any, more free in this country, than it is in the monarchical countries of Europe. There is here a censorship of the press, hardly less paralyzing than that established by Austria and Prussia. The government, to be sure, lets it alone, but in the absence of governmental restraint, each man erects himself into a censor, and if the paper utters an opinion he does not like, he forthwith stops his subscription. The publisher, therefore, finds very soon that he must either pocket his independence, and echo the popular dogma, whatever it may be, or quit publishing, or starve. There is hardly a civilized country on earth, whose literature is so tame and servile as ours has been. Our reviews, in general, take as much pains to avoid the utterance of any new or leading idea, as they would, were they published under the immediate supervision of the Spanish Inquisition, or the Ottoman Porte. Even our favorite North American refuses to utter the truth, when the truth is not of the sort to please its erudite editor. The honest and enlightened contributor to its pages must submit to a censorship altogether more humiliating than would be exacted by a European despot. This the Italian exile, who has fled from Austrian tyranny to enjoy life and freedom in America, can bear witness to, for he has been prohibited from telling the truth, and made to tell what is not true, and what he does not believe to be true. Sorry are we to say such things of the American press, but he is not always the worst patriot, who tells his countrymen of their faults.

If we pass from our periodical press to our regular built books, we shall find still deeper cause to blush and hang our heads. Scarcely a book has ever issued from the American press, that breathes anything like the free spirit we find in French literature, or even in that of Germany. The Anglo-Saxon mind is free enough in what relates to material interests, free enough in all practical matters, but in what relates to the region of ideas, to the higher departments of thought, it is a skeptic, or a slave. Scarcely shall you find a single English or American statesman, that has not a most holy horror of abstract principles, a most prudent detestation of "abstract right." Listen in the Parliament of Great Britain, or in the Congress of the United States, for the free utterance of great principles, or to the attempt to determine the worth of certain measures by considering them in the light of first principles, and you shall listen in vain. The Anglo-Saxon mind conceives nothing of first principles, has no acquaintance with ideas, no faith in mind, and faith only in steam-ships and rail-ways. At least, this has been its predominant character since the "glorious Revolution" of 1688.

This same trait of character appears in our literature. We can easily account for it, and are very far from declaiming against it, or about it. Still it prevents our literature from being what it ought to be. It shows us wherein we are defective, and wherein we should seek to amend. What American writers want is thought, free, deep, earnest thought. This they will not have until they learn to speak out freely what is in them. Man is man, here as well as elsewhere. There is nothing in our heavens, nothing in our lakes and rivers, our mountains and plains, the earth, on which we stand, the scenery, amidst which we are reared, or the food on which we feed, to hinder us from attaining to as lordly a stature of mind or body here as elsewhere. Let man here dare be a man, and a man he shall be, worthy to be the model-man of all ages and countries. He has had here the cour-

age to free himself from kings, nobilities, and hierarchies. Why, then, shall he not have the courage to speak out the rich thoughts the Divinity sends him, to tell without apology or misgiving what comes to him as truth? Shall I be thought the less of if I tell my honest convictions? Shall I feed the worse? be clad in a coarser garb? What then? Am I nothing but what the opinion of others, my food, and my clothing make me? Am I not a man, and not the less a man, whatever be my environment? Shall I bend to popular prejudice? shall I be false to my own soul,—false to all that is true within me, that I may be thought the better of, feed on costlier viands, or wear a finer coat? No. Let me be cast out from the society of men; let me wander the earth in sheep-skins, or in goat-skins; let me dwell alone on the mountain, or in caverns; let me beg, let me starve sooner. When God gave me a manly nature, he bid me be true to it; when he gave me reason, he bid me listen to its oracles, and when he gave me a social nature, and linked me by ties sweet as heaven to my kind, he bid me be true to whatever I should be honestly convinced would be for their good, and let me die, nay, let me sink into eternal torture, sooner than be false to the trust committed to me. This, it strikes us, is the only language becoming a man. Talk not to me of my party or my sect, talk not to me of reputation or of wealth; these are nothing; they can follow me only to the tomb. They cannot make me amends for having been false to my God. They will not quench the eternal fire, which must scorch the tongue which has uttered falsehood, or refused to utter the truth. He, who shrinks from free thought and free speech, is the most abject of slaves, is not a man but a pitiable thing, unworthy of heaven, and too imbecile for hell.

Still, we apprehend, that the American press is needlessly chary of free speech. There is, after all, something in even the Anglo-Saxon, that looks with contempt on the mental slave, and which leaps to behold the brave spirit that snaps his fetters, and stands up a

free man. Policy, interest, craft, may say what they deem expedient against the man who utters new thoughts, unpopular truths in free, bold, and manly tones; but the universal heart of Humanity does him homage, and even they, who are loudest in their censures, do inwardly reverence him. This is as true in this country as in any other; for even the Anglo-Saxon is a man, and the character we have given of his mind is only accidental and temporary. His mind was freer and richer once, and will be again. Nay; even now, all unconsciously, lie concealed within it the nobler elements, which constituted a Milton, a Sidney, and a Hampden. There is good stuff after all in the Anglo-Saxon mind, and whoso dare use it shall be crowned priest and king. There is not so much danger in speaking freely in this country as the conductors of our press apprehend. Our own Review is a proof of it. We say nothing by way of boasting, but this journal has spoken freely, and boldly, and strongly, on subjects of the greatest delicacy. It has uttered, without apology, as unpopular opinions as a man can utter in this country. And what has been the result? So far as the Review has been commended at all, it has been for the very qualities in which we contend the American press is most deficient. What reputation the editor has secured to himself, he has secured by means of the independence, the freedom, and boldness, which have characterized his discussions. The editor, in fact, instead of losing reputation by the course he has pursued in this Review, is almost wholly indebted to it for what little literary reputation may be allowed him. We regard this as a proof that a man may speak out honestly and fearlessly what is in him, without losing reputation, or endangering his success as a writer. In fact, the American public are prepared for discussions altogether freer than the conductors of the press seem to imagine.

Let the American press but assert its freedom, and enter freely and fully into all the great questions we

have raised, and it will do not a little to advance the education of the people. It must be free ; it must address itself to the mind of the community, and labor incessantly to quicken thought, and direct it to the solution of the problem of human destiny. It must not dogmatize, must not seek to establish a creed, but to throw what light it can on all questions of interest to man or society, to elicit discussion, and induce the people to find out truth for themselves. It will be well also for the people to bear in mind, that, if they are to have the advantages of a free press, they must tolerate great latitude of discussion, that they must not withhold their support from a periodical because it now and then puts forth an heterodox opinion. Perhaps the periodical's heterodoxy, upon closer examination, may turn out to be wholesome orthodoxy. Who knows ? " Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good."

These are some of the means which we possess for educating the people. Let these be judiciously and faithfully employed, and it will matter but little what the schools are. The most that can be asked of our schools is simply instruction in the art of reading and writing, and in the positive sciences. To them we may look for instruction, but never should we rely on them for education. The community can never be educated in schools, technically so called ; they can be educated only by the free action of mind on mind. Whatever means we have for bringing mind to act on mind, so many means we have for educating the people. Let every man do what is in him to employ these means judiciously and effectively.