

who is ignorant of the true character of an instrument which is the source of the obligation of his oath, can justly appreciate its value? An oath is the basis of our *social* or *political edifice*. "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere *politician* equally with the *pious*, ought to respect and cherish them. A *volume* could not trace all their connection with *private* and *public felicity*. Let it be simply asked, where is the security for *property*, for *reputation*, for *life*, if the *sense of religious obligation* desert the OATHS which are the *instruments of investigation in courts of justice*? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the *influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience* both forbid us to expect that *national morality* can prevail in exclusion of *religious principles*."—*Washington's Valedictory*.

This committee suggest such views as they think best calculated to perfect the great consequences which they have described. Our systems of education are radically defective, and the defect grows out of that impulse which was given to literature by the almost exclusive study of the dead languages during those centuries which succeeded the dark ages. The principles of science were for a great while unknown, and even after their publication they were so entirely above the habits and comprehension of the human race that they exerted but little influence. They *were*, and to a *very great extent now are* locked up in the closet of the learned. The constant application to the study of the dead languages by nations so exclusively, and for so long a time, settled down into a national habit, which became a paramount prejudice in their favor.

It is difficult to eradicate it, and hence the principles of science have been regarded as of minor importance.

There is now a conflict between the two, and the principles of science, like the doctrine of popular sovereignty, are producing a converted action in the mental operations of communities. It is right it should be so; for it is a question whether the *dead languages* have not cursed a greater portion of mankind than they have blessed. The progress of the principles of science is but the current and analytic progress of the principles of scripture. Christian logic is founded on natural laws, and every discovery in science is but the perfection and progression of that logic, to which much of the *dead languages* is diametrically opposed.

The *dead languages* are not practical in their tendency, and yet the whole scene of human pursuits is or ought to be radically practical. The facts contained in them are far remote from the period in which we live, and the constant, and in many instances, unintelligible study of them, has a tendency to enfeeble the mind and unfit it for practical effort. Thus the mind in its capacity