

THE VIRGINIA TEACHER

VOLUME IV

JULY-AUGUST, 1923

NUMBERS 7-8

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE NATION

Address delivered at the third annual dinner given by the Board of Trustees for the members of the Faculties of the University of Chicago, December 14, 1922, and here reprinted by permission of the author from *The University Record*, January, 1923.

HERE is a growing inquiry in the nation as to the social value of the university, a constant query about students' work, about stadia and grandstand athletics. In times past, universities and colleges were not a problem. They supplied the professions with recruits and occasionally they contributed an educated gentleman of leisure to the community. At the present moment, there are hundreds of thousands of youths at the universities and colleges. Most of them are not consumed with a desire to learn what men have done and tried to do in the past; they do not feel the impulse to discipline their minds into instruments of thought. They seek the college degree for its social value, and they wish to "have a good time," indulging in "activities." Meanwhile, the country is confronted with an ever increasing demand for men who know something and, above all, for men who are able to think. The country is growing impatient with young gentlemen of leisure, "activities," and fraternities. People ask constantly what the universities are for.

I

Let us take an inventory. Since the days of Darwin, university men and scientists outside of academic walls have gradually advanced the cause of knowledge, until today one of the fundamental sanctions of common men is thoroughly undermined. Few men now fear the anathemas of the clergy about the awful penalties of the life to come. The clergy that for a thousand years spoke with authority is losing its hold upon men. There has been no successor to Henry Ward Beecher, much as the country has needed another Beecher. The

churches are agencies now of social betterment. They do not appeal strongly to men on the "after life." The preacher is a professional man like other professional men. He leads if he counts at all because of his character and the wisdom of his social methods. Science has taken away the mystery of the divinity that once hedged about him. Science has taken away the mystery that once ruled so large a proportion of the men. Thus millions of people have ceased to feel one of the great sanctions. Having taken away so great a means of stabilizing society, does it not concern university men and scientists to return an equivalent?

Of similar import is the fact that, during the three generations since William Lloyd Garrison's great agitation, the state has pretty nearly lost its grip upon society. In order to arouse men to the necessity of destroying the great economic wrong of slavery, the state was brought more and more into disrepute. The state had permitted itself to become the shield of slavery. The nation was likewise suffering from the same dangerous alliance with a great social wrong. But as the nation finally broke the hold of slavery upon its leaders, the nation came out of the agitation with high moral prestige. Lincoln's work and death democratized and hallowed the nation. But the prestige of the state was forever broken.

Even if Garrison had not lived, the effect of two or three firmly lodged preconceptions of our life would have brought the state to its ultimate weakness. The delicate balancing of powers among three departments of all our state governments has the effect of undermining all sense of responsibility on the part of officers of the state. A governor may "pass the buck," as we irreverently say. The legislature, in deference to the supposed views of its constituencies, may likewise shirk responsibility. And the courts may, and do, avoid responsibility. The Fathers of American democracy were so disgusted with the results of corrupt personal leadership in eighteenth-century

Britain, that they went to the opposite extreme of trying to set up a system of laws instead of a system of responsible men. But laws do not operate automatically. One might cite scores of instances to prove that the most important laws ever enacted in the United States have not been enforced. The effect of the non-enforcement was fatal to the cause sought, for example, the failure to enforce the Sherman Anti-trust Law.

We now begin to see that the elaborate division of powers and careful distribution of authority is failing, failing above all in the old states that once held so complete a sway over the emotions and lives of men. In the old eastern states, the failure to enforce prohibition is daily weakening the state. There must be some person, some leader who knows what modern life requires and who will take the responsibility for acting, even against the apparent will of the majority. Such men have not been trained in the universities. The law schools set up legal practitioners, men who can "find themselves" in the maze of intricacies that now dominates the legal profession. Machine politics does not train such leaders, for the masters of political organizations seek ever to know how best to combine race groups in the great cities or appeal to old prejudices in the country. Their aim is to keep their crowd in office and incidentally to make fortunes out of "the game." The distribution of powers has weakened the state; the failure of higher education and the failure of party politics have still further hastened the decay of the state.

Society cannot long endure a process of undermining the very sanctions upon which social stability depends. That is exactly what our system has been subjected to since the Jackson epoch. But there is yet another aspect of the process. During the constitutional period, Americans set up the practice of requiring every representative to be a citizen of the district for which he spoke and voted in representative assemblies. This appeared to be democratic at the time. It was intended to thwart the control of legislation by groups of powerful men who might set up candidates for as many districts as they could finance in an election; people feared powerful economic groups and sought to democratize representation. The outcome has been to enable small minorities in the constituencies to control the representatives of the great masses of men who

cannot make a business of politics. The representative pays heed ever to his district. He will rob the nation as a whole in order to enrich his constituents. He has lost character as a man, he has failed as a legislator. Such a representative is the natural subject of a boss. There is no incentive for him to study; independent action for the national good is his last thought. He is, in part, the cause of the political machine. Nothing, in my judgment, has more weakened the fibre of our state and national legislatures than just this fact. It is a calamity.

II

I have indicated two very serious developments of the last three generations of American history: the break-down of the sanction of the clergy, the church, the absence of all fear of the penalties of the life to come; and the break-down of the morale of the state, its social and its political inhibitions. Men no longer fear God nor tremble in the presence of the state. The preacher is just a man; the governor and the local judge are mere politicians. Reverence has gone. In part, this was inevitable. When science discovers truth and lays the foundation of vast social betterment, all men must be grateful even if it undermines the faith of the masses. True men never fear the truth. In so far as this state of things is due to misconceptions of the proper methods of democracy, it has not been necessary. When men find that their political conceptions have failed, it is the business of education, both in institution and in political organizations, to abandon false and set up real methods. Democracy cannot long function when its leadership fails. The elaborate machine system is a negation of responsible leadership. It is a truism in our life that leadership has been failing with us now for thirty or forty years. There have hardly been great national leaders since Lincoln. Where both religious and political guidance fails, revolutions breed. France and Russia are the outstanding examples. Shall the United States invite such a catastrophe? That is the query I have hoped to have every one contemplate this evening.

If the American nation is to escape the university must train men to a different public attitude. Three-fourths of our divinity students realize their dilemma. Somehow they do not find a way forward. Three-fourths of our law students feel the hopelessness of the politi-

cal situation, but they are not trained to be physicians to society. The vast majority of our undergraduates permit themselves to care more for grandstand football than they do for the fortunes of either state or nation. Yet the universities and the colleges receive perhaps hundreds of millions annually for the very purpose of training leaders for society. The fault is rather with the older than the younger generation. It is the failure of both higher and secondary education that gives occasion for uneasiness on the part of thoughtful men. With American society surely drifting into disorder, with politics stalled and deadlocked, there is no generation of enthusiastic young men to help us to a sane reform. The national situation is distressing, public opinion is chaotic; and every economic group is seeking to help itself at the cost of us all. Under such pressure the poor security the bosses give must soon fail.

The country has drifted into this position. There has been little statesmanship until recent years. In order to exploit the national resources more rapidly, our fathers imported European labor in unprecedented numbers. Unlike earlier emigrants, the later ones settled in the cities. Their labor enabled American industry to become the greatest industry in the world. But, slowly and surely, the hordes of immigrants came to feel hostile toward their employers and sometimes the country itself. Then another element became involved. The sons of farmers hastened to the growing cities. In order to better their lots and compete with "foreigners," they organized into unions. These unions soon came to think that their interest took precedence over all other interests. And labor, as it is called today, confronts employers with vast numbers, and demands what it can get. The result is great blocs of unassimilated population and far-flung organizations of workers. Labor fights for itself and against "foreigners"; and the owners of capital, quite as well organized, fight for themselves. Nobody is for the public!

At one time the country sought immigrants from all lands. It was only sufficient to be poor and helpless. America was the asylum of the oppressed for a hundred years. Now business men wish fresh supplies of labor, but they fear the ideas that new laborers may bring with them. Now labor unions bitterly oppose the importation of fresh supplies of labor, lest

their employers prove too strong for them. They wish no new competitors in the field of their activities. And the nation flounders, loath to close its doors so long wide open, loath to take in "anarchists," but afraid to exclude fresh labor. Democracy has grown afraid.

The combination of industrial enterprise, vast resources, and the labor of a new and active population has given us an industrial power unmatched in all the world. The industrial output of 1920 was something like seventy billions' worth of goods. That is greater wealth than the world has ever known. The total property of Germany or France is hardly worth more than American industry creates in a single year. But the very existence of this vast wealth constitutes one of the greatest problems of all history. It might not have been a problem, if the plants of industry had originally been scattered all over the country, at waterfalls, near coal mines, wherever railroads could best be focused for general social purposes. But the people were not aware of the need for any such distribution until it was too late to distribute its social power. Business built the system to suit its immediate, not its ultimate, needs.

The consequence is that we have built vast cities—built Paris, Berlins, and Londons—with all the risks, injustices, and unavoidable hardships of life in a great city. Our legislators knew that Paris was the storm center of Europe, that the millions of poor people gathered there had long been the pawns of revolutions and reactions alike. They knew that Bismarck had built a similar storm center in Germany with his Hohenzollerns, his Prussian absentee junkers, his snobbish army officers, and his newly rich industrial masters. Few stop to think that this was one of the greatest causes of the Great War, this herding together of millions of men. With so much of fatal statesmanship before them, American lawmakers and American business men reared their New Yorks and Chicagos at places most convenient for them; and they still talk and plan even larger New Yorks and Chicagos.

Nearly all the industrial wealth of the nation is concentrated in a narrow belt of city-covered land stretching from Boston to Minneapolis. So concentrated is this wealth that New York alone pays more income tax to the federal treasury than do all the states of the South. This fact is of itself a sore problem.

The poorest and the richest of the country are brought into close juxtaposition. The rich speak one tongue; the poor, in general, speak another. The rich have little enough wisdom to make vulgar display; the poor are so miserable they cannot avoid display; such stresses the American democracy was never intended to sustain. These displays and these contrasts are ever exaggerated. When there is work enough for all, laboring men urge strikes; when there is too little work, employers resort to lockouts, in the hope of lowering high costs of production. In summer, working folk sometimes seem to be the happiest and the most reckless of men—the “happiest mortals on earth,” as some would have us believe. In winter, long lines of hungry proletarians stand shivering in the cold, waiting their turns at the coffee counter. And this is free America.

In the presence of these contrasts and without thought of danger, the railroads and builders of industry go on concentrating their vast plants, their huge banks, and their commercial exchanges. The greater part of the real power of the country is thus placed within the easy reach of masses of men who must, in the nature of things, one day be unemployed and starving. Unemployed and starving men cannot be expected long to remain passive. There is but a short turn between starvation and revolution. In neither case does the worker without work stand to lose. He cannot make his case much worse; it may be that he can improve it. A leader among labor groups said at a dinner party recently, “The railroad terminals and the banks of a great city could be seized without the loss of twenty men.” This may or may not be a correct judgment. The fact that working people think such a thing possible ought to set men to thinking.

And, outside the cities, there are the farmers. For half a century they have been declining in relative, and even in actual strength. Today they are the minority of the nation. They grow the wheat of the country at a loss. The workers in the city eat bread at war prices. The farmer who owns his home has to sell it to pay taxes; the tenant who ought ever to plan to buy a home does not think of buying. The former owner of land is becoming a tenant. The tenant is becoming a day laborer. Vast tracts of farm land are falling into the hands of city dwellers who have been able to gather from industry or trade the means to buy lands. Men who have stakes in the coun-

try decline in number every year. It is plainly a repetition of the awful evolution that took place in Italy during the third and second centuries before Christ. This appears a very pessimistic view. Let the optimist read the figures of the last census. There he will find the cause of agrarian unrest and decadence.

But unrest does not usually bring remedies. The unrest of 1893-96 was great and ominous. It brought no solution. The lucky turn in the economic world saved the day for a time. And, later, the Great War set up a feverish prosperity only to plunge the farmer folk into still deeper despair. The old free farmer of the United States is disappearing; and thinking men seem not to concern themselves. Might not the universities seek to lend aid? Is it our business to remain contented with the policy of drift till all of us are pushed over the precipice?

And, in the face of the city danger and the menace from the land, men talk of disfranchisement. There is a growing feeling on the part of powerful men, especially among industrial leaders, that democracy is a failure. Very many of these leaders seek openly to disfranchise the city majorities, their own laborers, in the hope of retaining control of the national economic life. People think to unite country folk against city workers and thus retain their power undisturbed. A great American statesman once warned the country that the coming of great cities would be the end of American democracy. Our leaders, ignoring that warning, seek now to avoid the consequences by disfranchising great masses of people. It is proposed in the form of constitutional arrangements. Men's faith in constitutions is to be subjected to still another strain by giving city majorities minority representation in legislatures. And the plan, already in operation in Massachusetts, New York, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania, is to be made effective by appeal to the age-old dislike of country folk for city folk! Is this wisdom? It is the Divide-and-Rule policy of Roman senators.

May we not draw a lesson from our own history—from all history? From 1776 to 1861, the leaders of the reactionary ideals in Virginia and the two Carolinas played this dangerous game. It was known to all that the masses of common folk in all these states were opposed to slavery, and that, if they were allowed fair representation, according to any democratic method, they would surely abolish

the "institution." In each of these states, the owners of property, in the main slave property, were able to prevent the people from getting a majority in any of the legislatures. In the most important struggle that ever took place about the matter, John Marshall, who was the great nationalist, did his utmost to prevent the white, non-slave-holding people of his state from gaining the power to destroy slavery. He thus made strong the power that was soon to disrupt the very nation he was building in his great judicial decisions, building with one hand and destroying with the other. But year in and year out, the Old South kept its masses of plain people from seeking that reform of property relations which alone would have prevented the Civil War. The ablest men the country ever produced thus thwarted democracy. They were setting the stage for their own ruin, the ruin, too, of countless innocent folk who never gave themselves the trouble to learn what was happening. Was there ever greater blunder? The worst way to solve the slavery problem, the Civil War, was forced upon the country by men who sought to save their property by thwarting the will of the majority, by flouting democracy. We may not all have faith in majorities. But surely we shall never find consolation in the conduct of the minorities that have from time to time been able to bring upon the country such disaster as that which marked the terrible years that followed 1861.

And, strange as it may seem, the universities and colleges of the old South, without exception, espoused the cause of those leaders who would rule against the wishes of the majority. In 1819 the University of Virginia was founded in the hope that it would train young men to deal wisely with slavery. In fact, Jefferson left a plan to Virginia whereby slavery was to be abolished, and with least harm. His grandson urged it upon the legislatures. Within ten years both the young university and the legislative leaders of the people abandoned the ideal and the hope of Virginia's greatest statesman. The University of Virginia became the very center of pro-slavery teaching. What influence it exerted—and it was great—was exerted on behalf of what its founder thought a grievous economic and political wrong.

What must be said of the University of Virginia must also be said of the famous Uni-

versity of South Carolina, an institution whose trustees made the unique record of dismissing a president because he did not change his opinions. Thomas Cooper was engaged there as president in 1820. He was the first, I believe, in the United States to teach that the Old Testament was not an inspired book. He was known to entertain that view in the beginning. He did not change his view. In 1833 he was dismissed because he still taught the same thing he began with. Thus trustees and governors of universities and colleges accustomed themselves to regulate men's opinions. In Virginia, in South Carolina, in Alabama, everywhere in the Old South, the universities set up by the state taught that the owners of property should govern society, even when they must deny democracy to do so. In the denominational colleges, there was the same trend. Heads of divinity schools declared in favor of the divine right of slave-owners to hold their property as against all opposition. And when, by chance, teachers or preachers warned people against the prevailing dogma, they were, without exception, dismissed. The South, in the heyday of its greatness, gave the nation an example of what it means to suppress majorities.

Having concentrated their wealth in the form of workers and plantations (these plantations forming a narrow belt that extended from Petersburg, Virginia, to New Orleans), the planters were so situated that they could control states and their whole social system; and the South's delegations in the national Congress were likewise, almost without exception, owners of slaves and plantations in the so-called black belt. The black belt was like our industrial belt; its economic leaders governed. It was a marvelous civilization; southerners made remarkable leaders of men; they were classical scholars and profound students of the science of government. But their fear of the majority of common men proved their everlasting undoing.

III

Shall the nation again make the mistake of fearing democracy? We are in a position to do so. Our vast cities are filled with workers whom many of us fear; and our workers are more and more coming to dislike, even hate, their employers. The nation has accumulated its greatest wealth in these cities where it may

easily become the object of violent strife. Several of the industrial states have, as I have said, set up constitutions that limit the power of the majority. Manhood suffrage prevails, to be sure, but the fruits of manhood suffrage are denied. Our industrial states are free in outward form from industrial control, but, in fact, industrial control is apparent every day. What avails democracy if schemes and methods of popular restraint become the rule of life? Let us have faith; let us cast ourselves upon the ocean of public opinion; we shall be surprised how well we swim.

Aside from the difficulties and the anxieties of the domestic situation, the foreign relations of the country are such that we are apt to have our electorates confused, and so intensify our problem, both from the point of view of democracy and from the point of view of national safety. In 1914, the nation and its citizens owed the rest of the world a sum so great that the interest has generally been estimated at five hundred millions a year. Before the Great War was half over, all that indebtedness was paid in goods at war prices. Now, four years after the war, the nation and its citizens have loaned other peoples enough capital to yield more than a billion dollars a year. The people and the nation are thus the greatest creditor in the world, and the sum already loaned is increasing at the rate of a billion a year. That is a fearful fact. It is a reversal of role so sudden and so vast in its consequences that common folk have not become aware of the new state of things. They clamor for the payment of the interest and capital by Europeans who are too poor to feed their children. They demand payment in some cases as a matter of punishing hereditary enemies, for example, the Irish and German attitudes toward the English and French debts.

There was another great change of roles that came out of the war and the peace which followed. Hitherto, the nation had never been greatly concerned with international security. The people had never known what international fear meant. The war came; it taught them the meaning of Europe and the significance of war on a world-scale. For a time, all good Americans felt the imminent danger of German victory. At the peace, the United States was left secure. Few men were left with any sense of fear of any nation whatever. The German militarist plan had shown what could

be done by that country. When Germany collapsed, there was no longer any power the United States feared. France, with its stationary population, could never attack the United States. England, dependent for its food and raw materials upon ocean traffic, could never make aggressive war upon the country. In fact, England has not in a century made aggressive war among great nations. Germany being subdued, there was security. That was a great gain. The people feel secure; they do not recognize the greatness of the boon. They cannot grasp, it seems, the reality of the fears of European peoples to whom the end of the war has not meant security. We think and vote as though we felt that other nations have only to say they are secure to be secure.

These are great things, although the people of the United States are not aware of them. Another benefit has not been named. The Monroe Doctrine, by which the United States had practically guided the affairs of Latin America for two decades, had never been recognized by the rest of the world before the Great War. When recognition of that doctrine was duly made in the treaty of Versailles, the United States received more than any other nation received at Paris. The American commissioners did not seek the guaranty. They knew it to be dangerous, doubtful in so far as it would affect the peace of the world, and they refused to ask its recognition. The Senate of the United States, aided by Messrs. Bryan, Hughes, Root, and Cardinal Gibbons, compelled them to change their attitude. The other powers wrote recognition into the treaty, the greatest concession in the treaty.

For now the United States and its citizens enjoy a sway and a prestige in all Latin America that equals the sway and prestige of ancient Roman citizens in the regions around them. It is a dangerous thing. It means enmity in all the countries south of us. It means interference with the internal affairs of small nations. It means economic exploitation in a region where peaceful trade might be far more valuable without it. Under it our government is disposed already to re-write the constitution of Mexico. The masses of democratic America are confused. They rarely think of the Monroe Doctrine as a means of aggression. They would feel affronted if they were told that the Monroe Doctrine means to the business interests of the country what the *Drang nach Osten*

meant to the business men of Germany before the Great War.

Thus the country has won three great advantages: economic leadership, security against all the world, and recognized primacy in Latin America. Yet our political leaders and our newspapers continue to talk about our unselfishness and our innocence of all desire for gain. It is a dangerous obscurantism, if not an actual deception. Democracies do not know their foreign relations well. All people may readily be exercised about wrongs other nations commit against them, but rarely think of wrongs their own governments commit. Was there ever a time when education was more needed and when educators had less to say?

The country occupies the very middle position of the modern world, a position like that of ancient Rome with the Mediterranean peoples about her; but no one knows it. The country holds the economic whip hand over the world; and yet our leaders in Congress talk about our being cheated out of hard-earned savings; the United States is safe beyond all other peoples since the day of Augustus Caesar; and yet Congress is warned and the people frightened daily lest we be caught unprepared. Men begin to pick England for an enemy. We hear constantly of army and navy plans. With economic supremacy, with a position in the very middle of the world, what a terror we might be if there were an army and a navy, ready to fight at the "drop of the hat"! And with all Spanish America under willing or unwilling tutelage, what more should the country ask? Has Japan ever enjoyed such an advantage? Has any other people ever held so many of the great pawns of history? I think not.

With a domestic position critical, with wealth concentrated and suspicion growing so that men wish to try Bismarck's plan of limiting popular representation, it does seem that the country needs to train men to think, take lessons in reality, and ponder what distrust of democracy means in our day. All the lessons of the recent war warn us; all the lessons of recent European history warn us; all the experience of American history says: "Beware."

IV

Since so many millions of men have lost their reverence for ancient religious sanctions;

since the old states and their courts have no longer the prestige they once had; since clergymen and politicians alike have been dethroned, either by the discoveries of science or by the workings of democracy, there seems to me only one resource left for modern American society. And that is the university. And with the university I associate the college and the whole army of teachers, high and low, throughout the nation. These constitute our hope. Yet how little we have taken thought of them!

If there are some who think the university a place to prop the fortunes of men already secure, they are mistaken. If there are those who hope to make of the universities places where democracy is to be sneered out of existence, they have been grossly misled. The business of the university is to serve and secure all groups. The universities may not have waked up; the colleges may still be indulging in false hopes as to their privileged positions, where young folk in easy circumstances shall be made happy and comfortable; but they are false hopes. It is too late to try again the role of the universities of the Old South. The university is now, and must ever become more, the home of learning and science, a resort for able men who love research. It is now, or must soon be, free; free to think, to teach, and to write. Without that freedom there can be no university. Germany tried to bolster her imperialism by university support, by guiding the thought of scholars and schoolmasters. Shall democratic America follow that example?

If the universities rise to the new demands, they will supply us the new sort of preachers, the better sort of lawyers, and young graduates who care less for grandstand athletics and more for the rewards of public service. And they will fill the country with teachers and writers of truth, with women whom legislatures and the leaders of business will delight to reward with salaries commensurate with the greatness of the task to be performed. Why should the teacher of our children be skimmed in his living and crowded into poor, musty rooms for his residence? Who is worth more to society than he who instructs the men and women of tomorrow?

A country less democratic cannot tide us over the dangers ahead; an ignorant electorate will not show us a rational foreign policy, nor shall we learn the great things of civiliza-

tion by putting out the very light of history and science. If ever any nation had a great mission, it is ours. Let us not deceive ourselves; the examples and the precepts of Jefferson and Lincoln cannot be abandoned. If thinkers arise and teachers bestir themselves our great democracy shall yet not fail.

WILLIAM E. DODD

DEVICES FOR ENLIVENING THE PRESENTATION OF SHAKESPEARE IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

“THE subject matter of English consists primarily of activities, not of information. It provides a means for the development of ideals, attitudes, skill, and habits rather than for the acquisition of a knowledge of facts and principles,” says James Fleming Hosc, chairman of the committee on the reorganization of English in secondary schools. “Activities,” you say, “but what do you mean by activities?” This question can best be met by an apt illustration. Take for instance a class in English literature. The instructor is attempting to introduce the study of Shakespeare. How can this be accomplished in such a way as to gain the strict attention and interest of the class at the outset? The construction of a miniature miracle wagon by the pupils themselves would no doubt prove an activity well worth the necessary time and work. This need not be elaborate. A “double-decker” built on the order of a two-storied doll house mounted on wheels would present to the class the general idea of these old miracle wagons. The space beneath the lower platform should be draped, showing the use of this lower division as a dressing room and—with the aid of a trap door in the stage—as Hades, a very necessary division for the early performances. Likewise with a trap door in the upper platform the miracle wagon would be practically complete—having a stage, a lower division representing Hades, and a platform above representing Heaven. Besides, with a little touching up this miracle wagon would serve finely as an illustration in discussing the development of the stage. Later an Elizabethan theater might be con-

structed. Thus we have activities in which the pupils can take a real part and gain valuable information through their contact with the actual construction far better than through a mere general discussion, with no model to base their knowledge upon.

There is a great need for the use of activities in the study of literature. No subject offered in the high school curriculum can plead a greater need. Although there has been in the past a noticeable neglect along this line, it is thought that the educators of the present day are waking up to the advantages derived from the use of activities and are giving their much-needed influence to promote this phase of education. The study of literature is no longer looked upon as a science. It is now regarded primarily as an art, to be learned by practice rather than by generalization. The field of activities open in the study of literature is full and will be discussed in concrete form later.

It might be well first to notice briefly the decided change in the aims and methods employed in the teaching of literature. In the past the primary aim of the literature teacher was to give an analytical treatment of all literary masterpieces, laying stress upon notes, allusions, figures of speech, and meanings of words. In order to accomplish this aim, it was necessary to tear each literary masterpiece to shreds, to put each word under a microscope and examine it as to its grammatical relation, its literal or figurative use, its precise shade of meaning, and its special appropriateness in the passage.¹ These aims and methods have undergone a very noticeable change. James Fleming Hosc says, “The essential object of the literature work is so to appeal to the developing sensibilities of early adolescence as to lead to eager and appreciative reading of books of as high an order as is possible for the given individual in the end of both present and future developments of his character and the formation of the habit of turning to good books for companionship in hours of leisure.” From this we gather that in the teaching of literature we should not be so concerned with the student’s gaining mere facts and principles, but rather that the high ideals of life and conduct should be broadened, and the power of self-expression

¹Stevenson, *The Old and the New in Literature Teaching—English Journal*.