

cation and have tried to get intelligent people to go into it as their life work.

Now, the easy way to save money is to reduce salaries. It requires no thought, no effort, no reorganization. It can be done by anybody who understands the rudiments of arithmetic.

But it is, in my opinion, the stupidest and most short-sighted means of cutting the costs of education. We wish to make the teaching profession attractive by adequate and secure compensation. We shall never have a respectable educational system until we have accomplished this aim.

We defeat this aim if we reduce salaries. And in addition we miss the only advantage of this depression, the opportunity to increase efficiency through house cleaning and reorganization, the opportunity in short to give better education at lower cost. A policy of salary reduction will indeed produce a lower cost; it will produce also a poorer education, now and in the future.

This country is still the richest in the world. For the things it ought to have it can well afford to pay. But it cannot get the money through an antiquated and iniquitous taxing system. As long as the preposterous general property tax is the chief source of local revenues we shall be unable to meet the demands which our civilization inevitably places on local governments. As long as a person who does not own real estate but has an excellent income may make no contribution whatever to the support of these units, while the farmer, who owns real estate but gets no income at all, sees his property sold for taxes, we may expect to hear that the cost of government must be reduced.—ROBERT M. HUTCHINS, in the *New York Times*.

WRONG PARTY

This month's greatest mistake was made by a book agent who tried to sell the book "Ask Me a Question," to a kindergarten teacher.

WHAT WE ARE TRYING TO DO IN SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

THOUGH people of every age have probably considered their age a changing one, and rightly so, for change is the law of growth and life, yet I doubt if change in mechanism and mode of thought has ever followed change so swiftly as in our time. The boys and girls now in school and college should be especially well equipped to deal with the complex world of confused ideas in which they will find themselves. How far are we helping them in school and college?

Now education in school and college roughly falls into two divisions; technical or practical education, the end of which is to make the young man or woman a self-supporting economic unit, a wage earner, and education which has no apparent practical end in itself and which for the want of a better name we term cultural.

The first kind of education or training is exemplified in the schools by such courses as sewing, cooking, typewriting, shop practice, and in colleges and universities by various engineering courses, by courses in the applied sciences and by courses in law, medicine or pharmacy; the second kind of education, namely cultural education, is furthered by such studies as Latin, Greek, modern languages, English, and philosophy. Of course one might say that these subjects sometimes have an economic end, since many of the students who excel in these subjects later support themselves by teaching them, but as a matter of fact, we can safely say that these cultural subjects are pursued by most students as ends in themselves, with the hope that with their mastery while being not better off materially, they may have acquired the art of thinking, tolerance, a worth-while point of view, a sense of values, a desire for truth, a passion for inquiry, all of which qualities will

14

help them to adjust themselves to the intricacies of modern life.

Now though there is a sharp distinction in colleges between the courses in applied sciences and courses in the Arts—in my own college, Union, for example, we differentiate such courses from the beginning of the freshman year—yet in many cases these curricula overlap. The students of the applied sciences must perforce learn some English, modern language, and history; often an Arts student will from choice elect some applied course about which he is curious. Nor is the division that we often make between applied courses and technical courses a sound one, for beyond doubt many of the applied courses if taught by wise men, can have as refining an effect upon the mind as participation in a so-called cultural course. The intricacies of higher mathematics that deal with electrical theory, the making of the design of an efficient engine, or the slender and graceful span of a great bridge that approaches perfection of line and the maximum of strength from the order and quality of the materials—surely the designing and making that demand such precision and exactness and often a sense of beauty, develop and cultivate the mind as much as would the study of Cæsar's Commentaries.—Frankly, I must confess that in writing this paper I had written the *Odyssey* in place of Cæsar's Commentaries. But in honesty I had to scratch out and substitute Cæsar, for I had just finished reading the *Odyssey*, and I can hardly think of any book the study of which would have as great a refining influence upon young imaginative minds open to the loveliness of life.

Let me reiterate that in practically all school and college curricula practical and cultural subjects overlap, and that many so-called applied subjects are in themselves truly cultural.

The curricula of all good American col-

leges are practically the same as are the curricula of public and private schools that prepare men and women for college. Of course it is a matter of common knowledge, that all high school graduates will not enter college, in fact that not more than ten per cent of them will do so, and school men have the problem of so adjusting their curricula, that the ninety per cent who will end their formal education with high school will have some adequate preparation for life, and that the ten per cent may receive such education as fits them to enter college. This has doubtless been a difficult curriculum problem for school men to solve. I wonder if some day we will not follow the distinction the Germans used to make before the World War, and may still make. Their old high schools were of two kinds, the *real-schule* and the *gymnasia*. Those students who wished to prepare themselves for the study of applied sciences or technical courses attended the *real-schule*; students who wished to enter the universities were educated in the *gymnasia*.

However, in this struggle we are making to prepare young people for life, it is not of the curricula of schools and colleges that I wish to speak. Curricula have been worked over so often and with such an expenditure of energy that they are on the whole not bad.

Our main fault in both the American school and college is, that we have the wrong kind of yard stick with which we attempt to measure the achievements of our students. We have the yard stick of quantity rather than quality. Let me explain how the system of quantity measurement works in most colleges. I presume it is the same in schools, though I am not thoroughly familiar with school systems. In most colleges a student takes a number of courses and acquires a number of credits. From time to time, when he is deficient, he may supplement these credits by courses taken in recognized extension or summer schools.

When the credits add up to 120 or some set number he is given a bachelor's degree. The bachelor may be educated or almost illiterate; if he has been a true student he will of course have some education at the time of graduation; if he has been lazy-minded and interested in everything but his studies, and still cunning enough to pass subjects with a minimum of effort and a third or fourth grade, his mind is but a chaotic thing of shreds and patches; in fact, I have known a few undergraduates who steadily declined under the present system, and who were not nearly as strong when they were seniors, as they had been when freshmen. It is a patent fact that the degree of Bachelor of Arts from any American college nowadays, is no guarantee that the holder is an educated man, or that he has any intention of becoming an educated man.

Now it is pretty obvious how this quantity measure has arisen and been established in school and college. During our pioneer period and during our late emergence from the pioneer period, our country was overrun with frauds, quacks, and charlatans. We had many fake colonels, fake doctors, fake preachers, fake lawyers, fake teachers corresponding to institutions and occasions that bred them, fake wars, fake medical schools, fake theological schools, fake law schools, and fake colleges of the Arts. To fight against these evils, the educator of fifty years ago set up the artificial standards I have spoken of; so many credits add up to a degree, there must be so many buildings in an accredited college, so many bottles in an accredited laboratory, so many books in an accredited library, so many this and that. We have still enough quacks and charlatans with us, but quacks and charlatans who can never withstand the clear light of truth, are no longer blatant and obtrusive, but lurk only in the dark places.

This quantity measure in school and college has served a wise purpose, and already

accomplished a useful end, but its usefulness is now over. Now the time has come to break the old yard stick of quantity and take the new yard stick of quality. Let me illustrate what I mean by describing a more ideal type of college than we have at present. Now a boy attends college for four years, sits through some 4,000 hours of recitation lecture and laboratory, passes examinations in 20-odd courses many of them isolated, and at the end receives a bachelor's degree. The banquet of knowledge has been spread before him by the professors, and he may have eaten fully and drunk deep or merely sniffed at what seemed to him unsavory messes. Supposing we changed all this and threw more of the burden upon the students; after all, what the students really learn they must dig out and learn by themselves. Supposing we drew up a curriculum like the following:

Mathematics—Algebra; Analytics; Calculus; Differential equations.

English—Beowulf; Chaucer and his times; Shakespeare and his times; Milton and his times; The 18th Century; The Romantic period; The Victorian age; American literature.

History—General history of the world; Greek history; Roman history; Mediæval history; English history; American history.

Classics—Homer; Virgil; Lucretius; Plato; The Greek tragedies and comedies: (A reading knowledge of Greek and Latin as evidenced by answers and an ability to write Greek and Latin prose).

Modern Languages—French; Spanish; German; Italian; (A speaking, reading and writing knowledge of any two of these languages).

These curricula are not models of content—in fact, I have made them up as fast as I could write them down—and they are singularly imperfect. I use them merely to illustrate an idea. Suppose we could say to a boy entering an Arts college: here is an outline of a certain amount of work for

14

you to do, and in this work there are professors to help and assist you. You must pass three or perhaps even two of these divisions before you will receive a degree. You may come up for examination, whenever you like, and whenever you think you have mastered these subjects. If you are clever, you may pass these divisions in two years or you may take three or four or five or even six years to pass them, or you may never pass them at all. Our only demand is that you must have a large body of well-ordered and well-digested knowledge, before you attempt the examinations, which will be thorough, both written and oral, and conducted by an examining board of professors.

Under such a system, obtaining a degree would not be a matter of so many years in college, so many hours in classroom, so many courses passed; rather the degree would guarantee to the world that the holder had acquired certain definite bodies of knowledge. That is what I mean by substituting the measure of quality for the measure of quantity in school and college.

Someone may very well ask: if you are convinced that this quality measure would overcome so many flagrant evils and bring much beneficent results, why not put it in force at once? But that question would only be asked by someone who did not understand school and college. School and college are conservative, trustees and boards are sticklers for established traditions. Teachers love to teach what they have been taught in the same manner in which they received instruction. You may set up all the machinery you like; nothing succeeds unless there is a stout backing of academic public opinion. We must move slowly and build what good we have onto something better. My only hope is that by steadily making minor changes, by increasing honours courses, by emphasizing the importance of those we have, we may approach this system of quality. Whenever I have an

opportunity I speak of it, and my chief interest in making this speech tonight is to lay such a plan, vague as it may be, before you, the directors of education in New York State.

But no matter how we may twist and mutilate and revamp curricula, we will only achieve the end of education when we have great-hearted, believing teachers who want to teach and who believe that teaching is the noblest and most important of all the professions. Some teachers are splendid, many are perfunctory, lazy, incompetent, time-serving. Many have graduated from colleges that have given them neither lofty ideals nor any body of knowledge. You see how things move in a vicious circle: the college does not educate the potential teacher, and the badly educated teacher from the inadequate college cannot stimulate a child's mind. For there is no blinking the facts, that the ablest young men in college go into the applied sciences, business, or the professions of law and medicine; and with shame we admit that often the second raters go into church and school, as preachers and teachers. And none the less is it obvious that no matter how much a person has been trained in the history of education, teaching methods, practice teaching, etc., he is of little use as a teacher unless he has a profound and thorough grasp of a body of knowledge coincident with the subject he professes to teach.

When the fine, intellectual, truth-seeking teacher and the true student are brought together, we have the fine school or college.

Now fine teachers are rare and they are the greatest asset to the state. School or college without fine teachers amount to little or nothing. What can we do to get teachers of quality in school and college? It is very difficult in this age of materialism, when the commercial idea has permeated not only school but church, to get idealistic teachers, who love what they are doing and

believe in it. How can we encourage more true students of fine mind and character to enter this the greatest of all professions? First, I think, we should remove from teachers as many artificial impediments as possible. I have always resisted with all the strength I have the flat rate system of payment. It is very easy to administer a college budget by saying an instructor is worth so much, an assistant professor so much, a professor so much. That system may keep peace in the academic faculty, but it is not a true or just system. For one instructor may be worth twice as much as another, and a good professor may be ten times the value of a lazy and indifferent one.

So in school systems of different states teachers have been hampered by a number of standardizing regulations. Laws that state that a man and woman teacher doing similar work must receive the same rate of pay, laws that do not allow married women to teach in the schools, seem hard and artificial as are the standardizing rules in colleges. The mediocre mind, the mediocre administrator, adores standardization. Such splendid reports can be drawn up! So obvious is the justice of the whole plan!

As a matter of fact, a woman may be worth twice as much as a man. If a married woman is a good teacher and she is not allowed to teach, the community is the loser. In selecting teachers there are but a few things to consider. Do they know their subjects? Are they moral, kindly, and idealistic? Do they love teaching? We cannot achieve much in school or college without good teachers; they are jewels of great price, the most precious possession of community and state. I always like to read over what Sir William Osler, himself a great and beloved teacher, said of others in his profession:

"The successful teacher is no longer on a height pumping knowledge at high pressure into a passive receptacle. He is no longer

Sir Oracle, perhaps unconsciously by his very manner antagonizing minds to whose level he cannot descend, but he is a senior student anxious to help his juniors. When a simple, earnest spirit animates a college, there is no appreciable interval between teacher and the taught; both are in the same class, the one a little more advanced than the other. So animated, the student feels that he has joined a family whose honour is his honour, whose welfare is his own, and whose interests should be the first consideration."

Through the years great educational prophets like Milton, Huxley, and Wilson have made pronouncements in no uncertain tones on the end of education. The burden of their prophecy has always been the same: Prepare for life; prepare to live more fully and richly. That must be our aim in school and college, and only those who believe and trust in life are fitted to teach the young. In our applied courses, we must be mindful that in this machine age of ours invention follows so fast upon the heels of invention, that a young man of mere technical skill may "become a servant overnight," and that if he has been taught no theory that may serve as a foundation for a new structure, he has been robbed of his birthright. For "education is training of men who are to rise above the ranks. . . . It is for those who approach life with the intention of becoming professional in its fields of achievement."

For the practical life a boy in school and college should have a broad training in mathematics and the principles of physics and chemistry. Instead of trying to teach everything to a young man of twenty, we should endeavor to lay foundations on which he can build himself into a wise and useful man at forty.

Let us hope that the school and college of the future, whether dealing with arts students or applied scientists, may encourage in all young minds a generous attitude

14

towards life, a moral sense towards others, a love of inquiry and a search for truth, so that our young people may be fitted to cope with the oppressive human problems under which our American civilization and the civilization of the whole world now groans.

FRANK PARKER DAY

“LIONS DON'T WRITE STORIES”

A SUGGESTION FOR TEACHERS OF
AMERICAN HISTORY

“**D**AD, why are there so many stories about men killing lions and so few about lions killing men?” a small boy asked his father.

“I suppose, Son, it's because lions don't write stories,” the father replied.

Histories, unfortunately, are much like that. They are written largely from the viewpoint of the nation, the class, or the racial group to which the writer belongs. British histories are pro-British; American histories, pro-American. One needs to read both to get the whole picture.

The place occupied in our own histories by “America's tenth man,” the Negro, is another illustration. As a matter of fact, this element in our population has made really notable contributions to American progress, when one considers its African background, two centuries of slavery, and other heavy handicaps. Yet relatively few people, white or colored, know anything of this story, because our histories, practically without exception, are silent on the subject. They show us the Negro only as a semi-savage slave, raising an occasional insurrection, or as an ignorant, dangerous freedman—always a burden, a liability, and a threat. Of the Negro as a patriot in every American war, as writer, educator, scientist, artisan, inventor, business and professional man, they tell us nothing. Yet this racial group comprises one-tenth of the nation's population, and its story, on the whole, is the most

dramatic and interesting chapter in the American romance.

Believing that much might be gained and nothing lost by balancing the picture—by putting in the lights as well as the shadows—the Commission on Interracial Co-operation has published a sixteen-page booklet entitled “America's Tenth Man,” setting out briefly but comprehensively the Negro's constructive contribution to American life. This story the Commission has made available to public schools and colleges for use as a supplement to American history, and more than 60,000 copies have been used in that way in hundreds of schools in twenty-odd states. In some cases it was used in connection with classes in history, sociology, civics, or English; in others, it was run through the entire school. The results invariably seem to have been good.

A new edition of the “Tenth Man” has just been printed and the Commission, located in the Standard Building, Atlanta, announces that a copy will be sent without charge to any teacher requesting it. As one means of vitalizing the teaching of American history, the writer does not hesitate to recommend it.

R. B. ELEAZER

IF THE SCHOOL facilities are inadequate, if the teachers are too few, there is no reason but community parsimony. It is poor policy. Economy in government is good, but it is false economy that stints the means of public education. If savings are to be made, let the whittling of public expenditure be done elsewhere. All insurance of progress, all hope for the success of democracy, all expectation of the continuance of public welfare and safety depend upon the proper maintenance of public education. The teachers should be given all necessary facilities to enable them to instruct in accordance with the best ideals of their profession.—*Detroit News*.