THE PRINCIPLES OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY CHIEFLY BASED ON THE
SYSTEMS OF THE UNITED STATES, ENGLAND,
GERMANY, AND FRANCE.

By CHARLES HERBERT THURBER.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

There is a mass of descriptive and statistical material about the great school systems of modern culture states, the descriptions being generally rather hard of comprehension for the uninitiated reader, the statistics meaning anything or nothing according to the methodology and teleology of their manipulation. So far as the mathematics and history of education have been laid under tribute for this study the best available sources have been employed.

Here and there we have in pedagogical literature references to the influence of the pedagogical development of one historical nation upon another, often, too, something in the nature of a comparison of this national system with that or the other. For the most part these references may be assigned to two, and only two, sources, having also two quite distinct purposes. The first of these is the genial enthusiasm of some youthful pedagogical cosmopolite who having made, generally in Germany, the discovery for which the world had long been waiting, of a more perfect, nay the only perfect pedagogical revelation, holds up the foreign model before the eyes of his countrymen with much the same spirit as that with which the Crusader pressed the cross upon the attention of the Turk.¹ To a more or less fanatical Chauvinism we owe the other common class of allusions to foreign schools which are made for the purpose of showing how immeasurably inferior they are to the native product. Between the Scylla of imitation and the Charybdis of execration there is a narrow channel,—few there be that find it—in which the aim is purely scientific.

I am far from denying that it is sometimes a good thing to

¹ Germans make similar discoveries. Note the remark in *Deutsche Zeit. f. Ausl. Unterrichtswesen*, 6, III, p. 223, "We have ceased to be regarded as the school nation par excellence . . . the staff of leadership in education is believed to have gone over to France and North America."

have our sluggish self-satisfaction roiled by the slipping in of a foreign model; if another nation has anything good we ought to know it, seldom, however, to adopt it unconditionally. Nor is it bad practice occasionally to execrate what is inferior to our own and to take heart of hope, seeing what we have achieved. But the aim of this brief study is somewhat different from either of those mentioned. No new descriptions will be attempted, no novel statistics have been collected, no oracular judgments are pronounced on any system or systems as a whole. The point of view is this: There are certain problems set for every people that undertakes to deal with school organization.

Moreover, such a study, dealing as it does with fundamental principles, should foster the acquisition of a philosophical attitude toward that wide field of interest covered by the term "organization of education." Lewes says, "every science has its metaphysic." If school organization were now a science this paper might be considered an essay in the formulation of the metaphysic of school organization. Perhaps, too, we shall see more clearly that education, as a system, is a development, a product of the evolution of society, and that if the form we have seems not quite to fit our highest conceptions, the way to better it is not by bartering what we have for what some one else has, nor by building a lean-to against our present structure. Further study might well be given to the basal problem for each country: how has the existing condition—system or lack of it—been developed out of the co-operations and antagonisms of universal principles and national peculiarities?

The work might easily be more comprehensive; the field is not all covered, not to say exhausted. But the aim has been to illustrate a method and spirit in pedagogical study, rather than to leave no stone unturned, no corner unilluminated. Interesting as is the historical side of the subject, adorned with such great names as Plato and Comenius, Loyola and Luther, it has been left almost untouched, for the purpose here is not to give a history of school organization theory, but rather to sketch some of the fundamental principles which are now vitally operative in the chief educational states of the world.

THE SCHOOL AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION.

The organization of education is essentially as modern as the applications of electricity or the germ theory of diseases. Something that we call education has always existed in one form or another. In its various stages it has been, first of all, unpremeditated and unconscious, consisting of mere imitation of leaders, and the handing down of tradition; this stage has been followed by a conscious effort to pass on the best possessions of

one generation to the next; finally has come the stage of conscious organized effort for the attainment of definite results. The second, and even the third, of these stages has been attained by various historical peoples.

The education of the past was only for a favored few or for some special class. The formal education of China was for men; of Egypt and India for a favored caste; of Greece, and to a large extent of Rome, only for the men of an aristocratic class. In the middle ages formal education was confined almost exclusively to candidates for the priesthood, and only since the reformation has the idea been abroad in the world that education was a good thing for everybody. The idea that it was a good thing preceded far the idea that it was a necessary thing. In all these stages of education private initiative or church initiative was exclusively relied upon for the founding of the schools. The state did indeed occasionally step in, but only to a very limited extent. There was, speaking in general terms, no education provided by the state at the state expense until within the last one hundred and fifty years. While education was thus narrow in its scope, limited in the number to whom it applied, and inconsiderable in its material relations, there was no field for organization. The phenomenon of the development of an elaborate and complicated machinery to perform a simple and relatively unimportant task is not often met with in the history of social and political development.

The greatest developments in education took place during the nineteenth century. In observing the workings of contemporary school administration there are many things that give us pause, many acts of injustice, much ill-directed effort, much working at cross-purposes, much money unwisely spent. But do we find absolute perfection in church administration, for example, which has been developing for about nineteen times as long as school administration; or do we find a millennial completeness and beauty in our political organization and administration which has been in process of evolution for a much longer period? And if perfection is not found in these fields to which the human intellect devoted its attention almost exclusively through so many centuries, should we despair if we do not find perfection in this newest field of organization and administration? It has been found true, also, that the most perfect schemes, theoretically, that have been propounded and even adopted in the field of education, have not always worked to the best advantage. Absolute perfection does, indeed, seem to be alien to the human mind.

The great achievements of education in the nineteenth century may be summarized in three words: instruction has been made first, free; second, compulsory; and third, lay. It has

been taken out of the exclusive control of the clergy, and it has been made open to all without regard to race, or sex, or sect, and it has been made compulsory upon all children up to a certain age. These three steps in progress, steps which have been taken substantially by all the great culture nations of the world, have lifted the school within the present century to the rank of the greatest of human institutions except government itself. The school is the only institution except government that reaches and influences every individual in the state. In spite of the occasional exhortations of eloquent enthusiasts, we do not, as a whole, sufficiently appreciate the magnitude of the school as a human institution. It is fairly safe to say that there is invested in school buildings and apparatus more capital than is employed in any single field of manufacturing, and it is quite true that the annual expenses of running the schools are larger than belong to any other field of government, unless it be the standing army in the great war powers of Europe.

A few figures will help the understanding. In the United States in 1896-97 the amount expended on public schools was about \$200,000,000. The amount paid for pensions for the same year was \$134,000,000. The total expenditure of the postal department for the same year was \$90,000,000. The expenditure for the war department for 1897 was \$48,000,000; for the navy department \$34,000,000; interest on the public debt \$37,000,000. The expenditure for education exceeded the total receipts from customs by about \$50,000,000. The total number of children in the public schools was over 14,000,000; in private schools about 1,500,000; and in public and private secondary schools about 600,000; a total of over 16,000,000 exclusive of those receiving higher education, which amounted to some 200,000 more, the grand total reaching up to 16,255,000. The total number of teachers in the public schools was something over 400,000, an army nearly twice as large as that called out in our recent war with Spain. The great railway lines furnish perhaps the only branch of industry to be compared in extent with school keeping. In 1897 there were 823,000 employees of the railways of the United States, while the net earnings of the railways for that time amounted to \$332,000,000. The aggregate amount of wages and salaries paid was \$465,000,000.

These figures, will not, it is true, show so strikingly in favor of education when we take up the great European countries. There were in England in 1897 5,500,000 children on the school registers, and some 130,000 teachers of all kinds. The amount appropriated by the government was, in round numbers, \$35,000,000, but it should be remembered that the schools

derive income also from endowments, school fees, local rates, voluntary subscriptions, and other sources, which amounted in England and Wales in this year, 1897, to about \$50,000,000, making a total of \$84,000,000. In Germany in 1890 the total number of children of school age was 8,694,000. No official statistics of the number of schools, pupils, teachers, etc., are issued for the entire German Empire. The number of elementary schools was estimated in 1891 at 56,560; of pupils attending them, 7,925,000; and of teachers 120,000. The immediate expenditure on elementary schools was about 242,400,000 marks, or something over \$60,000,000. The amount expended for the army in 1894-5 in Germany was 617,764,000 marks, or about \$124,000,000. In France the expenditure of the state on public instruction in 1895 amounted to 190,554,000 francs, or a little less than \$40,000,000. The total number of pupils in the elementary schools was 6,261,000. France had in 1897, including Algeria, Martinique and Reunion, a total of 409 secondary schools, including lycées, communal colleges and colleges for girls, with 99,264 pupils. The receipts from the state, departments, and towns in these secondary schools in 1896 amounted to 37,274,000 francs. These are large figures, all.

Thus strikingly does Dr. Skinner put the matter:¹

"The United States, to-day the youngest of all, is the only great nation of the world which expends more for education than for war. France spends annually \$4 per capita for her army and 70 cents per capita for education; England, \$3.72 for army and 62 cents for education; Prussia, \$2.04 for her army and 50 cents for education; Italy, \$1.52 for her army and 36 cents for education; Austria, \$1.36 for her army and 62 cents for education; Russia, \$2.04 for her army and 3 cents for education; the United States, 39 cents for army and \$1.35 for education. England six to one for war; Russia 68 to 1 for war; the United States, 4 to 1 for education. The United States spends more per capita annually for education than England, France and Russia combined."

Instances might be given showing the large place played by education in great cities. In the city of Chicago the expenditure for education amounts to about \$9,000,000 annually. There are between five and six thousand teachers in the city and upwards of 200,000 pupils. No other one department of the city government begins to approach in the amount of expenditures the public schools. In New York city the annual school budget is close to \$20,000,000. These figures are not given as absolutely accurate, but as approximate. They are presented solely to show how vast a human interest education has become from the purely business side, and for this purpose they are convincing enough. It is needless to argue that proper

¹ In the *Best Education for the Masses*, Chas. R. Skinner. *Proceed. Nat. Ed. Assn.*, 1897.

methods of organization and administration are essential to the successful conduct of this great business.

THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT AND THE SCHOOL.

In general, educational organization corresponds to national forms of government and administration. In Germany and France there is extreme centralization; the greatest centralized system of educational administration in the world is that of France. The centralizing principle is the same in Germany, but there education is one of those affairs that is left to the individual states. The German Empire as such does not control education, but Prussia, Saxony, Württemberg, Baden, Bavaria and the dozen or more minor states that make up the Empire, have each a centralized control, based in most particulars upon the Prussian model. England presents a modified form of centralization, if, indeed, it can be called centralized at all. There is a direct appropriation of money by the central government which is expended under governmental direction and in ways prescribed by the Committee of Council on Education. The control of the schools is brought about rather by the methods adopted for expending this money than by the assumption of any governmental prerogative to direct education. In the United States we have decentralization in its most complete, and, one might almost say, in its most aggravated form. So far as the national government is concerned the position is the same as in Germany.

The United States makes no direct appropriation for the support of the public schools, though it has set aside lands for school purposes and has made direct grants for certain educational objects, particularly for instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts. The United States Commissioner of Education exercises no control over education at large, his duty being simply to collect and publish statistics and disseminate valuable information to the schools. But when we come to the individual states the analogy with Germany breaks down. While each state recognizes public instruction and provides a state superintendent with limited authority, the actual direction of school affairs practically resides in the smallest governmental division. Not satisfied with that even, the people of the United States have generally gone further and created a particular and minute governmental division for school purposes, namely, the school district. The evil effects of this district organization are clearly shown by Martin.¹ At present there is in the United States a clearly defined tendency to a larger

¹ Geo. H. Martin: *Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System*, p. 114.

administrative unit in school matters.¹ The power of the central authority varies considerably in the different states. An interesting study might be made of this particular problem, the extent and variety of central versus local authority in school administration in our country.

We thus see that those nations which have strongly centralized governments, whether those governments be republican or monarchical in form, have also strongly centralized school administrations. Republican France has the most centralized administration of all; republican Switzerland has no centralization; monarchical Great Britain has a centralization with the starch all taken out of it; and the republican United States has the most extreme de-centralization. At the two extremes stand the two republics, France and the United States. It may be idle to speculate as to the relative merits of these two antagonistic forms of organization and administration, for as they correspond to national life and political organization they are not likely to be changed on purely theoretical grounds. Still, a brief consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of the two forms will be undertaken in the following chapters, for many unsettled problems cluster about the fundamental antagonism which these forms represent.

THE ADVANTAGES OF CENTRALIZATION.

Of the advantages that inhere in a centralized system of school administration some are quite obvious, others must be sought below the surface. Without straining any relations the considerations that follow may fairly be arrayed in favor of the centralized forms.

First: Absolute uniformity may be secured throughout in the school system of the state. The administrative advantages of such uniformity are very great, so great as often to overwhelm every other consideration. Many if not most of the perplexing administrative problems in the United States to-day arise from the lack of this uniformity. Where the schools have a definite objective goal ahead of them which all must attain, uniformity in plan is very alluring. It must in fairness be recognized that some degree of uniformity has so far been found necessary in managing large bodies of teachers and pupils.

Second: School administration is eliminated entirely from local politics. In a strike in New York, Brooklyn policemen were sent to New York City, and New York City policemen to Brooklyn in order that they might do their duty toward the strikers free from the influence of personal associations and

¹ See Report of the Committee on Rural Schools (published by Nat. Ed. Assn.).

local ties. Some things must always be done in public administration that are distasteful and that cause anger and dissatisfaction in certain of the population. In the enforcement of the excise laws in New York State, for example, the matter has been placed entirely in the hands of a state board. The excise officers are thus strangers in the community, they have no friends to protect, and in a given town they have no political future which may be ruined by prosecuting violators of the law. Where centralization prevails an entire course of study is not likely to be overturned in a moment as the result of a passing wave of public prejudice, whim or fancy, nor is the teacher's, or principal's, or superintendent's position placed in insecurity through an often fanciful slight to some influential local magnate. Evils of this kind are too well known in our own country to require any further explanation.

Third: Centralization of administration prevents the adoption of serious changes in the curriculum until after long, careful and scientific consideration has been given to these proposed changes. It thus tends towards conservatism. An illustration is found in the reforms in the German higher schools instituted as a result of the Berlin conference of 1890.¹ There had been a somewhat general demand throughout Germany for changes in the system of higher education. Through the Minister of Instruction invitations were issued to nearly fifty prominent school men of Prussia who met together in solemn conclave for two weeks. The sessions of the conference were opened and closed by the Emperor in person. The eyes of the whole country were directed upon the doings of this body. It met with such authority, and under such auspices as have not favored the work of any educational commission in the United States. Reports of the meetings were published from day to day in the papers, and at the close the entire proceedings were issued in a great volume which forms a storehouse of pedagogical material. The changes that were finally adopted were slight, relatively speaking, and yet in the line of public agitation. The step taken was not a great one, but it was towards progress.²

Fourth: Centralized administration tends to bring a higher grade of talent into educational administration. In the first place, a seat in the cabinet is the highest position, ordinarily, within the reach of a citizen. The Minister of Public Instruction is generally an able and distinguished man, and the recognition of education by the government as one of the co-ordi-

¹ See the Higher Schools of Prussia and the School Conference of 1890, by C. H. Thurber, in Report of Bureau of Education, 1889-90.

² After ten years in which to try the effect of these innovations, the Emperor issued another proclamation on the subject (see p. 379) which has aroused educational circles, and may lead to another conference.

nate departments of administration in itself dignifies the subject. Further than that, where a curriculum is prescribed in some detail for the entire country by a small body, expert knowledge of the highest order is likely to be called into play. I notice, for example, that in the plan of studies of the French lycée, the work in philosophy is outlined by Paul Janet, and the other subjects are in the hands of men of equally high authority, though not so well known in the United States. The higher officers of education under these conditions constitute also a fairly permanent body who are enabled to inaugurate and carry out a definite programme of work impossible when position depends upon annual or biennial re-election by the people. The tendency in centralized administration is to place and to leave the direction of education in the hands of professional experts, prepared for their work by special and severe training. Even the British system with its partial centralization has been able to call to its administration a line of distinguished men of whom I need only mention Sir Joshua Fitch and Matthew Arnold. Indeed, on this whole question I can scarcely do better than to quote what Arnold himself says:

"I come, lastly, to the third point for our remark in continental education. These foreign governments which we think so offensively arbitrary, do at least take, when they administer education, the best educational opinion of the country into their counsels, and we do not. This comes partly from our disbelief in government, partly from our belief in machinery. Our disbelief in government makes us slow to organize government perfectly for any matter. Our belief in machinery makes us think that when we have organized a department, however imperfectly, it must prove efficacious and self-acting. The result is that while, on the continent through boards and councils, the best educational opinion of the country,—by which I mean the opinion of men like Sir James Shuttleworth, Mr. Mill, Dr. Temple, men who have established their right to be at least heard on these topics,—necessarily reaches the government and influences its action, in this country there are no organized means for its ever reaching our government at all. The most important questions of educational policy may be settled without such men even being heard. A number of grave matters affecting public instruction in this country,—our system of competitive examinations, our regulation of studies, our whole school legislation, are at the present moment settled one hardly knows how, certainly without any care for the best counsel attainable being first taken on them. On the continent it is not so; and the more our government is likely in England to have to intervene in educational matters, the more does the continental practice, in this particular, invite and require our attention."¹

Fifth: Centralized administration permits of the immediate introduction of such reforms in the curriculum as have commended themselves to the conservative judgment of the educational authorities. Thus the reforms proposed by the school

¹ Matthew Arnold, *Higher Schools and Universities of Germany*.

conference of Prussia, so far as they were adopted by the educational administration, were put into effect at once all over Prussia by ministerial decree. It did not take years of agitation and continual local combats and a long process of educating public opinion to bring these reforms about. Having been determined upon by the educational administration, they were at once put into effect, whether the local authorities thought well of them or not.

Sixth: Centralized administration tends to the organization of education on broader lines than is possible with purely local ends in view. Education is apt to be considered from the point of view of national service and value. The reorganization of education in France in the last quarter-century illustrates this point. It could not be expected that all the communes throughout France would realize after the disaster of the Franco-Prussian war the necessity of recreating their state by educational means. A few high-minded statesmen first recognized this, and by legislative enactment took measures for the education of France which were founded upon the highest political wisdom. Vast sums of money were expended for a purpose which was remote and somewhat ideal; the constant temptation to sacrifice the future best to the present good to which mankind so generally yields was put aside by these statesmen and the educational system reformed with the future best steadily in view. It is possible, then, under these conditions, for educational statesmanship of high order to develop. The best instance we have of this in our own country is probably afforded by the work of Horace Mann in reorganizing the school system of Massachusetts. It is true that he had comparatively little power, and that he was obliged to build up the influence of his great office; still, the work that he accomplished remains for all times a monument to us of what far-sighted educational statesmanship may accomplish for the schools of a state in spite of bitter opposition from short-sighted temporizers.

Seventh: Centralized administration relieves school officers of the continual struggle over curriculum and courses of study to which such a large proportion of their time must otherwise be given, and leaves them free to carry on the great work of teaching and to develop methods of instruction to a high order of perfection. This is substantially illustrated in Germany. Nowhere is there a more intelligent and active body of teachers than in the various German states. Germany has been the great home of pedagogy, whither, only a few years ago, all students from the United States who wished to study education were obliged to go. We may fairly ask the question whether the great development in methods of education which has taken place in Germany would have produced so many valuable re-

sults if the teachers, and particularly the principals of schools, had been obliged to consume a large part of their time in the discussion of the curriculum and of purely administrative questions.

Eighth: Centralized administration provides absolute rules for the qualification and appointment of teachers, removing these matters entirely from local influence, laying out a regular course of preparation for teachers and providing the institutions necessary to secure that preparation. A uniform standard of teaching efficiency throughout the state is thereby attained. The system of French normal schools is a fine illustration of this. Not only does the government provide normal schools for the instruction of teachers, but at the head of these normal schools stand two superior schools for the express purpose of preparing teachers for the normal schools themselves.

These are the chief advantages which seem to me to flow from a centralized system of educational administration. On the other hand we may inquire what the disadvantages of such a system are, or, to put it in positive form, what are the advantages of a decentralized system of education such as we have in the United States? The answer to this question will be the subject of the next section.

THE ADVANTAGES OF DECENTRALIZATION.

As we have seen in the preceding section the centralized form of school administration offers many substantial advantages and puts forth strong claims for general recognition. Yet in the United States the centralized form has never prevailed, indeed, all attempts toward it have been bitterly opposed; and even in those countries where the acme of centralization has been reached we already see the beginning of a strong reaction towards decentralization. The decentralized form must then have some strong claims to put forward for popular favor, must offer advantages that in the minds of many quite outweigh those of the competing form. What are those advantages?

First: Analogy with other branches of administration is the most obvious if not the most fundamental advantage of the decentralized form, and of the centralized form as well for that matter. So long as the decentralized form corresponds to the general ideal of the people it is to a certain extent futile, of course, to consider the question of introducing a more centralized organization.

Second: Decentralization gives opportunity for individual initiative. This is, perhaps, the greatest argument in its favor. In place of a dull uniformity, there is a sprightly lack of uniformity, springing from the differences in individuals at the head of educational administration in different localities. A

new idea in education may be adopted and put into effect at once and proved in a small area to be good or bad; if bad, its evil influence is not likely to be extended; if good, it becomes an object lesson for others. Thus, in place of a small number of experts administering the whole system, there arises a large body of talented individuals, each striving to do the best in his particular field, with every stimulus to personal exertion and every opportunity for the exercise of creative ability. There is a wider development if not a higher development of administrative capacity.

Third: Decentralization permits instant adaptation to local needs. There is some justice in the claim that where the people pay for the schools, they should have the kind of schools they want. Centralized administration may fail to provide adequately for the specific needs of individual communities. All general laws are apt to work hardship upon individuals. Decentralization avoids the possibility of such local injustice. Where local needs are real and based upon sound reason there seems to be no fair ground for ignoring them.

Fourth: Decentralization introduces a spirit of generous rivalry between different communities, which, so long as it remains generous, is wholesome. The elimination of a proper competitive spirit from modern society is as yet a dream of visionaries. Indeed, the old saying that competition is the life of trade is more respected to-day than it was a few years ago, though it has been given a larger significance and scope. Helvetius held that it was only ambition that made the difference in men and in nations. It certainly would seem that there are few individuals, few communities, few states which may be safely left to develop the highest degree of effectiveness without the spur of competition. Few men of ambition would be willing to be deprived of that spur; most men are only too deeply conscious of their need of it. A proper rivalry between states, cities and adjacent towns has been a mighty force in advancing education in this country.

Fifth: So far as teachers are concerned, decentralized administration offers the following advantages:

(a) Provisions may be made by which capable persons, who for various reasons may have been unable to pass through the stages of the prescribed course of preparation, but have yet acquired adequate education and have the gift of teaching, may be brought into the service of the community. There is no principle of justice by which such persons can be fairly deprived of this opportunity.

(b) Teachers have a better opportunity to react upon the conditions which create them and the powers which employ them. This reaction under a centralized system must at best

be very indirect and proportionately ineffectual. Under a decentralized system the teachers are able to get directly at the moving springs of the institution of which they form a part, and thus it is possible for them in considerable degree to modify the educational conditions under which they work. In any intellectual occupation such a reactive opportunity is highly to be desired. Action without reaction is contrary to the laws of nature.

Sixth: Another consideration in favor of decentralization demands a little more extended treatment. Decentralization favors the participation of all the interested social factors in the administration of education. These social factors or powers are the family, the community, the church and the state. Under strong centralized administration such as we see developed in France and in Germany, the state usurps practically the entire control of the educational system.

The question may even be raised whether the great achievement of the last century in producing universal, compulsory, lay instruction is to stand unchallenged for all time. If we take up the subject from an historical point of view, we find that the three social elements which have been crowded out of the control of the school by the state, namely, the family, the community and the church, are the very factors to which the schools have owed their development. The interest of the family can never be anything but most keen and vital in everything that pertains to bringing up children; certainly, it never ought to be otherwise. If it be true that parents do take less actual interest in educational affairs now than at an earlier period, the increase in centralized control may have to answer for this loss. To the efforts of the church schools in the beginning owed a vast deal, and the church has showed no willingness to abandon its share of school control. The common school originally owed everything to the community, for the origin of common schools is undoubtedly to be found in the banding together of a few neighboring families to secure better facilities for the education of their youth.

All these statements are as true of the United States, *mutatis mutandis*, as of the other countries we have been considering. The church in the early days of Massachusetts, for example, practically was the state. There are, indeed, few better instances of an ecclesiastical state than is to be found in the first century of Massachusetts life. In the United States there is to-day no little agitation of the question as to how the family can come once more into closer connection with the school. Women's clubs are taking up the question, and in many other ways the matter is being brought to public attention. Furthermore, the social life of the community as a whole seeks to

find a way of impressing itself upon the school organization. A provision for this purpose was inserted in the so-called "Harper Bill" for reorganizing the school system of Chicago. By that provision school visitors were to be appointed from families residing in the neighborhood of each school.

While we have decided in the United States that education as supported by the state must be entirely disassociated from all ecclesiastical matters, yet it cannot be doubted that decentralized organization gives vastly greater opportunities for the participation in educational activities of the family, the community and the church. Sometimes this participation may take the form of annoying and even injurious interference, so that a public school system based on state support may occasionally resent this proffered assistance. But the question may fairly be asked whether it is not, on the whole, desirable that opportunities for such participation should be afforded to those great interests upon which education has historically been built. Interests which naturally and inevitably have to do largely with educational progress should be afforded opportunity to react upon the educational system of the country. Intellectual affairs grow and flourish best where a warm interest is felt for them, but this interest is enduring and effectual only when those who share it are not mere spectators, but are also fellow workers. Those who can advise, decide, lend a helping hand, interest themselves much more deeply and keenly for the progress of any matter than those to whom everything is sent down as a commandment from higher authorities, to whom everything flows from some external source. This applies as truly to the teachers themselves as it does to the family, the community and the church. Decentralized administration, then, enables justice to be done to all parties concerned in the progress of education. Even though the state dominates the situation, it does not entirely exclude from its councils the other great factors of society life.

It is curious and suggestive to note the past history and present status of this particular problem in the different countries we are considering. In Germany, for instance, where the most extreme form of centralization has existed, next to France, there is now strong agitation for decentralization. Professor Rein says, for example: "What the state does for education does not belong to its immediate duties and never will belong thereto unless the state interferes with the most inalienable rights of individual and personal freedom. The duty of the state is simply to bear itself helpfully, protectingly, and supportingly toward that which has been formed independently by free association. Otherwise, the state runs the danger of killing many flowers of progress in the bud; of produc-

ing by its uniform rules an opposition that will be highly dangerous to the state itself. One of the surest teachings of history is that intellectual flood tides cannot be held back by mechanical means, but where they are overthrown by external authority the death of all intellectual life is thereby sealed."

In France, too, which shows the most extremely centralized form of organization, there is at the present time a general movement toward decentralization, a movement which has been felt thus far chiefly in the universities, but which will doubtless extend to the lower schools. Compayré's views are, perhaps typical of the new tendency. He says: ("Doctrines of Education," Volume II.) "When we have agreed upon the principles, when we have recognized the necessity of instruction, it still remains to discuss the practical means which may assure its progress. The first of all is to leave more of initiative to individuals, more liberty to the communes, to the small aggregations of men which are united by common interests. In the United States it is the individual states and the communities which take charge of the organization of schools, regulation of methods, and the supervision of teachers. Would the cities of America make such large expenditures for instruction if they were not themselves the masters who regulated in their own way and according to local interests all which concerns the instruction of the children? There it is not only a few hundred inspectors scattered over the surface of the territory who watch over national education; it is six hundred thousand teachers who, divided into committees selected by election, share the care of supervision and inspection. Let the state, then, make a larger appeal to the initiative of the communes. Let it not demand absolute uniformity in methods. Let it take account of the diversity of needs and it will more and more see the citizens co-operate zealously for the accomplishment of the serious task of popular instruction."

The history of England gives us a different picture. There the state, as it favored free trade and left economic conditions free, also regarded the realm of culture and education as a free field into which it might not enter. But they have broken more and more with this view in England since the middle of the nineteenth century, and have recognized the idea of state organization as necessary for the educational system; so that now the agitation in England is chiefly in the direction of greater centralization.

Centralized France is moving toward decentralization; centralized Germany in the same direction; decentralized England is becoming more and more centralized, and centralization is making progress in the United States. It may fairly be ques-

tioned whether it is not possible to so combine centralization and decentralization as to secure the essential benefits of both without sacrificing the most important advantages of either. It is upon this problem that much attention may profitably be directed in the near future.

SECONDARY SCHOOL ORGANIZATION.

In secondary education we reach a more debatable territory. Two quite antagonistic doctrines prevail in regard to secondary instruction. That it is for a special class only, not necessarily free, and designed to prepare specifically for some higher career is the older view, everywhere prevalent half a century or less ago, and still dominant in the states of Europe. From this standpoint the duty of the state toward education fully ceases when common school instruction has been provided, and advanced education should be procured at parental expense. That secondary education should be free and accessible to all, should reach as many as possible, and should aim to give a certain amount of additional instruction of the best nature possible to all who have the leisure to obtain it, is the more modern view that underlies the public high school in the United States. These two theories of secondary education are incompatible in the same national system.¹ Where the latter view prevails, as in the United States, the former is represented, or at least is generally considered to be represented, by private schools of different kinds. These two ideas do therefore exist side by side, but they have not been, and probably cannot be incorporated together into a national school system.

It is largely if not altogether on account of these different views that we do not find the period of secondary education conforming in its space and time limits in the different countries. Under the first view, that it is for a special class and to prepare for specific careers in life, the pupil must be caught early and segregated from the masses; so we find the period of secondary education beginning in Germany at an early age. This view is much less prevalent in France, and the different divisions of secondary education there rest upon a common foundation up to the sixth class, that is, to the beginning of the eleventh year. It is, however, only in the United States where the second view fully prevails, that we find secondary education joining itself to a uniform preliminary course and beginning at a somewhat advanced period.

It may be noticed in passing that there are disadvantages in this arrangement of secondary education in the United States

¹In the country where the first view is most strongly held, Germany, secondary education is not a recognized division but is included in higher education.

which are not felt under the arrangement in France or Germany. Covering only the short period of time between the close of the grammar school course and the beginning of the college course, secondary education in our country is subject to pressure from both sides. The whole process of differentiation which takes place in France and Germany either at a very early age or progressively, in the United States is thrown entirely into the secondary schools. Here the pupil must decide, or some one must decide for him, whether or not he is to go later to the college or university, and this decision in itself is an important one for the school work since it determines whether the pupil's course of study is to be dominated by college entrance requirements, by the needs of some business, or by the purpose to attain the most liberal culture possible within the time limits.

If the pupil has decided to go to a higher school, then the further question arises which school shall he enter? As the requirements for admission to different schools have been varied, the settlement of this question is again a great difficulty to school authorities. If the recommendations in the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements are generally adopted, much of this difficulty will be removed. The secondary teacher in any given school in Germany or in any given class in France has a great advantage over the secondary teacher in the United States in knowing precisely what the pupil is aiming at. There need be no hesitation as to the method and subjects. These are, indeed, prescribed, the career of the pupil is fully marked out, and the great work of sifting pupils for different careers in life is taken entirely off the hands of the secondary teacher.

One of the great achievements of this century in common school education has been making it free. We find a contrast to this in secondary education, which is not free in any of the foreign countries we have been studying. In Germany the fees of secondary schools are very considerable, for example, in the catalogue of the Berlin Gymnasium zum grauen Kloster, the statement is made that the school fees amount to 100 marks, or about \$25 a year, to be paid quarterly. The amount is sometimes more than this. In France the tuition at the lycée varies from 80 to 200 francs, added to which, of course, is the cost of board which amounts, in the highest division of the Lycée Louis le Grand, for example, to 1,500 francs. In England the cost at the great public schools, which furnish all the secondary education worth mentioning in that country, is much greater. At Eton the cost is about £200 a year, including board. It is, therefore, only in the United States that free secondary education is provided. Upon what

grounds are we justified in providing such free secondary education?

An interesting answer to this question is given by Frank A. Hill, Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education.¹ From his first argument I quote the following:

"And so freedom of choice, when the question of what one's life work shall be comes up, is a basic thing in government by the people. Upon the wisdom of this choice turns the welfare of each unit in the state and therefore of the state itself. So vital is the connection between the individual's choice and the state's integrity, so essential to wisdom of choice is one's awakening to his own capacity and one's vision of the prizes that are possible to such awakening, that no state can afford to suffer its children or any portion of them to grow up without this revelation of themselves to themselves and without this stimulus from the splendid visions of a larger usefulness and a finer happiness.

"And so the total result of the process when people in general try to make something of the opportunities which are theirs under a wise government of their own is an uplift of the state through an enlargement and stimulus of the state. It is the essence of democracy—this freedom of intelligent initiative and push by the individual along the lines of his taste or capacity, a freedom that permits him to rise from the lower plane to the higher, if he can and will. So good a thing is such freedom for the individual and, therefore, for the state, that the public should spare no pains to keep the avenues of ascent open. If free public education of a high order keeps these avenues open—and with all its imperfections it seems the wisest scheme for this purpose that human ingenuity has yet succeeded in devising—that settles the wisdom of having it."

The importance of this freedom of choice becomes more striking when compared with the situation in France and Germany. There the choice is made forever at an early age. This choice once made, there can be no variableness or shadow of turning. Either the child is elected to belong to the classes, or doomed to remain with the masses; and as secondary schools are pay schools, the choice depends primarily not upon talent or intellectual ability, but upon the financial ability of the parents. This fact is recognized by German educators. It is only recently, indeed, that the common schools of Germany have been free and have ceased to foster class distinctions. Even yet, as we have seen in our discussion of the universal common school, there is in the organization of these common schools enough of differentiation left to cause serious discussion. It will therefore be some time at least before any reorganization of their higher schools doing away with class distinctions can be looked for. In France the continual struggle that has been going on to postpone the period of bifurcation in the higher schools, and the very slight difference that exists in the priv-

¹ How far is the Public High School a Just Charge upon the Public Treasury? *School Review*, Vol. VI, p. 746.

ileges which the different diplomas open up to their holders, clearly show the appreciation of this danger in that country and the movement towards its remedy.

Another argument in favor of the high school is that it exerts a powerful stimulus for good upon the schools below. Again I quote from Dr. Hill, who has stated this point so well that it is hopeless to attempt a better statement:

"One well recognized and valuable fact is this, that the high school exerts a powerful stimulus for good upon the schools below. It holds up before the young ideals of higher and broader scholarship; it is the gateway to otherwise inaccessible realms beyond; it appeals to the ambition of the young; it appeals to this ambition at a critical time when it is important that inferior ambitions shall be forestalled; it is a golden strand in that interest which holds the young up to scholarly endeavor. It fits in with the thought that noble inspiration comes from above, not from below, that normal children respond better, not when they are pushed from beneath, but when they are drawn from on high. The longing for higher things thus aroused, the children do better work in the lower schools; they are more readily guided; they hold to a definite course more steadily. Indeed, it is as true of the mind as of any ship that sails the seas that it must have momentum to obey its helm. If this ambition to attend the high school is, in some measure, imitative—a mere spirit to do as others do—it is, in a larger measure, a spirit to study for study's sake or for the rewards that study brings. It is not surprising, therefore, that school committees, with scarcely an exception, should bear witness to the bracing influence of a good high school upon the grades below, experience thus confirming what theory would lead one to expect."

That this is not a merely sentimental argument, all educational history shows. The universities have stimulated the secondary schools, and the secondary schools again have reached the schools below them. This movement is nowhere better exemplified than in our own country. The higher schools exert no such stimulating effect upon the lower schools in Germany, or, indeed, in France. There this intellectual stimulus is replaced by compulsory laws and by the special prizes in the way of desirable careers in life that may be won only through the higher schools.

Here, however, comes in the question as to the good or ill effect, the advantage or disadvantage of this clear distinction into elementary, secondary and higher education. The growth of man is, after all, a continuous process, and the development of the individual is an organic evolution. Any arbitrary subdivision of the periods of education tends to destroy the conception of this unity, and, furthermore, tends inevitably to develop the spirit of class distinction. More than this, what Mr. Hill calls "the seductive pause" between the grammar school and the high school, the fact that at this particular point such a large number of pupils leave school, that only a few either can or will go on to the higher school, tends to break down

educational unity and weakens the hold of the higher school upon the people. The reservation of a select few precious branches of knowledge for the higher schools without even allowing the lower schools a taste of them not only tends to create an aristocracy of learning, but also robs the lower schools of treasures that rightfully belong to them. The more a school system is regarded as an organic whole the less chance there will be for public opposition to paying money for secondary education.

The conditions for admission to the secondary schools of the different countries are apparently somewhat vague. I do not find, for example, in the catalogues that I have examined of the German Gymnasias, any definite statement of requirements. A statement made in one programme is as follows: The examination and reception of new students will take place on a certain day, scholars will present testimonials of dismissal from the school that they have visited before, as well as a certificate of vaccination. The entrance requirements are naturally much simpler and admit of less formulation where the child enters the secondary school at an early age. In the United States there has been some conflict over the question of admission to the high school, one party adhering vigorously to an entrance examination, the other party willing to admit on certificate from the lower school. The latter practice now generally prevails. In European countries, without exception, the egress from higher educational institutions is much more carefully guarded than the ingress to those institutions. It is comparatively easy to get in, but hard to get out with a certificate or degree.

The reasons why pupils attend secondary schools are hereditary, social, economic, ethical. Parents who have enjoyed a certain education themselves and occupy a certain social position quite naturally desire that their children should follow in the same path. How much of the child's own tendency in that direction depends upon heredity and how much upon its constant environment from earliest days is a question. A certain number of people, also, always covet the best things because they are best. The desire for a higher education springing from a thirst for knowledge is not so uncommon in the period of adolescence as pessimistic valetudinarians would sometimes have us believe. These two influences, the hereditary and the social, are forceful in varying degree in all peoples. The social reason has been most strongly felt in the older civilizations where rank and caste have come to be somewhat definitely defined. The attendance upon the higher schools in Germany, for example, is practically the privilege of the aristocratic few. Certainly, those who possess a higher education are forever

marked off by social boundary lines from those who do not possess that advantage. The economic reason for pursuing higher studies lies in the fact that these constitute the gateway to the professions, and, in foreign countries, to the higher posts in the civil service, in short, to what are considered the most desirable occupations of life outside of trade and commerce, and even there a higher education is demanded for the better class of positions.

DIFFERENTIATION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL.

The elementary schools, in Germany especially, have a problem of their own as to whether there shall be one universal elementary school, which, so far as it goes, shall be attended by all scholars, or whether there shall be a separate preparatory school for those who are going into the higher schools. In secondary education this problem becomes far more complex. The time obviously must come when students will differentiate according to (a) the professions or careers in life which are picked for them by their parents; or (b) their own natural aptitude and predilections.

Where the secondary school has a long course and begins at an early age, as in Germany, the choice, which must be made by the parents, is in no small measure determined by pecuniary ability to pay the fees. The postponement of this choice to such an age as will enable the aptitudes and endowments of the student to be taken into consideration has been a matter of serious consideration by the educational world.

What fills the place of secondary education in Germany has been well and often described, best of all by Russell in his *German Higher Schools*. There is a complete "trifurcation," shown in three distinct institutions: the *Gymnasium*, ancient and classical, the *Oberrealschule*, modern and scientifically disposed, and the *Realgymnasium*, a half-way-between affair, would-be mutual friend, but really mutual enemy. Each type has a nine year's course, and each is planned to catch the pupil when he is nine years old. Once started in any one of them the pupil has no chance worth considering to switch over into either of the others. Often there is only one type of school in a given locality, the three courses never being found under the same roof.

Six years in any one of these schools gives the right to the one year so-called "volunteer" military service, a privilege dearly prized and often dearly purchased for a favored son by pathetic sacrifice on the part of the other members of the family. At the end of these six years hosts of students quit school. The military privilege is practically the only common advantage which these schools offer. There is a very complete and inex-

orable code of "privileges" attached to graduation, really amounting to tremendous prizes. Of these prizes the gymnasium has more than a lion's share. To put a boy at nine into any other school than a gymnasium is practically to shut him out then once and forever from the most attractive professions. So long as the gymnasium retains this monopoly of the highest prizes of life in Germany, its opponents may rage in vain.¹

In the Frankfort plan an effort has been made in Germany, and received with approbation, toward the solution of this problem by postponing the choice for a number of years after entrance upon the higher schools. This, however, does not remove the fundamental objection that the choice of any higher career at all for the student must be made by the parents at about the age of nine.

In France there has been a long history of development along this line, which it may be well to sketch somewhat more in detail. There are three types of secondary schools in France, the lycées belonging to the state, the city colleges, and private schools, the latter being part lay and part Catholic. But there are no important inner differences, so far as the plans and aims of instruction are concerned, in these three schools. The lay private schools have fallen off notably since 1880, and now very few of any importance exist. Secondary instruction in France is based upon the statutes and regulations of Napoleon I, by which the University of France was created between the years 1801-1808. Before the Revolution, instruction was based upon the study of Latin, and the monastic orders, chiefly the Jesuits, constituted the great majority of teachers. We have already seen something of the efforts made in the Revolution for elementary schools. The Constituent Assembly did decide in 1791 for the creation of a system of public schools which should be free to all citizens, and in September, 1793, the Convention decided that besides these schools there should be three other orders of instruction provided for by the state: first, for artisans; second, for other classes in society; and, third, for the pursuit of those subjects of instruction whose serious study was not attainable by all. This third step corresponds to the present conception of secondary education.

These schools were to be called institutes and to consist of four classes. The two first should be parallel, and the others

¹ No less a person than Emperor William, however, fairly recognizes the injustice of this gymnasial monopoly. A decade ago, shortly after he ascended the throne, by a decree he started the only effective educational reform in Germany for a generation. As king of Prussia he is in position to bring things educational to pass in that state, while what is done there becomes, by reason of Prussia's general influence, a measure of what is likely to be done in other parts of the Empire.

so planned that they could be attended together, or one at a time. The subjects were: In class first, mathematics and physics; class second, morals and politics; class third, applied mathematics and physics; class fourth, literature and the fine arts. This plan of Condorcet remained on paper.

Next came Lakanal's plan of a central school with a rather highfaluting programme embracing mathematics, physics, experimental chemistry, natural history, agriculture and trade, original psychology, political economy, jurisprudence, philosophy of history, hygiene, arts, grammar, belles lettres, ancient and modern languages and drawing. Some order was brought out of this confusion by Daunon, the proposer of a law in 1795 in which he divided the scholars of the central school into three grades, and the subjects of instruction also into three grades. Pupils from the twelfth to the fourteenth year were to pursue drawing, natural history, ancient languages and elective modern languages; from the fourteenth to the sixteenth year they were to pursue mathematics, physics and chemistry; from the sixteenth general grammar, belles lettres, history and jurisprudence. The preponderance of the realistic studies and the philosophical tendency of these programmes denote their revolutionary character.

The success of these schools was very moderate, largely on account of incapable teachers. Only a few of them could later be changed into lycées. It is to be noted, however, that these programmes have the germ of the tripartite division which still exists in France in higher education, namely, a literary and classical instruction with Greek and Latin, classical and realistic instruction mixed, and realistic instruction with modern languages.

By the law of the first of May, 1802, the lycée was substituted for the central school. The decree of the 10th of December, 1802, says with true Napoleonic directness, "In the lycées Latin and mathematics shall be chiefly taught." Latin and mathematics still remain the backbone of the secondary instruction in France. The whole educational organization has not broken with the plans of Napoleon.

Under the Restoration, in the programmes followed from 1815 to 1821, there was a violent reaction in favor of the classical and against the realistic studies. History was despised, philosophy was to be regarded as the completion of rhetoric and to be taught in the Latin language. Public opinion, however, drove the administration to more liberal rules which were introduced in 1828 by Minister Vatimesnil, to whom is due the introduction of elective instruction in the modern languages in the lower classes and permission to introduce special courses, *cours spéciaux*, in favor of those scholars who had no taste for classi-

cal learning. Here is a germ of the realistic instruction, *enseignement spécial*, later called *enseignement moderne*. The development of these courses was favored under the government of Louis Phillipe. After the Revolution of 1848, thanks to Minister Carnot, the question was first raised of the overloading of the school programme and of differentiation according to the needs of the scholars.

The solution of this whole question lay in bifurcation, separation into the classical and the realistic programmes. The plan of Fortoul, 1852, separated the classes of the lycées and colleges into three grades: first, the elementary classes, eighth and seventh, with the same plan of instruction as the common schools, except that Latin was given in class seven; second, the grammatical division, the same for all scholars; besides Latin Greek was taught in class six, then modern languages, French, history and geography, geometry and arithmetic; third, the higher division in which the lessons in French, Latin, modern languages and history remain common, but the remaining subjects from class three to the class in logic—the term philosophy being unacceptable, but logic corresponding to the present class in philosophy—formed two separate divisions which led to a humanistic and realistic bachelor's degree (*baccalauréat ès lettres* and *baccalauréat ès sciences*). Commenting on this arrangement, M. Stropeno, one of the editors of the *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement*, says that it was certainly altogether too symmetrical to be practical, and yet can be defended on pedagogical grounds.

The putting of this plan into operation was prevented by petty rules based on mistrust. The teachers were fettered by the regulation of their work down to the very minute. They were practically compelled to be as superficial as possible in their attainments, since only two categories of teachers, humanists and realists, were recognized. So there were two sorts of maids of all work. The reason of this, as given in the ministerial report of the 19th of September, 1853, was to preserve them from idle investigations, vain subtleties, and false pride in individual ideas! The teachers, too, had to wear the official dress all the while, and shave their beards. Is it any wonder that the most gifted soon forsook the calling? This went on for ten years, during which rich and independent people sent their sons into the schools of the priests which were opened everywhere after the monopoly of the state was abandoned in 1851.

A change was made by Minister Duruy who took office in June, 1863. Favored by Napoleon III he again restored the name philosophy to the highest class, shoved the bifurcation ahead from class four to class three, where it soon practically

disappeared, elevated the teaching of modern languages by providing special teachers, emphasized instruction of history in the lycées, and organized realistic instruction so that it was advantageous for trade and industry. It is interesting to note that he also founded at Cluny a special normal school to prepare teachers to give this realistic instruction. This institution is now closed, the special examination for real teachers done away with, and the name *enseignement spécial* also.

The next great improvement was made by Jules Simon, whose circular of the 27th September, 1872, and book on *La réforme de l'enseignement secondaire* are epoch making and form the basis of the present condition of the question. Most notable points of his plan are the addition of a course in geography and living languages, increased instruction in the vernacular, diminution of Latin verse and Latin themes and general diminution of written work. He also was the first to introduce monthly teachers' conferences in every lycée. There was a reaction, and in 1874 a new plan was promulgated in which the real studies were less prominent. In 1880 Jules Ferry introduced another reform which was based upon the ideas of Simon. In 1890 new instructions were published touching various matters of detail. So much for a brief and far from satisfactory sketch of a field of school-programme evolution that in all its details is worthy of the careful attention of students of secondary education.

In England, in almost all the greater schools, there are at least two chief divisions, the classical side and the modern side. Along with these, according to the character of the schools and the careers for which they prepare, we find a military side, army class, commercial class, science or engineering department. There is no such separation of the schools as in Germany. There is a uniform substructure with a late bifurcation according to the local needs of the school. In the larger cities, many schools, as in Leeds, have strong commercial tendencies. In the schools of North England, the technical branches and natural science are particularly favored. Some schools, as Cheltenham, make special preparation for military examinations, and so on. The different divisions of the school are shown in the arrangement of Clifton College, for example. From the eighth to the eleventh year constitutes the preparatory school; from the eleventh to the fourteenth the junior school; from the fourteenth to the nineteenth run the three divisions, classical, modern and military. The differentiation, therefore, is postponed until the fourteenth year. To be more specific, when a boy is eleven years old he must leave the preparatory school and enter the junior school. He then generally goes into a parallel class, his transfer from the preparatory to the junior school

being not dependent upon his attainments, but upon his age. In the junior school he remains until fourteen, when again he must leave that, for he is now too old for the junior boys. Then he goes into what is called the higher department, where he often enters a parallel class to the one that he left in the junior school.

This emphasizes the fact that in England the common fashion of dividing schools is according to the age of the pupils at leaving the school. This kind of division was first made by the Commission of 1861 to 1864, and has been maintained in spite of all criticisms by the last commission. According as the pupils leave the school at the age of 19, 17, or 15, the schools are divided into first, second and third grades. The first two are oftentimes designated as higher and intermediate secondary schools. The schools of the third grade are closely related with the higher common schools, and can scarcely be differentiated from them. The schools of the highest grade prepare their scholars for the higher callings of life, military, civil service and the university. They keep their pupils until the eighteenth or nineteenth year. The schools of the second grade prepare particularly for mercantile, industrial and agricultural life, and dismiss their pupils at the age of sixteen or seventeen. The schools of the third grade, the age limit being fourteen or fifteen, fit boys for the workshop and the store. To the schools of the first grade belong the great public schools, all the best endowed schools, the great corporation schools and a large number of the private schools. There are also preparatory schools which take sons of the better classes up to the age of about fourteen and make them ready for the schools of the first grade. The school hierarchy may be represented, in a way, by the table (after Baumeister) on the next page.

This table is somewhat schematic, and of course does not represent the succession of institutions which any individual has to go through in order. Clever elementary school pupils who have made quick passage through the higher grade elementary school may receive a stipendium and go immediately to the secondary school of the first grade, skipping the intermediate ranks. From what has already been said it is clear that there are in England no differentiated classes of higher schools which correspond to the German *Gymnasien*, *Realgymnasien* and *Realschulen*. All are grammar schools, originally purely classical and corresponding to the *Gymnasien*, which have in modern times developed more or less important modern sides.

The particular question of bifurcation is, in the United States, owing to the loose organization of education and the lack of class distinctions, of far less importance than in Germany,

France, or England. And yet it cannot be said that we have escaped the problem altogether, or that its solution has still been absolutely determined in this country. This problem in our country, however, is a modern one growing out of the rise of the great public high schools. It has been felt that "it is unwise, impracticable, and impossible to divide the pupils in our public high schools into two distinct classes, the one preparing for college and the other for life." Here the secondary schools are the schools of the people. "Throughout the course of secondary instruction, surely there must be no Procrustean bed which every pupil by some process of stretching or dwarfing must be made to fit. Natural endowments as soon as discovered should have full sway within certain limitations. College courses ought to be so adjusted that every pupil at the end of the secondary course, recognized as excellent both in quality and quantity of his work, may find the doors of every college swinging wide to receive him into an atmosphere of deeper research and higher culture along the lines of his mental aptitudes."¹

There is a growing sentiment that the solution of this difficulty is to be found by a wider introduction of elective courses into high schools. The Committee of Ten in its report published in 1893, in commenting upon its final programme, takes the matter up as follows: "Many teachers will say, at first sight, that physics comes too early in these programmes and

¹ A. F. Nightingale in the *School Review* for June, 1896.

Greek too late. One member of the committee is firmly of the opinion that Greek comes too late. The explanation of the positions assigned to these subjects is that the Committee of Ten attached great importance to the two general principles in programme making:—In the first place they endeavored to postpone till the third year the grave choice between the Classical course and the Latin-Scientific. They believed that this bifurcation should occur as late as possible, since the choice between these two roads often determines for life the youth's career. Moreover, they believed that it is possible to make this important decision for a boy on good grounds only when he has opportunity to exhibit his quality and discover his tastes by making excursions into all the principal fields of knowledge. The youth who has never studied any but his native language cannot know his own capacity for linguistic acquisition; and the youth who has never made a chemical or physical experiment cannot know whether or not he has a taste for exact science. The wisest teacher or the most observant parent can hardly predict with confidence a boy's gift for a subject which he has never touched. In these considerations the committee found strong reasons for postponing bifurcation, and making the subjects of the first two years as truly representative as possible. Secondly, inasmuch as many boys and girls who begin the secondary school course do not stay in school more than two years, the committee thought it important to select the studies of the first two years in such a way that linguistic, historical, mathematical, and scientific subjects should all be properly represented. Natural history being represented by physical geography, the committee wished physics to represent the inorganic sciences of precision. The first two years of any one of the four programmes presented above will, in the judgment of the committee, be highly profitable by themselves to children who can go no farther."

The more recent Report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements contains no recommended curriculum, and avoids the problem that caused its predecessor so much trouble by a rather tacit but none the less complete adoption of an elective principle which, carried to its logical conclusion, can only mean the construction for each pupil by the pupil, parents, teachers and principal of an individual curriculum fashioned to suit individual needs. This individual curriculum will be made up out of the separate studies which the school is able to offer. The external conditions modifying school freedom in regard to studies are essentially different in the United States from those in Germany, France occupying an intermediate position between the two. In this I refer to the system of privileges and the like, which in Germany exercises a tyrannical

nical domination over the schools, in France has far less influence, and in the United States is scarcely felt except in college entrance requirements which are becoming more elastic every year. In England, secondary education as a system can hardly be said to exist at all, and therefore the problems in this field that have occupied other countries and called forth various solutions, receive no light from English experience. The new law which went into effect April 1, 1900, for the first time brings secondary education into organic connection with the state system, but the results can scarcely be predicted. In Germany there has already gained some headway a movement looking towards the postponement of choice along lines similar to those of the French tinkering of the past thirty years. The Germans, however, have progressed no further than to begin French instead of Latin on entrance to the higher school, so that not until the third year do pupils reach the point of "bifurcation" where choice must be made between the *Gymnasium* or the *Realgymnasium*. This is a gain, and the spirit shown is more significant than the attainment already made. Even this modest reform is by no means generally popular as yet.¹

Reference has already been made (see pp. 358, 372) to the German Emperor's share in educational reform. He has recently issued another decree, about which the German schoolmen are now buzzing, and which is of enough interest to be given in full.

THE EMPEROR'S EDICT CONCERNING THE REFORM OF THE SCHOOLS.

In regard to the report of Nov. 20 of this year (1900), I announce my agreement to the plan of carrying further the reform of the higher schools that I introduced in the year 1892. The further measures concern the following points:

1. In regard to privileges, the starting point is this, that the *Gymnasium*, *Realgymnasium* and *Higher Realschool* are to be regarded as equal for the general culture of the intellect. No reorganization of the system of privileges is demanded except such as are due to the fact that a special preparation is necessary for many studies and callings in life, in consequence of which fact attention should be given to an extension of the privileges in the realistic schools. This is also the best way to increase the dignity of these institutions and the attendance upon them, and so of accomplishing the wider dissemination of realistic knowledge.

2. Through a fundamental recognition of the equivalent value of the three institutions of higher learning the possibility is offered of emphasizing more strongly the individuality of each. With this consideration in mind I shall have no objections if Latin is decidedly strengthened in the programmes of the *Gymnasias* and *Realgymnasias*. I consider it especially important, however, that, in view of the great

¹ See Reform in the German Higher Schools, Oscar Thiergen, Sc. Rev., Vol. VIII, No. 4.

importance which a knowledge of English has now assumed, this language should be more thoroughly attended to in the gymnasia. To this end instruction in English should everywhere be permitted as a substitute for Greek as far as *Untersecunda*; and further, where local conditions are favorable, in the three upper classes of the gymnasium English should be made optional in place of French, though the latter should be retained. It also seems to me advisable that in the programme of the higher realschools, which, according to the number of hours still has room for it, geography should have more careful attention.

3. In the management of education unmistakable progress has been made in various fields since 1892. But still more must be done. The directors, having in mind the maxim *Multum non multa*, must take greater care that equally high demands in regard to work are not made in all subjects of instruction, but that the more important of these from the point of view of the different institutions, are brought into the foreground and strengthened.

Especial weight should be laid in the instruction in Greek upon the disregard of useless formalities and especial attention given to the æsthetic side and to the relations between the ancient world and modern culture.

In modern languages particular stress is to be laid upon skill in speaking and clear understanding of contemporary authors.

In the history teaching two gaps are still noticeable: neglect of the more important portions of ancient history, and a too superficial treatment of the German history of the 19th century with all its stimulating, inspiring memories and great achievements for the Fatherland.

So far as geography is concerned it is still to be desired that both in the gymnasia and the realgymnasia the instruction should be placed in the charge of special teachers.

In the instruction in natural science observation and experimentation should have a larger place, and more frequent excursions should enliven the study.

In physics and chemistry the applied and the technical sides should not be neglected.

Concerning drawing—and the ability to sketch rapidly what has been seen deserves consideration in this connection—the gymnasia should see to it that those scholars especially who think of devoting themselves to technical studies, the natural sciences, mathematics or medicine, make diligent use of the elective instruction in this branch.

Besides physical exercise, which should be conducted more thoroughly, the arrangement of the daily programme must give more consideration to health, especially through the right placing and considerable increase of the far too short recesses.

4. Since the final examination has not realized the high expectations with which it was introduced, and, in fact, has rather increased than diminished the excessive tendency to university study, this examination should be abolished as soon as possible.

5. The establishment of institutions according to the programme of those in Altona and Frankfort has justified itself, up to this time, for the places where they exist. By reason of the common substructure which covers the ground of the realschool, they also present a social advantage that is not to be underestimated. It is my wish, therefore, not only that the experiment be continued in a suitable way, but also that it be tried in a broader way where the conditions are favorable.

I cherish the hope that the measures that shall be hereafter adopted, and for the execution of which I rely upon the unchanging fidelity and intelligent devotion of the teachers, will be a blessing to our higher

schools, and will contribute their share toward modifying the antagonism between the representatives of the humanistic and of the realistic tendencies and to introduce a reconciliatory adjustment.

Given at Kiel, Nov. 26, 1900, on board the imperial yacht Kaiser Wilhelm II.

WILHELM R.¹

To the Minister, etc.

The question of differentiation that we have been considering never could arise when men were united, as in the middle ages, upon one type of education as the only desirable type. It is therefore entirely a modern question. Into the relative claims of the several kinds of education we have not yet entered, and shall enter only briefly. The old classical type is still dominant in Germany, France, England, and shall we say in the United States? At least Dr. Harris shows that the study of Latin has made enormous gains in the United States in recent years, gains greater in proportion than any other study.

But it is in Germany that the battle wages with greatest fierceness, that huge books are written on the matter in that hearty controversial style which it seems only a German nowadays can get warm enough to use in a purely academic discussion. This is finely illustrated in Schmeding's *Die Klassische Bildung in der Gegenwart*, a book that is really interesting as a collection of facts and an example of special pleading. The author, who is a "real" school teacher, has no difficulty in proving that Germany is in a bad way, all owing to the spirit of classical culture whose corrupting influence blasts every form of national life and enterprise. He gives some interesting quotations: "The lack of enthusiasm for science is universal" (Wiese), "Where does one find enthusiasm that grows with the greatness of the task?" (Hoffmann), "The ideal ends fade more and more; a dull utilitarianism gets the upper hand. Men work only for external advantages, for the sake of the examination and of bread" (Risch), "I hold the learned to be altogether disqualified for participation in practical affairs" (Baron von Stein), "What I want to do above all is to shut up the professors in my country. I will save Prussia from the professors" (Bismarck, 1894), "The finished scholar, who is on confidential terms with the history of a past that is 2,000 years old, must have his sight completely darkened for the sun of the present" (Bismarck, 1882). Another rather more scholarly work is Nerrlich's *Das Dogma vom Klassischen Altertum*. Here the author gives an interesting historical account of the classical element in formal culture, but his work is essentially a polemic for the time as much as Schmeding's.

¹Translated from *Das Humanistische Gymnasium*, 1901, p. 88.

THE ARTICULATION OF THE SECONDARY WITH THE HIGHER SCHOOLS.

Some competent body must determine whether pupils are ready to enter upon higher education, whether it be in college or university. Here arises the broad general question as to whether this determination shall be made by the school that the student is leaving or by some authority outside of this school. If the latter view is adopted, it makes little difference whether the outside authority be the school that the student is entering or a board of examiners. Germany solves the question by making the certificate of the completion of the secondary school the full credential for admission to higher study. The student passes his examination in the *Gymnasium*, *Realgymnasium*, or *Realschule*, receives his certificate, and, fortified with that certificate, may enter any school in the state of the class for which his training has been fitting him. Such things as entrance examinations to universities and technical schools are unknown. In France the examinations for the *baccalauréat* which mark the completion of the secondary school system are conducted by Boards of Examiners who are state officials, but are not representatives of the institution which the student aims to enter. In England everything is made dependent upon the passing of entrance examinations which are set by the authorities at the several institutions. In these three countries, however, secondary education has never been conceived of as being the privilege of the masses, but as a special training reserved for the select few. Such differentiation as may be needed in these few is provided for either at the beginning or at some period during the secondary school course.

In earlier times in the United States the English model was copied fully. At the present time only a few institutions preserve completely the system of entrance examinations, but these few are among the most influential. The West, in large measure through the influence of the University of Michigan, has developed a system based upon the German plan, but which has many unique features of its own. It is interesting to note that the "University of Michigan" was the name given by the charter of 1817 to the whole system of public or state instruction as the same should be organized in the territory of Michigan, the model of the proposed university having been apparently the University of France. A second charter passed in 1821 repealed the earlier one, but still retained the French idea. The constitution of 1835 based the school system on so-called Prussian ideas, but the charter of 1837, enacted under the state constitution, shows new traces of the French influence. This charter directed the Board of Regents to es-

tablish branches of the university in different parts of the state, but these branches should not confer degrees. Several such branches were established and became important feeders to the university. Moreover, they hastened the establishment of the public high schools which took their place. When these branches had been cut away no vital relation remained between the university and the other schools of the state any more than in any other state. But in 1869 and 1870 Dr. Frieze, then acting president, made a practical suggestion embodying a fruitful way of carrying out the Prussian ideas and raising the high schools of the state to the rank of realgymnasias. In his report for the year Dr. Frieze states that his plan had been carried out and the results that he expected to follow are outlined as follows:

"The effect of this plan of annual examination, which, of course, is to be matured and perfected by experience, will be to stimulate the schools to a higher grade, and bring them to a more perfect uniformity of preparation, and thus make it possible to elevate the scholarship in the lower classes in the university. But more than this, it creates at once a reciprocal interest between the schools and the university, and also wins for the university a livelier interest on the part of the citizens whose schools are brought into such close connection with the institution. . . . The principle of this movement is obvious. We go back to the schools and aid their instructors in devising correct plans and laying solid foundations of scholarship, instead of waiting until pupils present themselves at the university prepared under dissimilar and perhaps erroneous systems, often imperfectly prepared, and sometimes rejected for deficiencies which could have been obviated by this previous interchange of views between the faculty and the preparatory teachers."

What the university really does now is to send a commission to examine schools and approve such as are deemed worthy for periods of from one to three years. When a school is accredited, the student who comes to the university properly certificated is admitted at once. Dr. Hinsdale states the results as follows:¹

Schools have been stimulated to a higher grade of work, preparation for the university been made more uniform, scholarship in the lower classes elevated, closer reciprocal interest between schools and the university been created and a livelier interest in the university awakened in the public mind. The schools receive from the university the most practical and useful report on their work that it is possible for them to receive. The Board of Education find great interest in visitations and find them very helpful. The faculty renews its acquaintance with the schools in the most practical and direct of ways so that the faculty discussions and decisions on many subjects are guided in no small degree by the observations of the professors in the schools. Much of the information needed on both sides can be acquired in other ways, but in no other ways can it be made so real, practical and useful as in this way. The system, it may be said, is

¹ B. A. Hinsdale: *The Michigan System* (in *Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools for 1896*).

extended far beyond the state and to private schools and academies as well as high schools. The standards of many of these schools have been raised, their methods of teaching improved, their apparatus and libraries augmented and their tone elevated by being brought into diplomal relations. The most serious weakness of the system is the tendency to undue expansion, and the amount of examining to be done tends to outgrow the ability of the faculty to do the work as it should be done.

Admission to college by examinations set by the college itself is too well understood to require explanation. The chief arguments advanced by the adherents of this system are the following:¹

Entrance examinations furnish in themselves most valuable educational discipline. Entrance examinations as conducted by the leading institutions of the country are an adequate and satisfactory means of determining the qualifications of candidates, and, under existing circumstances, are the safest and most satisfactory means we possess. Conditions of secondary education are most varied, and colleges drawing from large areas have no uniform standard of excellence in preparatory schools to depend upon. By entrance examinations one standard is applied to all candidates for admission, and it is fairly certain that all successful candidates have met a fixed minimum requirement. The standards for admission to college are largely maintained by entrance examinations. The varying standards of admission requirements are measured chiefly by the requirements of the older institutions in the East which have steadily maintained entrance examinations, and by means of entrance examinations have raised the standard of admission to college for the entire country. The institutions that admit by certificate have neither set, nor do they at present maintain a standard for the country at large. Many of the best secondary teachers feel that far more credit comes to them and to their schools from their students' success in meeting a uniform test of examinations than comes from permission to send pupils to college without examinations. The success of pupils on entrance examinations is the current stamp of approval on the teacher's work that the teachers value highly.

Such in brief are the arguments in favor of the examination. Under present conditions it is impossible for any college or university to inspect all the schools that send pupils to it, and, therefore, those which have the diploma system still retain the examination system for those students who come from other than accredited schools.

A very important modification of the entrance examination

¹ Clifford H. Moore: *The Examination System*, in *Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools*, 1896; also printed in the *School Review*, Vol. IV.

system is shown in the methods of the College Entrance Examination Board established by the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. This board conducts, at numerous convenient centers on the same date, examinations in all subjects that are accepted for admission to college. These examinations are recognized by a large number of colleges and universities, and the student who passes them successfully finds many doors open to him. The papers are made out and read by examiners and readers selected from the teaching force of the institutions belonging to the association. Uniform admission requirements are thus maintained for all institutions that accept the work of the board. The first examinations under the system were held in June, 1901. This board must at present be regarded as one of the most significant factors in working out the great problem of the mutual relations of the secondary and the higher schools.¹

The University of the State of New York is a unique educational organization worthy of careful study since its history and development illustrate some of the most notable features in all educational development.² In January, 1784, two months after the British left New York, Governor George Clinton sent his message to the legislature in which is found the first public expression of the need of better educational institutions. His words are these: "Neglect of the education of youth is among the evils consequent on war. Perhaps there is scarce anything more worthy your attention than the revival and encouragement of seminaries of learning." A movement was at once started, and James Duane presented a bill entitled, "An Act for establishing a University within this State." The friends of King's College, which had been suspended during the Revolution, captured the movement started to establish a university, and the title was amended to read "An Act for granting certain privileges to the college heretofore called King's College for the name and charter thereof, and erecting an University within this State." Thus the influence of the old university was to be dominant in the new régime, and laws passed May 1st, 1784, made a body of men who were virtually trustees of Columbia College autocrats in the whole educational system of the state. This was also the law which changed the name of King's College to Columbia. Columbia captured the Board of Regents, and for three years controlled their actions.

¹ For the history of this movement see Proceedings of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, 1898, 1899, 1900.

² See for full account, Sidney Sherwood, Regents Bulletin, No. 11, Jan., 1893, on the University of the State of New York, Origin, History and Present Organization.

Opposition soon developed to this preponderating influence of Columbia. One of the lines of opposition was directed to the preponderance of a distinctively church college in state educational affairs. In 1787 a new law was passed which remains substantially the basis of the regent system.

The effects of the law, without going into detail, were that it lessened theoretically the rigor of state control of the system by emancipating the colleges from the actual government of the regents while it practically widened the scope of this state control by emancipating the regents from the monopolizing control of Columbia. An interesting detail of this act is found in the provision in regard to incorporated academies, limiting their income to the value of four thousand bushels of wheat. The whole educational work, including the common schools of the state, was placed in the hands of the university. It is to be noted also that the Board of Regents of the State of New York did not resemble the regents of the English universities, and that the whole idea of the University of the State of New York was essentially a pattern to the University of France. This New York organization has undoubtedly been the model for many western states, so that we see a great line of apparent French influence upon our own educational system.

It may be said that Napoleon did not constitute the University of France until nearly twenty years after the organization of the University of the State of New York, but plans for the reorganization of education had been rife in France since the days of the Encyclopedists. Ever since 1762, indeed, France had been flooded with writings upon this subject. At the time of the Revolution, as we have seen, Talleyrand, Condorcet, Mirabeau and others presented reports and plans upon the subject of national education. All French ideas passed readily to the New World. There was, no doubt, reciprocal influence from the New World upon the Old. "France may claim to have given New York the symmetrical state system of secular learning. New York may claim to have given France the practical form of such a system in its great, all-inclusive university corporation." So far as the form is concerned, then, the University of France is indebted to the University of the State of New York. This body has now a dominating influence upon secondary education in the State of New York. Supervision of the common schools passed into the hands of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction many years ago.

The Regents of the University of the State of New York now have a large and competent staff devoting their time entirely to the inspection of schools and the conducting of examinations. These inspectors visit all the high schools and academies of the state regularly, and upon their report and upon the

results of the examinations held depends the state allotment of money. The regents' examinations are held in all the high schools and academies of the state, the questions being uniform, prepared by the department, but the examinations are conducted by the teachers. The papers, after being read by the teachers, are sent to Albany for rereading and regrading. The total number of papers read is enormous. An academic syllabus is regularly issued, the purpose of which is stated as follows:

"This detailed syllabus was prepared to indicate definitely the scope and character of the examinations in the several subjects. It is hoped that in this way the diversity in preparation which arises from the use of different text-books, and from different methods of instruction, may be obviated. It is not designed to interfere with that freedom and flexibility which ought to exist in a system of instruction so extended as that conducted in the academies of the state, but only to specify with such exactness as may be practicable the subjects and the extent in these subjects for which the candidates in these examinations will be held responsible. It is understood that the restrictions laid down in the syllabus are intended as well for those who prepare and issue the questions as for those who are to be called upon to answer them."

The credentials issued by the regents are accepted for admission to the colleges and universities in New York State and also by many institutions outside the state. This system of examination is most extensive, thorough and systematic, and, doubtless, has no superior in the world.

The syllabus upon which the examinations are based is revised every five years. This revision takes place after the widest opportunities are given for consultation and suggestion on the part of the secondary teachers of the state. The syllabus, as finally adopted and published, stands for five years. Thus frequent and irrational changes are avoided. The schools know for five years, at least, exactly the work they will be called upon to do. This is one of the most important features of the system, one which all colleges might well copy in their arrangements of entrance requirements.¹

The historical development of the relation of colleges and universities to secondary schools is such that at the outset the higher institutions not only could mould the curriculum of the lower institutions, but were expected so to do. The secondary

¹The subject of articulation between secondary and higher schools embraces more than what may be called mere mechanical means of passing from one system to the other. The reports of various institutions of higher learning contain most valuable information upon this subject. The reports of President Eliot, of Harvard College, have for several years been notable in this respect; one of particular value appeared in 1898. The whole subject is treated most interestingly and thoroughly, also, in the report of Dean Capps, published in the President's Report of the University of Chicago for the year ending July 1st, 1898.

schools in the early days of this country were grammar schools and academies established in the main for the sole purpose of fitting pupils for college. Colleges were located in different sections of the country, each, to a large extent, with its own peculiar constituency upon which it was able to stamp its seal from the beginning of the preparatory course. There was entire lack of any central authority in higher education, and, for the most part, of state supervision of any kind. That great disparity in college courses should grow up and be perpetuated was inevitable from the circumstances of the case. So long as different sections of the country remained isolated and college fitting schools were called upon almost exclusively each to fit for its own special college or university, little difficulty arose; but as railroads multiplied, transportation became cheaper and traveling developed into a national habit, various causes arose to make this lack of uniformity a serious evil. Population was no longer fairly fixed but roving. This roving feature of our population is a unique characteristic of the United States. In the same city there will congregate graduates of twenty or fifty different colleges, each of whom will desire to send his children to his own *alma mater*; but all these children, or a large number of them, must be fitted for college in the local high school. Added to this element of complexity there is frequently a feeling that it is good for western boys to be educated in the East, and, much less frequently, that it is well for eastern boys to be educated in the West.

With college entrance requirements fixed and immovable and varying enormously, it became a task of almost superhuman difficulty for the high schools to meet these requirements. The private secondary schools have largely for this reason taken a position of increasing importance in fitting for college; but that college preparation should be entirely relegated to private enterprise would certainly mean to deprive the high schools of one of the greatest incentives to scholarly work by which they are now affected. Any one who is interested in seeing how great the diversity of requirements was may examine the tabular statement of entrance requirements to colleges and universities of the United States which appeared in the *School Review* for June, 1896, and also a statement published in the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education, Volume I, 1896-97.

Two notable efforts have been made to bring some uniformity out of this confusion. The first is that which resulted in the Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies, a document now familiar to every one engaged in the field of secondary education. This report presented certain model secondary school curriculums which had been prepared by an

eminent body of experts. While the special reports upon which the model curriculums were based have been found of great value, the curriculums themselves have not found universal acceptance, though undoubtedly much good influence has been exerted by them upon the schools.

With the primary purpose of securing the wider adoption of the work of the Committee of Ten in the schools, a committee was appointed by the departments of secondary and higher education at Denver in 1895, which after four years of work presented its conclusions at the meeting of the National Educational Association at Los Angeles in 1899. This committee adopted a different plan from that followed by the Committee of Ten. In the first place, no model curriculum is presented. The fundamental problem for this committee is the formulation of courses of study in each of the several subjects of the curriculum which shall be substantially equal in value, the measure of value being both the quantity and quality of work done. These courses of study are to constitute so many national norms or units, which shall be of equal value everywhere, and a certain number of which, varying with different institutions, shall constitute the requirement for admission to the higher schools. Emphasis is laid upon these units rather than upon the combinations that may be made of them.

In the terminology adopted by the committee the programme of studies includes all of the work offered by the school, and is made up of a certain number of courses of study in the individual subjects, a course of study being a unit. From the courses of study, a curriculum or several curriculums may be made up for different classes of pupils, or for the individual pupil, a minimum fixed requirement being suggested in the way of a small amount of English and mathematics. No uniformity in programme of studies or in curriculums is aimed at by the committee, these being left for adjustment according to local conditions. The assumption is made throughout the report that a certain amount of work rather than a definite prescribed kind of work shall be the qualification for admission to college, and that all courses of study of the quality outlined by the committee shall be regarded as good collateral for college entrance. The principles of election in secondary school work and of wide option in college entrance requirements are thus fundamental. Upon this basis it seems likely that some degree of uniformity may be introduced into our secondary education and into college entrance requirements. Whatever is accomplished must be by means of mutual agreement and constant agitation, since in this country we possess no official means of enforcing any views upon this question.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Whoever has had the courage to read thus far has doubtless found more questions raised than answered. Baumeister's great work devotes some nine hundred pages to a description merely of the organization of the school systems of the various states. To Germany alone is given the equivalent of some two hundred and fifty pages the size of this. The accounts in Baumeister, however, are written by natives of each country that is considered, and are, for the most part, purely descriptive, nor are they always easily intelligible to the foreigner. Of comparison between the different systems there is scarcely a trace. Neglecting from necessity a multitude of interesting and important details, I have endeavored to present the chief features of the leading systems side by side, to the end that both fundamental similarities and fundamental differences might clearly appear. Certain basal questions eliminate themselves from the tangle of likenesses and unlikenesses and present themselves as problems whose solution is pressing not in one country but in many.

The problem of problems is that of the social function of the school. Is it to aid in the separation of society into classes or to become the great social unifier? The answer to this question depends entirely upon the organization and conduct of the schools themselves. When Napoleon organized the lycées so that they were objectionable to the better classes, the lycées were promptly deserted by the better classes. In England even to-day the free public schools are to all intents and purposes poor schools. To preserve class distinctions no better way has as yet been invented than a system of free public schools so administered that only those parents who are too indifferent to care or too needy to help themselves will send their children to those schools.

A part of this same problem is seen in the struggle now going on in all the countries we have considered to bring the schools closer to the needs of every day life. Especially is this true in the domain of secondary education. What other meaning, for example, has the struggle over differentiation in the secondary schools? The primacy of the ancient and honorable classical course has not yet been seriously shaken in France, or Germany, or England, or the United States, but other courses have been widely introduced and are increasingly popular. But are the new courses to lead to equal privileges with the old, and so to attract attendance from all classes of the community, rich as well as poor, professional, commercial and artisan? If all the courses are placed under the same roof, will the newer ones have a fair

chance? They did not have in France. If they are separated in different buildings will the preponderance of social desirability be in proportion to the preponderance of the older disciplines? That has been the case, certainly, in Germany.

Here and there we catch glimpses of a new factor to be reckoned with in school organization, nothing more nor less than the individuality of the child. The older schools considered this a negligible factor, if indeed they considered it at all. To catch the child young and make of him an adult of this or that pattern, chiefly according to the social ambition and financial resources of the parent has been the task of the German higher schools. Sometimes they failed, but then was it not always because of the inherent stupidity of the child? That was the obvious explanation. But the fact that the child has a personality, an individuality of its own is pressing for recognition. All men may be born equal, but all children are not. This new factor is not only a contributory cause to all the discussions about differentiation of courses, but it also enters into many of the pressing school problems in ways unknown a generation ago.

If it were not for the spasmodic habit of educational movement it would be safe to prophesy that the dominant considerations in school organization for the next generation or so would be social adaptation and individual conservation. But while it is possible in school matters to point out the tendencies that prevail at any given minute it is quite fruitless to speculate how far any movement will carry. Apparently the only thing certain is uncertainty. Scarcely any other great human interest has been so hysterical in its conduct as education. "Fads in education" is a common form of speech, only too well justified by the facts. The history of education shows every extreme of theory and practice, every form of control, state, church, family, community, successive or simultaneous. The partisan spirit in education is always more or less rampant. The supply of controversial questions never runs out.

Let it not be thought, however, that the schools are the football of chance. On the one hand they have to-day their full share of the best administrative talent of the world,—on the other, in this country and in many others, they are grounded firm on the rock foundations of the peoples life. The amount of grumbling about the school tax is surprisingly little. The typical citizen is not the one who growls about the schools but the one for whom no sacrifice is too great to give his children a better education than he had.

In all fields of public administration the great modern city is a perplexing factor. Already the city enjoys as a rule a large measure of freedom from state interference in educational as in

other matters. Owing to the concentration of wealth and population the school conditions in the city are not the same as those in the rural community. Each section has its own advantages and disadvantages. By combination, free transportation of pupils, and other methods the country is making progress towards securing urban school advantages. But the progress is slow. So far the city has made even slower progress in removing the evils of overcrowding and unfavorable environment. All conceivable evils in school administration are bound to develop, and to develop in an aggravated form in the city. They are equally bound to be combated with vigor. The city is then the great pedagogical laboratory.¹

Any great machine loses efficiency from friction. A great school organization constantly confronts these deadly perils, that too much energy will be wasted in merely keeping up the motion, that the greatness and complication of the machinery will beget a helpless and hopeless wonder soon to merge in worship, that the individual child, whose interests are the sole excuse for the organization's existence, will become too insignificant to be considered. Unwieldiness, idolatry and uselessness are, then, the three perils that school organization must somehow or other escape. These are the greatest, but by no means all. Already it is clearly recognized that in the public schools exists ready to the hand such a tool for propaganda that the temptation to use it unwisely has not always been resistible. Nor will it be denied that the political possibilities of the schools have, in the United States at least, had ample recognition.

The political question starts a train of considerations. In the United States the notion has apparently prevailed that the schools, supported by taxation, should be divorced entirely from politics. We have no cabinet minister for education. The state superintendent is, it is true, frequently elected by popular vote on a partisan ticket, but it is not expected that he will administer his position on political lines, nor could he exercise much political influence if he tried to do so. In cities the general theory is to place the administration of the schools in the hands of a non-partisan board of reputable citizens. Ostensibly, then, our schools are "out of politics." In reality they are very much in politics, and certain to remain there.

Might it not be better to be honest in this matter? In those countries we have been considering where the minister of education is a responsible member of the administration, losing his

¹ A very interesting and suggestive contribution to the problem of city school administration is the Report of the Chicago School Commission, 1898.

portfolio when the country votes against the cabinet of which he forms a part, there is scarcely a trace of the unworthy sort of political influence in the schools. The only subject in which the American people can apparently be counted on to sustain a lively interest is politics. On all political questions is shed the constant glare of publicity. To take any great public interest out of politics is likely to put it under conditions where strange things can be done in dark corners. The cloak of non-political respectability may hide a multitude of sins that would not bear the light.

Perhaps, then, we need not less politics, but more politics in our school affairs. Granted that American political life is imperfect, we shall not improve it by calling it by another name. We shall not improve any great public interest that possesses inherent and inevitable political possibilities by saying it does not. We shall not overcome the present normal apathy of the American citizen on school questions by removing these questions yet further outside the circle of his certain active interest.

In England, Germany and France the schools are masculine; in the United States they are feminine. The condition in the United States to-day is this: women form an overwhelming majority of the teachers, girls form an overwhelming majority of the pupils, and mothers manifest an overwhelming majority of the total amount of real interest taken in the schools. That feminine influence will always be strong in our schools is as certain as it is desirable. But if, as is sometimes held, men are really good for something in stamping the imprint of civilized attainment on the generation that must be its conservator, then it would seem a pity that they should be not merely permitted but encouraged to keep hands off the schools. Ways and means may need devising for keeping the boys in the schools, masters at the desks, men in sympathetic and helpful relations to school activities, all in reasonable proportion.

All the civilized nations of the world carry into the twentieth century a great school system in good working order. The invention has been made and in a measure perfected. What is the task set the new century? Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart, their predecessors and disciples, have furnished a tolerably adequate body of pedagogical doctrine. The times do not seem to cry out for another prophet of their stamp. The pathetic need is for wisdom and honesty to manage this mightiest of social organizations, the public school; to manage it in such a way that the whirl of the machinery will not drown the cries of a single helpless, tortured child; to manage it so that we may not be awed by its immensity into an idolatrous worship of its very shortcomings; so to manage it that it shall not be a propaganda shop for "fads" or "isms" or "ologies"

or pseudo-science; so to manage it that it shall draw ever nearer the hearts and lives of the people; so to direct it that it may always be aware of its ideals, alert to its opportunities the servant of an ever higher civilization. This is a task worthy of the giants that shall appear.