THE INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF MISSIONS

EDUCATION FOR LIFE AND DUTY

BY SIR MICHAEL E. SADLER, K.C.S.I.

IN all parts of the English-speaking world students of education are indebted to Dr Paul Monroe. To his labours and to those of his colleagues we owe the comprehensive *Cyclopædia of Education* (Macmillan) which, apart from its value as a book of reference, will stand as a tide-mark of our generation's insight into the significance of the teacher's art. Dr Monroe also commands our respect from the fact that he holds the chair of the History of Education at Teachers College in Columbia University, New York. The magnitude of Teachers College, the range of the studies which it represents and the fine generosity of its foundation encourage everywhere, and not least in England and in India, those who long for a more adequate recognition of the value of an intelligent and scientific investigation of the difficult and elusive questions which underlie the practice of education.

In the important article on 'Mission Education and National Policy' which he contributed to the last issue of this Review Dr Monroe has done a further public service

When articles in the Review are an expression of the policy or views of the Continuation Committee, or of the conclusions reached by any of its Special Committees, this fact will be made clear. In all other instances the writer of the paper is alone responsible for the opinions expressed

by recording his 'keen appreciation of the result of mission education in the past and the present.' Writing with the authority of a skilled observer, he draws public attention to the fact that 'the problems of mission education are the problems of education at home.' He reminds us that recently developments, even in American education, have disclosed certain dangers. 'A mass education, controlled by the public,' may 'minimize or neglect the essential elements of culture and personality.' 'Democratic education has some obvious shortcomings which should be avoided.' Even under the surface of 'a letter-perfect technique,' there may be felt 'the deadening influence of a mechanical bureaucracy.' It may not be thought unbecoming on the part of an English student of the subject to say how deeply he feels the debt of the modern world, and especially of Britain, to the educational enterprise of America; to its verve, its courage, its liberality, its incessant experiments, its readiness to take stock of itself and to adjust itself to new social needs. Courage and candour are great moral forces. Both of them are displayed by the true leaders of American education, and are not absent from Dr Monroe's article. Full of respect for the great achievements of public authority in American education, he sees nevertheless that the wisdom of public authority should be strengthened by the counterpoise of private initiative. 'The function of privately controlled education at home is to point the way to educational advance through its greater freedom of initiative and experimentation. The function of education inspired by a religious motive is to formulate and work out a comprehensive scheme of education which should include essential elements of culture and personality which are apt to be minimized or neglected in the mass education controlled by the public. The function in mission education is to serve these purposes abroad in much more difficult situations.'

Great is the significance of such a judgment falling

from the lips of a scholar in Dr Monroe's position. It means that the members of one of the largest training colleges in the world are watching the educational work of Christian missions and are endeavouring to assimilate their experience. In each great university, the missionary educator should feel that he has a home base. There, as well as at the headquarters of his society, his labours should be followed with sympathetic and critical attention. To the generous imagination of the young men and women in British and American universities (not to speak of the universities of France, Central Europe and India) the human experience of the missionary, of the pioneer and of the overseas administrator makes its appeal. Mr H. G. Wells, whose responsive sympathy gives warmth and variety to his writings, has just said in his wrath that 'the British universities have no philosophy of education and hardly any idea of an educational duty to the community as a whole.'¹ If this is true, it is high time that we university people were warned of our failure in a plain duty and were bidden repent. Study of missionary education, of its difficulties and political problems, will help to carry us into the heart of the labyrinth where the great secrets lie. Already we can see signs of the change which a candid and respectful study of missionary problems is making in university thought. The academic outlook, especially among the younger men and women, has been widened. *Abeunt studia in mores*. And the Student Christian Movement has helped in preparing the field for this new seed. Missionary work abroad and Christian work at home are but two aspects of one and the same duty. Educational policy in the West needs the light which missionary experience throws upon its problems and presuppositions. When intellectual opinion in France was still averse from learning what Christian experience has to teach, the pavilion of Roman Catholic missions at the Paris Exhibition of 1900 revealed to the student that, in its deep foundations,

¹ *The New Teaching of History*, by H. G. Wells (Cassell, 1921), p. 7.

French education rests upon the Christian ethic as well as upon critical exactitude.

The leaven of these contrasted influences (contrasted only until they harmonize in a new concord) is working in European and Indian as well as in American and Chinese thought. Dr Monroe is so good as to disclose to his readers his own disquietude of mind, his uneasiness at the insufficiency of some current political generalizations to cover all the facts revealed by missionary experience. We in England are similarly harassed by the misfit of some of our educational presuppositions when we are called upon to apply them to the varied problems of the mission field. But, through our having undertaken earlier than the Americans or the Germans responsibilities for overseas government we have been saved from committing ourselves as whole-heartedly as they to dogmas which are too narrow to embrace all the pertinent facts. Overseas experience has held back the English judgment from accepting some formulas of policy which are attractive through their logical precision but faulty by reason of their inadequacy to meet all the needs of the case. No one who is familiar with Shakespeare or with Wordsworth would arraign the English of incompetence in philosophic insight. Our heads are not empty of thought, however reluctantly thought jumps from our tongues. A mixed people, as Defoe described us, we have a mixed philosophy. Charged under Providence with a miscellaneous mission in the world, our policy is a mosaic of miscellaneous presuppositions. In the crisis of our educational controversy in the seventeenth century, we had somehow or other to square the experience of Nicholas Ferrar and Edwin Sandys in Virginia with the experience of the General Court of New England and with the hesitancies of New Hampshire and Rhode Island. More than a century later in our history it was a wise and calm-minded man who said that if you bound in one cover Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* and Tom Paine's *Rights of Man*, the two together

would make a good book. A generation afterwards, when in 1833 the British Government created the Committee of Council on Education, Lord John Russell announced that it was Her Majesty's wish 'that the rights of conscience should be respected.' The obdurate convictions of diverse groups in the community had made it clear to our legislators that England, though it needed modern education, would not tolerate any state educational department which claimed absolute authority over the conscience, whether in religious belief or in the province of economic justice. In the famous Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, issued in 1843 and 1846, we find the outcome of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth's untiring effort to translate the principle of toleration into the administrative regulations of a modern Education Department. The idea of entrusting to the state and to its expert officials a monopoly of educational control over the national 'culture' was, so far as England and Wales were concerned, decisively abandoned. The same policy, which had been reached in England at the cost of centuries of contention and bitter experience, was carried over into Indian education by the Despatch of the Court of Directors of the East India Company on July 19th, 1854. The despatch records the 'natural conclusion that the most effectual method of providing for the wants of India in education will be to combine with the agency of the Government the aid which may be derived from the exertions and liberality of the educated and wealthy natives of India and of other benevolent persons.' Therefore the authors of the despatch had 'resolved to adopt in India the system of grants-in-aid which has been carried out in this country with very great success . . . and the system will be based on an entire abstinence from interference with the religious instruction conveyed in the schools assisted.' The two-mindedness of England has taught us a philosophy, now instinctive, though rarely formulated. We first practised the philosophy at home.

Then we applied it to the dependent parts of the Commonwealth. Toleration, in its deepest sense, is *arcanum imperii*. And in no sphere of public effort is true toleration wiser or more necessary than in the sphere of education.

Unhappily for Europe, Germany addressed herself to the modern problem of educational policy without access to the experience which England had derived from her overseas responsibilities. More hemmed in by continental powers than we, she felt a little more hurried in her duty of internal reorganization. A late-comer into the new fields of industrial enterprise, she put more brains into her social policy as an accompaniment of her economic advance, and strove to recover lost ground by brilliant staff-work in educational planning. As fond of philosophy as the Scots, the Germans rejoiced in formulated principles, in which they rightly sought a guide to practical administration. A little prone by temperament to the joy of extreme conclusions, they swung themselves enthusiastically from the older tradition of particularism into the new implications of their imperial unity. The building up of the German systems of education during the nineteenth century was one of the capital achievements of political engineering. The results fascinated the world. Unfortunately they intoxicated the Germans. One of the most clear-eyed of Germans, Dr Walther Rathenau, has recently described the event. 'Instead of the Germany of thought and spirit, one saw suddenly a brutal, stupid community of interested persons, greedy for power, who gave themselves out as that Germany whose opposite they were; who, unable to point to any thought of their own, prided themselves on an imaginary race-unity which their very appearance contradicted: who had no ideas beyond rancour, the slaverings of league-oratory and subordination; and who with these properties, which they were pleased to call *Kultur*, undertook to bring blessing to the world. . . . The system looked like a nation. In

reality it was an autocratic association of economic interests bristling with arms.' ¹

Without a further penny of tribute, Germany has paid her indemnity to the world. She has proved the falsity of the ideal which poisoned her judgment. The foundation of that ideal lay in the thought that education can 'impart a community of ideas, purposes, traditions, institutions, accurately indicated by the German word *Kultur*.' The German policy held that this vitally influential agent, education, must be 'a government function.' State education should be dominant. 'Education is legitimately to be controlled by Government for the production of a common culture.' We see how large an element of truth there is in this theory. Education *is* a power. But we see also how perilous is any thorough-going application of the theory and how liable it is to be infected by false ideals. The theory is not dead. It still has power over many minds in Britain and elsewhere. To such people, sincerely patriotic as they feel themselves to be, it seems to offer a short-cut to national unity and strength. Plato cherished the doctrine, and who can wonder if it appeals to lesser minds than Plato's? In spite of the lessons of the war, it lingers in some passages of Dr Monroe's article. But it would appear from the concluding paragraphs of his paper that he feels a little uneasy as to its implications, and that the natural dictates of his heart and judgment lead him to rise above and beyond it.

America, like England, does not put all her educational eggs into one basket. She prefers a composite system, though rightly she lays the chief administrative emphasis upon that part of the system which is public in the sense of being governed by public authority and financed from public funds. Unlike England, America has had to create with all possible speed something like national unity among

¹ Walther Rathenau, *The New Society* (London : Williams & Norgate, 1921), pp. 91-3.

the mixed bodies of immigrants who have been poured through the funnel of New York harbour into the vast tankard of her population. The swifter the immigration and the more heterogeneous its ingredients, the more urgent have been the duty of developing the public school system and the desirability of getting people to believe in education as a national benefit. Consequently, to many Americans, education is one of the religions they really believe in. It has its orthodoxy, its pontiffs, its noble buildings. Education is the Established Church of the United States. And one need not be a thorough-going Erastian to see the benefit of state action in American education during a critical phase of American development. But the close observer soon discovers that state education has no monopoly in the United States. The Americans wisely retain another element in their educational system. The state universities of the Middle West, a conspicuous achievement of the last century, are none the worse for the existence of Harvard, Columbia and Yale. The public high schools gain from the juxtaposition of some of the private schools for boys and girls. The primary schools have learnt not a little from Dr John Dewey's philosophy, tested by experiment in a private university school at Chicago. And in Dr Monroe's article there are many references to the product of an old American tradition, much older than that of the ordinary state schools—a tradition which is strong in the influences which make for character, though dilatory in its welcome to new educational ideas and apt to fumble with antiquated methods of teaching. Between the mission field and this older tradition in American education the connexion has been close. Dr Monroe is one of those who are bringing American missionary education into closer contact with the newer educational life of the United States. The combination, when effected, will be fruitful, but all the more fruitful if it does not exclude recruitment from that quieter and more conservative world in which time-honoured ideas of education still hold sway.

Missionary education owes much to Germany and to Central Europe. Review the whole field and see how many admirable schools have derived their inspiration and their methods from those sources. It owes much to America, never more than at this hour. And it owes much to Britain;—to Scotland with her long-established reverence for learning and to England with her full heart, her shy loyalties, her distrust of official systematization and her dislike of any tendency to overrate the value of technique.

Yet, in proportion to her sphere of administrative responsibility and influence, Britain (in spite of the infusion of Scots in her overseas service and missionary enterprise) has made a less alert use of the instrument of education than have Germany and America. The older among British overseas administrators did not put the teacher or the officials of the Education Department into the seats of highest honour. As regards our public expenditure, frugality has found a field of exercise in the sphere of education. No one has ever charged British administration overseas with wild extravagance in its educational outlay. It might even occur to some observers that the older British administrators distrusted education for its own sake as well as disliking it because of its expense. The keen interest in educational reform, now noticeable among some British administrators, is a thing of yesterday. The badge of the older group of men (noble characters, many of them, in their self-sacrifice and equity) was hesitancy as to the benefits likely to be derived by the masses of any population (our own included) from a diffusion of modern western education, especially when it worked through books and talk. Knowing how wise many of these men were, should we not take trouble to ascertain why they distrusted education, in spite of the assiduity of the Germans and the zeal of the Americans?

In one of his less known and fiercer writings,¹ John Henry

¹ J. H. Newman, *Discussions and Arguments* (London: Longmans, 1897), pp. 254 ff. (Letters on the Tamworth Reading Room, 1841.)

Newman fell upon Sir Robert Peel for having stumbled into a false philosophy of education when he made a speech at the opening of a reading room in Tamworth. Sir Robert seems to have said that 'in becoming wiser a man will become better' and that a widely diffused interest in knowledge, especially in physical knowledge, will contribute 'to the intellectual and moral improvement of the community.' Newman sharply retorts that 'to know is one thing : to do is another : the two things are altogether distinct. A man knows he should get up in the morning,—he lies a-bed : he knows he should not lose his temper, yet he cannot keep it. A labouring man knows he should not go to the alehouse and his wife knows she should not flinch when she goes out charring ; but nevertheless, in these cases, the consciousness of a duty is not at one with the performance of it.' Newman's charge against Peel, and against the facile optimism of the school of thought which Peel was echoing, is that modern education of the superficial type 'makes no pretence of subduing the giant nature in which we were born, of smiting the loins of the domestic enemies of our peace, of overthrowing passion and fortifying reason.' It does 'but offer to bribe the foe for the nonce with gifts which will avail for that purpose just so long as they *will* avail, and no longer.' Then, with rising emotion, he concludes : 'If virtue be a mastery over the mind, if its end be action, if its perfection be inward order, harmony and peace, we must seek guidance in graver and holier places. . . . The problem for statesmen of this age is how to educate the masses ; and literature and science cannot give the solution. Faith, not Knowledge or Argument, is our principle of action. . . . Intrinsically excellent and noble as are scientific pursuits and worthy of a place in a liberal education, and fruitful in temporal benefits to the community, still they are not, and cannot be, the instruments of an ethical training. The apprehension of the unseen is the only known principle of subduing moral evil, educating the multitude and organizing society.

And whereas man is born for action, action flows not from inferences, but from impressions—not from reasonings, but from Faith.'

It was from an instinct like that which Newman thus attempts to put into words that the older type of Englishmen (and many still living) distrusted the panacea of education. Many of them were unbelievers, but wanted the masses to believe. Some had a wistful reverence for the Christian religion but regarded it as a lost cause which the enlightened must discard. Many, especially in India, would have liked the public schools to teach religion but shrank from the political peril of seeming to attempt interference with the religious faiths of the people. Consequently, their interest in education was weakened by hesitations. Their hand faltered on the plough-tail before the furrow had been cut. But there is this to be said for their psychological insight. Both in Germany and America, where modern education was effectively pressed home on the masses of the people, it was exalted into something very like an article of faith. But the critical English mind is not idolatrous, and feels some distaste for what it suspects of being half a fetich.

There was another cause, hardly less profound, for the English distrust of systems of state education for the masses. What, these men asked, is the implicit social aim of the education which you propose to provide and to compel people to receive? What is its suppressed premise? What its unconscious principle? Is it the purpose which Samuel Taylor Coleridge borrowed from Fichte—Fichte who was a *fons et origo belli*—namely, 'to form and train up the people of the country to *obedient*, free, useful and *organizable* subjects, citizens and patriots, living to the benefit of the state and prepared to die in its defence'? A noble doctrine, but how apply it to 'subject' India? Is not, they asked, modern western education based upon presuppositions of political freedom and of national independence? Is not the literature it calls in aid, is not the

philosophy upon which it rests, soaked in presuppositions of political liberty? How far are you prepared to go in allowing the peoples whom you infect with these ideas to put them into practice? To the utmost limit, say I. Not so, said they.

More than that, education conveys ideas, and ideas are dynamite. Are you sure that the economic structure of a society based upon acquisition will be tough enough to stand the criticisms and the discontents of a hungry but intellectualized proletariat? This anxiety is still strong. As Dr Monroe points out, 'certain American states have recently passed very drastic laws directed towards controlling the economic and political beliefs of teachers. There has developed, or is developing, a new orthodoxy. The question of religious orthodoxy no longer interests the masses of the people or the government authorities. But the question of political and economic orthodoxy does.' If one admits (which I do not) that 'education is the means for determining the culture of a people, and that all individuals should participate in such a culture,' one finds it difficult, as Dr Monroe admits that he finds it difficult, to question the validity of a government's right to control the freedom and the spirit of the schools.

Yet what is education without freedom? And what warnings has not the human race received against empowering any human authority to prescribe what it shall believe and learn? Education should teach a way of life. It must teach it mainly by example, and in simple words for simple minds. But it must respect human personality. It must reverence truth. It must be disinterested. It must honestly open new windows in the mind. Dr Monroe evidently regrets some recent tendencies in American educational administration just as our great-grandfathers regretted the window-tax. But if the claim of the secular Government to the control of opinion through the schools is once admitted, no one can legitimately blame Government for taking measures of disciplinary

coercion against new ideas which happen to be unpalatable to it.

Mr Bernard Shaw, who allows himself poetic licence when he writes about education, thinks that even in England our teachers are muzzled. 'Is there any hope in education?' he asks in his preface to *Back to Methuselah*.¹ 'The usual answer is that we must teach citizenship and political science at school. The hard fact is that we must *not* teach political science or citizenship at schools. The schoolmaster who attempted it would soon find himself penniless in the streets without pupils, if not in the dock pleading to a pompously worded indictment for sedition. Our schools teach the morality of feudalism corrupted by commercialism, and hold up the military conqueror, the robber baron and the profiteers as models of the illustrious and the successful. . . . There is no way out through the schoolmaster. Mankind cannot be saved by schoolmasters or by any other sort of masters. It can only be lamed or enslaved by them.'

But the crucial test of the theory that the state is to develop a national social 'culture' through its schools was made in Germany before the war. 'On balance,' writes Dr Walther Rathenau, 'the endowments of the German people work out as follows:—High qualities of intellect and heart. Ethics and mentality normal. Originative will-power and independent activity weak. We give our devotion freely, and the heart rules in action. Our feelings are genuine and powerful. We have courage and endurance. . . . But in obedience we know no limit, and never question what is imposed on us. . . . For character and will we substituted discipline. But discipline is not nationality: it is an external instrument, and, when it breaks, it leaves—nothing.'²

In a striking passage in his article in the last issue of this Review, Dr Monroe writes that 'during the past two hundred years two great political forces have been opera-

¹ London: Constable, 1921. Pp. x ff.

² *The New Society*, pp. 92, 97.

tive in society—that of democracy and that of nationality.’ But he would doubtless allow that, along with these, other great political forces have been at work. Such are individualism, industrial and commercial enterprise, internationality, and militarism. Some of these forces are discordant with one another. Hence have sprung the struggles, inward and outward, in all peoples in modern history. An educational discipline which sought to concentrate in the life of a nation one or two of these forces, and set itself to repress or ignore the others, would in course of time explode. In Germany, the explosion has already taken place. Modern education needs many safety valves. The theory that the state should by means of education repress tendencies which are disagreeable to its taste suggests a policy of sitting on the safety valves.

National education in the true sense is a spirit of living influence, a spiritual and intellectual atmosphere. It may, or it may not, exert much of its influence through some mechanism, new or old—through a mechanism expressly set up for the purpose or by traditional convenience employed for it. True, it comprises many material things, such as buildings, equipments, books, laboratories, as well as much systematic organization such as are rules for the order of studies, for the licensing of teachers, for the conduct of inspection and for the apportioning of money grants. But national education is not a mechanical fabric of codes and subsidies. It is a much more penetrating and subtle thing. Its chief influences are spiritual and atmospheric and therefore for the most part unorganizable. In their operation they are little subject to bureaucratic control. For the erection of a national system of education in any true sense of the words there is required either a stable order of society on which to build (and a stable order of society implies a stable faith) or such a moment of ardent spiritual unity as sometimes, though not always, follows a collapse of the outer fabric of national life. The inner life of a people, its character

and predisposition, determine the main lines of its education. No system of education, artificially constructed and imposed upon it, can permanently change the inward character of the people or, even under the arrogant name of *Kultur*, shape its life. National education is not a matter of schools alone. It requires schools: it requires the organized provision of good and tested teaching in all subjects necessary to be learnt. In this manner, intellectually, it knits the generations each with each. More than this, it must seek to furnish opportunities for the effective development and training of individual wills. But, essentially, it is a sort of envelope of varied influences (some didactic, some social, some economic, some mental) which act on the sympathies, the imagination, the judgment and the will, stimulating all alike into activity but imparting no identity of belief or of ideal or of prejudice. All that it can do is to impart a certain uniformity of tone to the complexion of the mind, a certain predisposition to conform to a general type. And fortunate is the nation which by inbred power produces variations of type and has diversity in its unity. Such a nation may not be able to boast of a tidily organized 'system of national education,' but it may produce great poets and sages, great captains in war and in industry, great statesmen and divines, and unknown heroes and heroines. It may enrich the world with new discoveries and with creative ideas. It brooks no standardized culture. It has an instinctive dread of a system of education which makes people intellectually impressionable without at the same time increasing their reserve of moral strength. It suspects that it is possible to overstimulate the intellectual susceptibility of large numbers of people of mediocre talent, without adding much to the sound stock of critical and practical judgment. And, above all, while heartily admiring some of the achievements of modern state education and sorrowfully admitting its own shortcomings in regard to educational liberality and to educational technique, such a people realizes the fact that modern

education has been on the whole a destructive force, scouring away old traditions, disturbing old ways of life, breaking down former restrictions and discrediting old valuations. A critical and eliminatory force of this kind may have been needed by the modern world. Revolutions do not happen without cause. But our final judgment upon some modern educational ideas may be reserved until we have seen to what reconstruction of society they lead. As we are not inclined to admire what Dr Rathenau calls 'an excitable and loquacious generation, prizing success and hostile to all superiority,' we may well continue to allow a certain variety in our educational influences and institutions, in order that temporarily unpopular or temporarily undervalued ways of life may still have shelter in some corners of our national education.

How different and how difficult are the problems of education with which we teachers, whether at home or in the mission field, have to contend! Are we not right, though we respect profoundly the skilled practitioner in the act of teaching, in distrusting any cocksureness in educational prescriptions? Education, as Dean Church said,¹ is 'one of the greatest and hardest tasks which it lies on each generation of human society to fulfil. So great, so difficult, so full of unexplored and unknown conditions, and apparently contradictory requirements that human thought and human wisdom are not wide enough to take in the whole field it presents to them; they still stand perplexed and baffled before many of its important problems. . . . We come more and more to see how in all its parts it must be a combination of authority and liberty: how essential it is that with discipline and control there should also be frank confidence and trust: how teacher and scholar act and react on one another: how much the scholar has to give and to teach, how greatly he must be induced to contribute to his own education, if it is to be a successful one. . . . In the eventful and hazardous interval which

¹ *Pascal and other Sermons* (London: Macmillan, 1896), p. 217.

all must cross between childhood and manhood, two terrible powers of evil are to be met with in each man's path—ignorance and sin. If education is to have its perfect work, both must be encountered, both must be defeated. It only fulfils half its office, it works with a maimed and distorted idea, unless it deals with character as well as with intelligence: unless it opens and enlightens the mind, as well as directs and purifies and fortifies the will.' Dean Church here speaks of education as if it ended at school or college. But no one knew better than he that education begins in the cradle and ends on the death-bed.

Initiation into a way of life is therefore a desirable, if not an indispensable, element in a liberal education. Religion assigns their relative values to the various good things which a man may enjoy but must learn how to use. Education in its wider sense is therefore impoverished unless it has the directive guidance of religion and its help in discriminating between the worthy and the less worthy ideals of life. Life may become brutish and bleak without religion. And what is true of life is true also of education, because education is the accompaniment of life as well as a preparation for it.

We believe that the Christian faith and the Christian experience teach, reveal, communicate the Way, the Truth and the Life. This is the priceless treasure of a Christian education.

In its most intense forms, Christian education seeks some degree of seclusion, of immunity from discordant and disquieting interruption. It invites us to submit heart and mind to an influence which is concentrated and unified, though not narrow in its outlook or unfaithful to new truth. Some temperaments, it is true, are repelled by anything that savours of the seminary. And, out of the great multitude of schools and colleges aided by public funds, only a few may be able to conform to a type of education so exclusive. Even in our Christian schools we find it necessary to admit to the teaching staff some who do not

profess the Christian faith. But we are thankful that under modern conditions of public opinion and of government we can usually secure in our publicly aided institutions in England and elsewhere so much at any rate of opportunity for Christian teaching and training as enables those who desire to do so to learn the Way and the Truth, which, if believed in, determine for us the relative values of what life can offer. The Christian faith helps us to know our duty. Where this is made impossible by the Government, the Christian school has no choice. It must refuse to accept the conditions imposed by the Government. But we may take some pride in the fact that, wherever modern English example has influenced educational administration, reasonable toleration has hitherto prevailed. Such toleration will be less likely to prevail if Governments allow themselves to regard national education as a province in which, for political reasons, they are at liberty to impose an orthodoxy of their own. But only those whose knowledge of educational history is imperfect would expect such restrictive methods of educational governance to succeed for long. Statesmen, however wilful and authoritative, cannot systematize the unsystematizable.

M. E. SADLER