

RIGID *vs.* ELASTIC COURSES OF STUDY FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS.¹

I AM disposed to submit this matter without defense, to this court of educational opinion. I am inclined to rest the case, thoroughly convinced that there can be but one intelligent decision among a class of educators, who are religiously interested in the highest intellectual development of the pupils and students who will be enrolled in the higher schools of this country at the beginning of the twentieth century.

I am aware, however, that there are some anachronisms still left in the ranks of educators, and that I have neither the force nor persuasion, the plenitude of rhetoric, the potency of logic, the eloquence of speech, nor the wealth of language to turn them from their fetich worship. They are wedded to their idols, let them alone. I have a profound respect for the experience, the wisdom, the independence of thought and action of every member of this association, and do not arrogate to myself the idea that I can change, modify, or mollify anyone's

¹ Paper read at the meeting of the North Central Association of College and Preparatory Schools, April 2, 1898, in the discussion of the following resolution and substitute :

RESOLUTION IV.

Resolved, That in every secondary school and in college as far as to the end of the Sophomore year, the study of language and the study of mathematics should be predominantly and continuously pursued ; that the study of English, including grammar, rhetoric, and composition, should continue throughout every course ; that two languages besides English should be studied, and that no other studies should be allowed to interfere with the preëminence of the studies here designated.

SUBSTITUTE FOR RESOLUTION IV.

Resolved, That in both secondary schools and colleges, such courses of study should be provided, as will offer to every student the best advantages, within reasonable limits, for the highest development of those talents with which he has been endowed, and that to this end studies should be arranged under the following heads, viz., (1) language ; (2) mathematics ; (3) natural and physical science ; (4) history and literature ; (5) civics and economics ; *further*, that while students should, in general, be encouraged to maintain a reasonable balance between these, the courses should be so plastic, as to permit alternative options, with a view to their adaptation to the individual capacities and purposes of students.

opinion, and I should prefer not to prolong this discussion, but I have been urged to show the courage of my convictions and I shall proceed in the simplest and plainest manner to present them.

It matters but little, perhaps, on what platform the North Central Association may choose to stand, but it matters greatly what the public will demand in the near future of our secondary schools, and what position the colleges shall decide to take in relation to the course of study pursued in those schools. If the spirit of affiliation and coöperation is to prevail between the public high schools and the state universities, and between all secondary schools and colleges, there must be mutual concessions, and exchange of professional courtesy and comity, and the interest of the higher few must be made to harmonize with those of the lower many, and the taste and talent of the individual must not be sacrificed in the futile attempt to shape all into one mold. The Almighty makes a separate die for every creature that comes from His hands. In the laboratory of nature no two things are alike, and the mechanism of mind varies with each individual.

Pud'n Head Wilson proved that no two thumb marks were alike, and in this statement Mark Twain strikes the keynote of modern educational philosophy.

It is incumbent upon us in the discussion of any question to have correct definitions of the words we use. What is a secondary school? What is a college? I am quite willing and have been for twenty years, to see our public high schools extend their courses to six years and thereby do the work under the benign influence of home guardianship which has been hitherto assigned to the first two years of the college, but until the politician, anxious for votes, and the public press largely controlled by this class, cease their annual onslaughts on the high school, and desist from enforcing the fallacy that these schools are maintained by the poor for the benefit of the rich, we shall have no assurance of the consummation of this plan, however strongly it may be advocated by the advanced thinkers of education.

In our treatment of this question, therefore, the secondary school, and I shall speak especially of the public high school, will be considered as one having a four-years' course of study following the completion of common English in the elementary school, and the college as an institution with a four-years' course adapted to those who have merited the diploma of the best secondary schools. Before speaking of the merit of the substitute which I had the honor of presenting to

the association a year ago, I desire to point out some of the very grave and vital mistakes and incongruities of Resolution IV. Let us carefully note its phraseology.

RESOLUTION IV.

Resolved, That in every secondary school and college as far as to the end of the Sophomore year, the study of language and the study of mathematics should be predominantly and continuously pursued ; that the study of English, including grammar, rhetoric, and composition, should continue throughout every course ; that two languages besides English should be studied ; and that no other studies should be allowed to interfere with the preëminence of the studies here designated.

Can anyone tell me why the study of language and the study of mathematics should be predominantly and continuously pursued in every secondary school, and in college as far as to the end of the Sophomore year, to the exclusion, for I shall demonstrate that this alone it means, of the sciences, of history, of civics, and of economics ?

I know of no public high school today that offers in its course the study of mathematics for four years, nor is it necessary. All the algebra, all the geometry, plane and solid, all the plane trigonometry required for admission to any higher institution can be thoroughly mastered in three years.

Again, there are scores, hundreds, in the high schools to whom higher mathematics are a forlorn hope. Nature has deprived them of the mathematical faculty. It is unfair, unjust, cruel, to demand of them a mathematical knowledge beyond that of plane geometry, or the alternative of being turned away from the school. Should colleges so shape their courses of study that students cannot receive benefit from them without going into the abstractions of higher mathematics, useless to so many, useful to so few, we need not blind ourselves to the fact that more than 90 per cent. of our pupils never reach the college, and that the high schools are established and maintained by the people for furnishing the most practical education for these 90 per cent., and not for the less than 10 per cent. of the favored few.

It is the generally conceded opinion of educators, an opinion promulgated by the Committee of Ten, and sustained and emphasized by educational associations all over the country, that the studies pursued and the methods of instruction in our secondary schools should be the same for pupils who are going to college and for those who are not.

The proposition that mathematics should be continuously pursued for four years in our high schools is too absurd for refutation. Such a course should be neither required nor encouraged, although I am willing it should be allowed, for there are some minds for which the strengthening properties of higher mathematics are a peculiarly profitable diet, but there are many students in whom this study for six years would produce intellectual dyspepsia and heart failure, and as medical guides of the mind, our efforts should be to prevent, rather than to heal diseases.

Again I read "that the study of English, including grammar, rhetoric, and composition should continue throughout every course."

My passing comment on this statement is that it overshoots the mark. If the thought were that English through its literature should be constantly pursued, there would be little objection, but in the continuous study of grammar and rhetoric there is great danger of losing the substance in the shadow, and securing but the dead skeleton of our incomparable language. It is the living, breathing, vitalizing force of words as the expression of thought, that we need to be saturated with. It is Shakespeare, and Milton, and Macaulay, and Addison, and Spencer, and Coleridge, and Tennyson, and Hawthorne from whom flow the everlasting streams of English undefiled, that we need to study, not the mere mechanism and classified rules of grammar and rhetoric, which are generally more a clog than a clue to the conception of thought and the use of words.

Now I come to the *summum bonum*, or I should rather say the *pessimum malum* of this mediæval and cloister-conceived resolution.

That two languages besides the English should be studied; and that no other study should be allowed to interfere with the preëminence of the studies here designated.

What an abominable proposition! How out of all keeping with the present trend of educational thought and action! Look where you will, to the institutions of New England supposedly in the meshes of two hundred and fifty years of worshiped tradition, to the conservative methods and phlegmatic temperament of the Middle States, or to the great Northwest, and to the Pacific coast, where wisdom is unhampered and the schools keep close to the people, and everywhere, East, West, North, and South, the demand, which brooks no compromise and will suffer no defeat, is for freedom, the welfare of the individual, elasticity

in courses of study, the bursting of shackles which have bound students in masses, and the emancipation of the race from the narrowing and degrading influences of outgrown mediævalism. The greatest educators of our time are proving, not by dogmatic statement and theory, but by direct experiment and practice, that the disciplinary power of a study resides not so much in the subject itself, as in its adaptation to the mind of the individual. It has taken the world a long time to appreciate the analogies of mind and matter. We adapt our seed to our soil, and the indiscriminate sower would have naught but empty bins.

Let us analyze a little, and look at facts.

An ideal course of study, one which I think would meet with almost universal approval, should consist of but three subjects, pursued five times a week, with no subject occupying less than one year. Applying the letter and spirit of this resolution to such a course, we should be compelled to exclude mathematics altogether, and have a course of study for four years devoted to nothing but "two languages besides the English," for if two languages beside the *English* are to be continuously studied, and no other studies are to be allowed to interfere with their preëminence, and there can be but three studies at one time, surely it is axiomatic that our pupils would study nothing but language throughout their course in the secondary school, and even to the end of the Sophomore year in college.

Since English has become such an important study in every curriculum, and since no other study will yield its place to the newcomer, we must require our pupils, if we teach mathematics at all, to divide their thought and attention among four studies in place of three, and in order to relieve them of the extra burden of preparation, we must limit the recitations to four instead of five periods a week. This will give to secondary pupils sixteen periods a week, to which should be added two for drawing and one each for vocal music and physical culture, making twenty periods, and if the schools divide the day into five periods of about fifty minutes each, we should give twenty-five periods a week, of which the pupil would be busy in the class room or the laboratory, twenty periods, leaving him fifty minutes only for study in school, and requiring the preparation of all his work to be done outside of school. By the adoption of this method, which I conceive to be the only rational one, under present and pressing conditions, we shall be enabled to harmonize the parts of this resolution, and restore mathe-

matics to be the handmaiden of the "two languages beside the English."

I challenge anyone to a deeper appreciation of the value of classical study than I possess. More than twenty years of my teaching experience were largely confined to instruction in Latin and Greek. My best efforts as an occasional writer on educational topics have been put forth to magnify the value and importance of these languages; were I to become again a class-room teacher, I should prefer to teach nothing else. I have just returned from the Classical Conference at Ann Arbor, where I was invited to participate in the deliberations of the Committee of Twelve of the American Philological Association, appointed at the request of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, to prepare and submit to them model courses of Latin and Greek for our secondary schools. At this conference I read a paper yesterday on "The Results of the Chicago Experiment of Introducing the Study of Latin into the Seventh and Eighth Grades of the Grammar Schools,"—a proposition which I most earnestly favored, and for the adoption of which I exerted all my influence, although the credit of its adoption belongs especially to Hon. Charles S. Thornton and Mrs. Caroline K. Sherman, then members of the Board of Education, who championed the cause as devoted advocates of the early study of this important language. I introduce this bit of autobiography simply to prove that I have been a student and teacher of the classics all my life, that I would foster their study in every rational way, and still believe them to be a great enginery of power in stimulating thought and in giving to those who master them an intellectual grasp and growth imparted by few other subjects. I am not, however, suffering from classical myopia in my intellectual vision. I have too great a respect for the age in which we live; too painful an appreciation of its demands; too sanguine a faith in its opportunities; too deep an interest in the life, honor, and contentment of our young people; too keen a knowledge of the striking differences of inherited tendencies, and tastes, and talents, and capacities, to stand up here and advocate a theory that would alienate the interest of the people, waste their generous outlay of money, discourage one-third of the pupils, limit unreasonably the usefulness of our instruction, and prevent our secondary schools from occupying even the very narrow field wherein students may be fitted for the so-called classical course of our best, aye, of our poorest higher institutions.

So much for this anachronistic resolution.

What of the substitute? It does not advocate an indiscriminate election of studies; it does not propose to recognize an uncorrelated, inharmonious jumble of subjects; it does not favor short courses, nor encourage the pursuit of studies but two or three times a week. It is an appeal for a rational choice of subjects; for options within limited restrictions. It places language and literature, history and science, mathematics and civics side by side, and leaves to parents, the natural guardians of youth, to pupils, not altogether unwise in their judgment of themselves, and to teachers, the pedagogically endowed guides of children, to lead and direct those committed to their charge into those groups of studies and along those lines of work for which divinity, heredity, and environment prove them to be the best adapted.

Our distinguished president himself, courteous, considerate, conservative, in his recent report to the trustees of the State University of Ohio, says that we have gone to extremes in insisting that women should have an education identical with that offered men, a theory and practice which he says "is accountable for much that is strained and unnatural in the present social and economical relations of the sexes." Truly a Daniel come to judgment. If the sexes may be more profitably educated along different lines, how much truer is it that some men and some women should be differently trained from some other men and women! Shall we have no technological institutions and no secondary schools to prepare for them? No commercial high schools to fit pupils for the new courses of commercial and political science in our colleges?

Shall pupils be denied the inestimable privilege of turning the leaves of nature and reading what God has written upon rock, and tree, and soil; upon leaf, and bud, and flower; upon sun, and star, and planet, which He declares have been made subject to the sovereignty of man? Shall botany, and geology, and physics, and chemistry, in their superficial relations and in their practical applications, be a closed book to all except a few who go to college, aye, to the university?

Shall our young people be told that they need take no survey of the world's history, which repeats itself in human nature? That they need no systematized and thoroughly digested knowledge of the industrial and political beginnings and advance of our own country? A subject that ought to be at the forefront in every secondary school, two languages beside the English and mathematics to the contrary notwithstanding.

These questions answer themselves. They need to have shed upon them no light of psychic research, no pedagogical disquisitions, no truths of the dangers of adolescence. The schools are for the people, and when I visit almost ten thousand pupils who attend the public high schools of Chicago, and witness among them all racial conditions, all varying environments, and ever-diverse aptitudes, and see them here, there, and everywhere putting forth efforts which recoil upon them in their innocent slavery, my indignation knows no bounds and I feel like crying out from the housetops: "Give these children something to do that shall touch the hidden springs of their nature, lend them an inspiration for work, and bring into flower and fruitage their long-slumbering talents."

This subject of elasticity in courses of study is dominating educational thought today, and you can no more stop its leavening power than you can stay the working of the natural laws of evolution. The few may contend against it and take up arms against a sea of troubles, but by opposing cannot end them. Man and his environment, nature and her laws, history and the warning it gives and the lesson it teaches, sociology in the relations to the development of harmonious conditions, the industries by which man is supported, art not for art's sake, music not for music's sake, but to impart an inspiration to life, to lend a charm to labor—these, and none more diligently, more pleasantly, nor more profitably, are to be studied in the colleges of the people, either in addition to or in place of "two languages beside the English."

Mrs. Ella F. Young, the queen regent of assistant superintendents, recently said in a public address:

Notwithstanding the many views on every subject, in education, I believe it possible to get at a common basis of thought which will divide the entire teaching corps from the first grade teacher to the superintendent into only two classes: the first class will include those holding to the old academic view of education; the second will include those holding to the view that there are natural lines of interest for the child along which he develops through the exercises of his motor energies, his senses, his constructive powers, and his purely intellectual powers.

I enroll myself in the second class.

President Eliot in his last annual report says (page 18):

The college inclines to count for admission any subject which is taught in good secondary schools long enough and well enough to make the study of it a substantial part of a training appropriate to the pupil's capacity and

degree of maturity. The college tends to accept any selection of subjects—made by school, parents, or pupil—which may fairly be said to constitute a sound training, and is disposed to leave the secondary school its full share of the responsibility for making wise selections. The future attitude of the college is likely to be not continued insistence upon certain school studies as essential to preparation for college, but insistence that the gate to a university education shall not be closed on the candidate in consequence of his omission at school of any particular studies, provided that his school course has been so composed as to afford him a sound training of some sort. In a democratic nation, spread over a continent, and in which secondary education presents great local diversities, colleges and universities, if they would retain a national character and influence, must be careful not to offer unnecessary obstacles to the admission of young men of adequate, though diversified, preliminary training. Harvard College has long presented the principle of election of college studies, and has found nothing but advantage in the free application of that principle. It is natural that the college should seek to further the adoption of the same principle in secondary education and in requirements for admission to college. It also believes that the introduction of this principle adds greatly to the dignity, merit, and serviceableness of any academic school. It enables a school to serve well and develop effectively a greater variety of minds and characters; and this is as great merit in a secondary school as it is in a college, and quite as important to the country, inasmuch as the number of pupils in secondary schools must always exceed the number in colleges and universities.

This is not only good theory from high authority, but it has been demonstrated by a rich experience, and fair Harvard has not been required to lower its colors to one of those “I-am-holier-than-thou” institutions, which will not allow a student to cross its threshold with less than three languages besides mathematics.

The Harvard Teachers’ Association held its seventh annual meeting March 5. The one topic for discussion was “A Free Election of Studies in the Secondary Schools.”

The paper of Mr. Samuel Thurber of the Girls’ Latin School, Boston, favored the freest election possible. In part he said substantially:

That the state educates the few well with the hope that they will leaven society. This the present system has failed to do. To teach Latin does not, it has been found, necessarily create leaders. The adolescent years should be spent in coming in contact with the great minds of the past who have made society what it is. Thus should be aroused toward the state that feeling of gratitude which college men feel towards *alma mater*. This can only

be done by making the high school the "people's college." We must break our courses for those who have no aptitude or cannot pass examinations. We must not worship the system and make it a cult. We must cease to look upon him who seeks admission in one or two subjects as a poacher. Different tastes, different degrees of strength demand flexibility; high school teachers at present know nothing of the individual pupils. To everyone who comes they offer the course.

The study of sociology which has made rapid advance is developing the altruistic spirit, and this spirit is looking to education as a means. The people are far more ready for the change than the teachers. The change will surely come but it will come slowly.

Why need I multiply arguments or summon more witnesses. The case is clear, the cause is just, the end is near. Elasticity in courses of study, options within correlated groups, adaptations of subjects to individual aptitudes, are to be the sign-manual of the secondary schools in the near future, and a broad exit from the best of these schools is to be the wide entrance into the real college, or if fate so decrees, into the contentment and success of real life.

I cannot present a better climax to this paper than to read you three letters from the three great divisions of the country. One from the Atlantic coast, one from the Pacific coast, and a third from where the sun shines in its meridian glory.

I wrote these three presidents, asking them for an honest opinion of the comparative merits of the resolution and the substitute. I received the following replies:

ITHACA, N. Y., February 28, 1898.

Dear Superintendent Nightingale: I have not hitherto been able to give your letter of the 18th and the enclosed resolutions the attention it deserves. I shall now briefly give you my opinion upon the resolutions.

I think the one labeled "Resolution IV" will not hold water upon any consideration, either theoretical or practical. The proposal to make the study of mathematics and of languages preëminent in every school, and in colleges until the end of the Sophomore year, would make the curriculum of all these institutions deal predominantly with *symbols*, verbal and numeral, and would not provide for dealing directly with any one of the three fundamental objects of human knowledge, nature, man, or God. Any wisely planned curriculum must be based upon science, which trains us to see and understand the world we live in; upon history, economic, political and social science, psychology, literature, etc., which train us to an understanding of mankind; and religion and philosophy, which lead us to know God and our relations to him. Mathematics is a useful tool in the hands of the scientist,

and linguistics in the hands of the historian, but to subordinate the study of nature and man to the study of numerals and words is like making carpentry an incident to the study of the plane, or subordinating chemistry to the higher mysteries of the blowpipe. This is the criticism which suggests itself from the side of the subjects to be known.

Looking at the matter from the side of those who are to know, two criticisms suggest themselves: (1) Why, up to the end of the present Sophomore year in college should the faculty of dealing at first hand with life be left untrained, or ill-trained? Not only are the chief subjects of knowledge to be neglected all this time, but the faculties of the human mind which deal with them are to be left undeveloped, necessary as the development of the faculty of acquiring knowledge at first hand is to the proper unfolding of the mind, vital as it is to the individual and to society; and (2) this programme calls not merely for the neglect of immensely valuable faculties, but it promises to waste itself in trying to develop all minds by means which have proved inadequate to the education of some. When Providence gives us Darwins, is it wise to set all our school machinery upon trying to convert them into Newtons and Müllers? Or, in homely comparison, would we not often find ourselves trying to form locomotives out of silk, and millinery out of granite?

The "substitute for Resolution IV" I heartily approve. The principle upon which it is based we hold fast to at Cornell, of making courses conform to men, not men to courses. I think it well, however, to set bounds to pliability of courses, especially in the earlier years, let us say up to the time of entrance into college. While a man who has the foundation of his education built, and built according to the natural topography of his mind, may then be left to select his own studies, and make such a combination of them as perhaps no one else has ever precisely made, yet in the earlier period, when the foundation is being built, it is wise to recognize a certain relationship between subjects. To illustrate this correctly, we do not at Cornell allow a man to enter the B. A. course, to offer at entrance any combination of studies he pleases, but we do allow him to offer any one of the three groups which we have designated. Mathematics and language-study play the premier rôle in these groups, which is defensible upon the theory that the student who is to pass freely into his chosen field for four years' study after entrance, should be provided with the tools of study before entering. It is my opinion, however, that we must give larger scope to the sciences even in the period antedating the Freshman year in college, since the training of the cardinal faculty of observation is dependent upon scientific studies, and should date from very early in the education of the individual.

In concluding this letter I must make one criticism upon a detail of that "Resolution IV," which goes into minutiae with regard to its prescription of English. It directs the study of "English, including grammar, rhetoric, and

composition." This involves the endorsement of a method of teaching English which is—to say the least—in debate. The study of English as prescribed for entrance to Cornell University comprises composition and literary study. You will find no mention in our entrance requirements of grammar or rhetoric. We do not believe in teaching these as branches of English, in the preparatory school, and there are many who agree with us. Preparatory education in English means with us the intelligent reading of a prescribed portion of standard English literature, and the ability to write intelligently and correctly upon themes taken from that literature. But this is a matter of detail. The battle will doubtless be fought upon the larger field.

With you, I should very much "regret to see the educators of the Northwest in these closing years of the nineteenth century adopt such a policy, and commend such a worn-out theory as the resolution contains.

Yours, very truly,

[Signed] J. G. SCHURMAN

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, Cambridge, February 23, 1898.

My dear Sir :—The original resolution IV strikes me as distinctly archaic. It is nearly thirty years since the policy recommended in that resolution ceased to be followed in Harvard College. Your substitution is, in my opinion, a great improvement on the original resolution. I should have put literature with language rather than history ; but this is little more than a detail.

Your resolution has the great advantage of recognizing the indispensableness of election of studies and individual instruction.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) CHARLES W. ELIOT

Mr. A. F. Nightingale.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
LELAND STANFORD UNIVERSITY }

PALO ALTO, CAL., February 24, 1898.

Superintendent A. F. Nightingale, Chicago.

Dear Mr. Nightingale :—I have before me your kind letter asking me to express my opinion of a resolution reading as follows :

"*Resolved*, That in every secondary school and college as far as to the end of the Sophomore year, the study of language and the study of mathematics should be predominantly and continuously pursued ; that the study of English including grammar, rhetoric, and composition, should continue throughout every course ; that two languages besides English should be studied ; and that no other studies should be allowed to interfere with the preëminence of the studies here designated."

This resolutions seems to me to represent a piece of reactionary mediævalism which is surprising in view of the rapid progress made in America by educational ideas.

I do not question the value of mathematical studies, but there is nothing except tradition and inertia that would assign to them a disciplinary value above that given by any natural science or by physics or chemistry. The study of mathematics for one thing has the distinct disadvantage that in training the power of abstract reasoning, it is likely to create the impression that truth is to be ascertained by deductive reasoning. The whole of mathematics, broadly speaking, is implied in its definitions, but truths ought to be sought in school as in life, through experience. Moreover, much of mathematics, as now taught, is a dead waste of time.

There can be no doubt of the value of the study of English diction and its corresponding practice. To speak or write clearly is to think clearly, which is a rare and most valuable accomplishment. But English grammar is not the basis of good English. Grammar is the philosophy of language. It is an advanced, not an elementary study, while English grammar is an afterthought of the grammarians. It is largely a "made up" subject, so far as the student can see. The classical languages had grammar, but English being a language of advanced type has largely escaped the artificialities of inflection and declension; these elaborations of grammar being a sign of linguistic maturity. In a serviceable language the emphasis is laid on words instead of forms. Too much study of forms and definitions produces a mental dyspepsia. The fact that young people learn languages easily (and forget them readily) is not in itself a reason for making language the chief element of their education. Children are also very fond of candy, and they prefer it to bread or beefsteak. I believe that the energy devoted to languages, ancient and modern, is still disproportionately great. The amount of language taken should be that which can be digested, that is, that which can be used in the thought and action of after life. This depends upon the person, and cannot be decided arbitrarily in advance. With most people the nourishing and training value of scientific knowledge is far greater. There are words enough in the world, but society is starving for knowledge.

If the collegiate work "to the end of the Sophomore year" is composed entirely of elementary or preparatory work, as above indicated, it should be all done in the high schools and academies. Let the college work begin with something real. When a man is mature enough to enter college, he has enough of individuality to justify adapting his course of study to his actual powers and needs. If all secondary and collegiate work to the end of the Sophomore year were practically reduced to English, mathematics and two foreign languages, it would emasculate the colleges. Most of the ablest and most effective students would avoid the schools and seek some other entrance into life. The greatest extension of the influence of the American universities during the last twenty years is due to the enrichment and individualization of their work. They are worth more to the community since they give what the people need. The inflexible curriculum with its arbitrary classifi-

cation of studies has ceased to be sacred. It has found its level as a mere matter of convenience, and to convenience, realities are no longer sacrificed.

What the secondary course needs is not to be unified, but to be similarly enriched and individualized. The business of all schools is to make men and women, and this cannot be done by subordinating other considerations "to the preëminence of the studies here designated," or any other studies. The substitute resolution suggested by you has my entire approval.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) DAVID S. JORDAN.

What more need I say? Were my convictions on this subject not intense, I should have said much less. You will pardon me for enlarging a discussion into a paper. In conclusion, let me appeal to the North Central Association to take an exalted position on this question which will affect, in a large degree, the courses of study in twelve sovereign states, containing one-third of the population of this country. Need we be ashamed to follow in the paths so clearly defined by Harvard, Cornell, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Leland Stanford University, and many others of our best institutions? If we had been less pedantic and more independent, we might have been leaders in educational thought; let us at least refuse to constitute the rear guard of this advancing army.

By the needs of our famishing pupils, by the wrecks strewn along our high-school courses, the results of starvation, by all the demands of the present, by all the hopes of the future, by our knowledge of individual aptitudes, and our faith in the laws of heredity, by the undiscovered laws of nature, and the undeveloped truths of science, by all our professed sincerity as guides and instructors of the young, let us remove from our schools all semblance of that inscription of the Inferno "Let him who enters here leave hope behind," and cause to cease ringing in our ears that rebuke of the Divine Voice, "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these ye did it not unto me," by so studying the talents and answering to the needs of every immortal soul committed to our charge, that we may equip him to walk forth into the highways of opportunity to secure that contentment and achieve that success for which these schools of the people are so generously maintained.

A. F. NIGHTINGALE

CHICAGO, ILL.