

misleading, which makes the school simply a place for imparting knowledge, or in addition, an intellectual gymnasium. It should be beyond question, that the State, in undertaking the work of education, can only find an aim at once adequate and consistent in the preparation of the youth, so far as public education can prepare them, for the parts they have to play in civil life. In a single word, the aim of the public school is to make good citizens, or to train the youth of the State, that they shall become good citizens. But to make good citizens, the school must make good men. Character is at least as requisite as intelligence, virtuous habits as trained intellect, to the proper equipment for life. The prosperity, whether of the individual or of the State, rests on a treacherous basis, which does not rest on integrity and self-control. It is often the precursor of ruin. Against that ruin, learning whether of the school or of the college, is but a feeble barrier. Nay, learning divorced from morals, disciplined intellect disengaged from the control of virtuous principle may only make that ruin more speedy and more complete, may have no other result than to give us more skillful swindlers, or more expert thieves. In this way, the school instructing the mind and cultivating the intellectual facilities while disregarding the moral nature, constitutes a real danger and may become a positive injury both to the individual and to society. In any case it must be obvious that the good man is necessary to constitute the good citizen, and the education therefore, which is to promote the society and welfare of the state must be capable of forming good men—it must at least aim at doing so.

But to make good men there must be moral teaching and moral training; that is, there must be both instruction in the principles of morality and the effort to see that these principles are acted out by those in attendance on the school. The virtues of truthfulness, purity, gentleness, self-control—the virtues which go to make good men—if in any sense native to the soil of our fallen nature, find much in it to retard their growth. They need to be cultivated. The opposite vices, falsehood, selfishness, angry passion, will shew themselves more or less in every school room, and every play ground. They will need to be wisely but firmly repressed. The school, if its aim be to make not simply expert arithmeticians, correct grammarians, but truthful and upright men, pure minded and gentle women, cannot disregard the workings of the moral nature, as these come out from day to day within it, not on their better side, now on their worse. The better must be fostered and encouraged, the worse checked and in some cases punished. The conscience must be appealed to. The sense of duty must be cultivated. The habit of obedience must be taught. It is true that the public school is

NOT PRIMARILY A SCHOOL OF MORALITY

any more than it is primarily a school of religion, but a teacher charged with the oversight of children for five or six hours a day during the most formative period of life, may not ignore the moral nature, as it reveals itself every hour in his presence. He must rebuke or punish indolence, falsehood, rudeness, malice, even as he must encourage diligence, truthfulness, purity and gentleness. For him to be indifferent or neutral in the conflict between good and evil, which goes on in the school-room and the play-ground as really as in the business mart or the legislative hall, of which the heart of the youngest child is the seat, as undeniably as that of the busiest adult, is virtually to betray the cause of right; and in mercy at once to the child and to society, he must make his sympathy with goodness, with right character and right conduct, clearly and decisively felt. At any rate, if the public school is to be the seed-plot of noble character, of generous virtues, and not simply of scholastic attainments, if it is to furnish society with good citizens, and not simply with smart arithmeticians or possibly with apt criminals, there must be found in it, not only methodical instruction and careful intellectual drill, but amid all else, as the occasion offers or requires, moral teaching and moral influence. The presiding genius in every school, a genius which may be often silent but which should never sleep, ought to be a lofty and generous morality.

But (and this forms the last link in the argument against a purely secular system of education) moral teaching, to be effective in the highest degree, or in any degree near to the highest, must lean on religion and be enforced by its considerations. It is this, position especially that the apologist for a purely secular system refuses to accept. It is claimed that it is possible to teach morality, and morality of a high kind, without introducing the religious element in any form. Everything turns here on what is meant by the teaching of morality. If by this is meant simply, pointing out in words what is proper and dutiful in human conduct, defining the duties which men owe to each other, then it is possible. The summaries of morals which are found in the agnostic literature of the period, not the less excellent that they are, in good part, borrowed without acknowledgement from the Bible, demonstrate its possibility. But to how little purpose are duties pointed out in the school-room, or anywhere else, if there are no considerations presented, enforcing their performance, no sanctions of a high and sacred kind to secure them against neglect or violation. The whole end contemplated in the teaching of morality, is TO BRING THE TEACHING INTO PRACTICE, to have the precept translated into action. And the main difficulty in the attainment of this end, as everyone knows, has al-