

so that they may understand the incertitude and varied interpretation of detail. In passing I would suggest the study each year of one or two selected articles from the *Quarterlies* to give pupils an insight into intensive history.

A third problem, what may be called somewhat loosely, destructive criticism, is in its cruder forms at least hardly for the high school, though it has a distinct value for historians. A recent writer, by a voluminous array of evidence, has attempted to upset our whole conception of the French Revolution. All history is not in the melting pot. If the teacher considers it necessary to indicate generally that there are historians whose temperament leads them to form opinions at variance with the concensus of opinion, here, seems to me, one of the few occasions where teachers may wisely use their intellectual authority, for one should not allow pupils to go out into the world with a general scepticism of history. Pupils are certain sooner or later to encounter unbalanced minds, eager to exploit some fixed idea by means of a topsyturvy history. Opinion is sure to vary as to how this most difficult problem should be treated; probably the sanest thing to do is to laugh it out of court.

The study of school history is rapidly changing from the chronological to the topical, as illustrated by our Grade Ten syllabus. This is all to the good, though I wish it were supplemented by a chronology to scale, classified under dynasty, France, Economics, etc. Facts can now be weighed rather than counted. As history is assuming such unmanageable proportions a still more rigid selection may soon be imperative. However, with a background of general history for Grade Eleven their special topics can increasingly be discussed from the wider standpoint of comparative history. The prospect is most encouraging for a better type of teaching.

Viewed broadly the topics should include: The evolution of the executive, assembly, judiciary; the ethnical and territorial growth of the state; its safety; colonization; the special fields of central and local government; political and economical contact with foreign nations; respect for other peoples and customs; chivalry; public health and wealth; personal rights and duties; education, literature, art, science. Another generation may vary the emphasis to suit its own immediate needs but it can hardly get away from these fundamental problems. They are the kings and queens, bishops, knights and pawns with which every man and woman should be able intelligently to play the secular game of life. The particular mixture of the concrete and the philosophical with which they should be treated must depend upon the maturity of each particular class year by year, provided only the pupils do not fall between two stools—fact and opinion. It would be utterly foolish however while endeavoring to make history useful to overlook the dramatic element and the dramatic method.

A speaker last year suggested that too much emphasis is placed on kings and too little on the laborer of the XIV. Century. The circumstances of the small cultivator and the agricultural laborer are a permanent subject for consideration. Whether the stress should be placed in the XIV. or the XVIII. Century is a matter of opinion. Conditions of labor in that earlier period are still in the hands of the archivist and, when clarified, may be valued perhaps mainly for the insight they afford as to the growth of the artisan and middle classes, just as a better knowledge of servile Athens would be valued for its fuller light on Plato. No one topic can be allowed to usurp the whole field of instruction. We study kings to-day, not for their trappings, though these should not be overlooked, but mainly because they concretely embody, often unwillingly, the influences which shaped our constitution and common law and that of the United States and indirectly of the modern world. In January in England a judgment was based on *Magna Charta*. Further, these kings of old establish a firm time perspective and the emotions produced by the deeds, good and bad, of rulers of the past are largely passive and so the judgment has freer play.

Another charge against history as taught, inarticulate perhaps at present, is that it is unreal and that we ought to throw all our energy into civics and community work. This is only another aspect of the present struggle between vocationalists and the other—call it what you will: culture, happiness, balance. Civics is a subject of vital importance and the stress laid upon its teaching is made with the best possible intentions. The struggle for a particular emphasis arises from the fact that teachers are anxious to make the best use of the limited time allowed to history. It would be fatuous to ask for more. I cannot see, however, how civics can ever be a substitute for history; how, in fact, it can be intelligently studied without such a foundation. It would be a training in anarchy and be in the end destructive of good citizenship. The real solution appears to be in a further simplification of the syllabus, with civics implicit in all that is taught.

Lastly there is that insistent subject—the present economic unrest. The English Minister of Education calls the Industrial Revolution of the XVIII. Century one of the great watersheds of time. Myers says it is the greatest event since the discovery of fire. It would be safer perhaps to say it is the most important secular single cause for it would be dangerous to one's mental makeup to ignore the cumulative effect of printing, the Renaissance, inductive science, etc., to mention only recent causes. Its origin was obscure, eclipsed by the very dramatic French Revolution. It has been in the main a leaderless movement; a mute inglorious search of all classes for material happiness. To-day the two revolutions have coalesced. Watt and Rousseau let loose titanic forces which are remorselessly and inexorably reshaping Western