

imposed from above by the educational authorities of the particular university. In this way you avoid complete and foolish ignorance of any one subject about which it is desirable for everybody to know something ; but at the same time you give full and free play to individual diversities of taste and faculty.

A person brought up on such a curriculum ought to be fairly well equipped for the battle of modern life in everything except the technical training of the particular profession. And technical training must, of course, come afterwards—in the medical school, in the lawyer's office, in the engineering yard, in the merchant's counting-house. But I maintain that every man or woman will be better fitted for every position in life—he or she may fill—as a citizen, as a breadwinner, as a wife, as a parent—than when linguistically educated upon the existing basis. Wide knowledge of facts is essential to success in modern life ; it is ignorance of facts that most often causes failure of adaptation. And any nation that ventured to adopt such an education in facts, instead of words, would forge ahead of all other nations with an accelerated rapidity that would astonish even those who introduced it.

But there is a preconception still more fatal to progress than all these preconceptions with which I have hitherto dealt—a preconception which vitiates as yet almost all thinking on the subject, even in America. It is the deep-seated prejudice in favor of the college itself—of education as essentially a thing of teaching, not of learning—of education as bookish and scholastic—another baneful legacy of the monkish training. I believe almost everybody still overestimates the importance of college as such, and underestimates the value of travel and experience. Let me put the thing graphically. Thousands of American

parents, asked to thrust their hands into their pockets and pay a round sum to send their sons or daughters to Harvard or Vassar, will do so without hesitation. Thousands of English parents will do the same thing, at still greater expense, for Oxford or Girton. But ask those same parents to thrust their hands into their pockets and pull out an equal amount to send their sons and daughters traveling, deliberately, as a mode of education, in Europe, and they will draw back at once ; “ I don't want to waste so large a sum on a mere pleasure excursion.”

Why is this? Clearly because the mediæval idea that most learning or all learning is to be derived from books still survives among us. In the middle ages travel was difficult. People lived much in the same place, and the knowledge of the times was really all book knowledge. To-day people travel freely ; but the conception of travel as a great educator hardly exists at all in Europe, and is relatively little known even in America. I say “ even in America,” for I gladly admit that many more Americans than Europeans do really understand the high educational value of travel. But for the Englishman, travel in England itself is comparatively useless ; so for the American, is travel in America. It is travel in other countries that is of prime importance—above all, in the motherlands of culture—France, Germany, Italy, Greece, Egypt. And the greatest of these is Italy.

In my opinion a father who has sons and daughters of the proper age to go to college will do better by his children, and not less economically for himself, if he sends them for two years to travel in Europe than if he sends them for three years to an American or English university.

The knowledge gained at the university is unreal and bookish—