

without knowing it. For Huxley has defined science as "organised common-sense". And yet it is curious how many people on inquiry will be found to have the scientific method but poorly developed. William James has commented upon this in his delightful way; he says "The aspiration to be 'scientific' is such an idol of the tribe to the present generation, is so sucked in with his mother's milk by every one of us, that we find it hard to conceive of a creature who should not feel it, and harder still to treat it freely as the altogether peculiar and one-sided subjective interest that it is. But as a matter of fact, few even of the cultivated members of the race have shared it; it was invented but a generation or two ago". I would place its "invention" farther back than "a generation or two ago", but certainly it is by no means a universal possession of all our fellow-men to-day.

The scientific method is the method we all must cultivate if we seek success under the complicated environment of to-day. The scholastic method may have been well enough for the seclusion of the cloisters, but we must struggle with a larger and more complex environment. We must observe, think and conclude that our actions may be adapted to the conditions in which we find ourselves. And there we are back again to the idea of adaptation. The development of the powers of adaptation, *that* is education, and we gain adaptability by developing our powers of observation, reflection and deduction. That is the place of science in education. Or let me say, rather, that is the place of the scientific method in education. Because it is the method that counts, and it matters not whether we make use of science or the classics or moderns or history or mathematics or what not, provided we use them as means to develop the method. True, the sciences lend themselves somewhat more readily to its development, but the application of the scientific method is not necessarily limited to those studies which we ordinarily include under the sciences; it is applicable to all studies.

I have no quarrel with the classics; far from it. I am not advocating the supplanting of the classics by the sciences. It is not necessary, for the classics may be taught by the scientific method and effectively used to develop the triad of processes which make up the scientific method. But the sciences have one great merit—to some it may seem a demerit—less evident in literary studies, namely their objectivity, their impersonality, their concreteness, and in this lies the great advantage they possess for developing the scientific method, which, as I have tried to show, is the method of education that most successfully makes for the development of adaptability to the environment.

Nor do I quarrel with the use of facts. We must make use of them, they are the tools with which we have to work, and if the facts thus employed be useful ones, so much the better. But we must regard