

sent day a step further: we are not content simply to follow Arnold and Herbart in giving a nobler aim to the studies of the child, but we desire also to bend his activities in recreation, in physical education, and in all the arts towards the same moral end. We need not, however, dwell upon this topic, for indeed it will occupy our attention at a later stage, when we come to consider the selection of material for the curriculum. I mention it here as a link of connection—showing how dependent we are, when proceeding to consider practical problems of teaching, upon our previous inquiry into this first department, the aim of education.

It appears, then, that the primitive ethical ideal needs to be interpreted anew under new social conditions. You will readily agree with me that in each age it is also imperilled by new dangers. To the most obvious and most oppressive of these I have already referred:—the forces of competition and wealth are a permanent foe to the simplicity of moral aims. I may mention briefly two other agencies which seem to me to be fraught with more subtle danger. The introduction of science teaching into our curricula has been, as we all agree, a necessary and welcome addition to our resources, but we shall surely also agree that it has sometimes been pushed to an extreme. After all, a knowledge of the natural world is not the highest or most important knowledge open to the child; nor does it lie closest to his affections and interests. First of all he is a human being, and in the pursuit of humanistic studies he has ever found the most direct food for moral nurture. (I of course include the study of the literature of the Bible as taking a supreme place in the Humanities.) It is widely admitted that the one-sided action of such organizations as the Science and Art Department has

not only hindered literary culture in our secondary schools, but has imperilled the ethical idea which underlies our conception of "a sound general education."

Another danger, surely, is to be recognized in our excessive absorption just now in problems of administration. Formerly the schoolmaster was a clergyman; now he seems likely to become a politician! From what I have said in the earlier part of this address, you will see that I make this reference to administration in no spirit of contempt. On the contrary, we owe a great debt to the leaders of our profession, who in recent years have taught us the necessity of organizing our secondary education. But we know that these very leaders are the first to anticipate the danger to which I refer. No interest of party or of organization should suffice to draw us away from the principal subject to which we are pledged to devote our lives:—the one subject of education now and always is the child, and the society of children which we call our school. Only so far as we remain faithful to this interest we are justified in giving what remains of our energy to the common cause of our profession. The business of the teacher is obviously to teach and to train the young; in their society he finds that his aims and hopes for education take a higher range than is permitted to him in the turmoil of educational politics.

Here, then, is the standpoint from which we have sought to answer our inquiry as to the Aim of Education. In its fundamental ethical basis it can never change, but, since each period of society, each nation and civilization, produces new codes of conduct, novel readjustment of the moral life, new perils to that life, so the business of the teacher needs to be presented under new aspects, conformable to what I sometimes call