

about to abandon it for some other course. They met with our suggestions and as a last hope resolved to put them into practise; their success, they declare to have far surpassed their utmost expectations. School is no longer the same thing it was to them heretofore, and they have returned to their profession with feelings of affection and zeal.

But on the other hand and side by side, with these testimonies of unreserved approbation, lie the arguments of opponents or of teachers who offer doubts and propose objections. The first, and we regret to say it, no doubt hurried away by ancient usage, reject all systems of education that have for object and foundation of discipline, the existence of a mutual love between master and pupil. According to them, children are to be governed only by fear. To attempt any other method with love as a guide is, in their opinion, the setting up of an utopia. They will have that children are indolent, that they are dull to every proof of interest or affection, that pleasure is their only care, chastisement their only dread, and that by severity only can they be kept under dominion.

We regret that it is beyond our reach to convince such opponents, but it is not our custom to try and satisfy those who make it a practise to contradict us without, at the same time, advancing new reasons for so doing. Besides, we have no ambition to convert those whose minds are more than made up not to be convinced. Unfortunately there are many men in this world who are not open to conviction, and for our part we are not so vainglorious as to suppose that our words will work a miracle and bring all minds to the same convictions as those we ourselves entertain. Moreover, we have reason to fear that those who entertain such a style of language, no more love children than they do their calling, in which case all argument is less than useless.

These obdurate opponents are fortunately few in number. Others, on the contrary, without absolutely rejecting the system of love with children, are pleased to express their doubts; they fear lest we have subjected ourselves to vain and illusory hopes. They consider that that rule may do with children in isolated cases, but that with a number, it will be found unfruitful, and that with the many gathered in a class it will utterly miscarry. They look upon our proposing it as the result of certain preconceived notions of our own, and that it behoves experience to give it a denial.

These people seem to have been carried away with the supposition that in the expression of such opinions we have given utterance to ideas personal to ourself. They forget one thing that we have often repeated, which is, that we do not profess to devise, and that we are disposed to be most guarded against innovation in the matter of education. Our part is altogether a more modest one, it consists in being satisfied to collect and propose the experience of others. If, therefore, we recommend love as a basis to discipline, it is that the excellence of the principle itself guaranties us in so doing, it is the successes obtained through every age by those masters of youth and learning who made the love of their disciples the foundation upon which to build that dominion which it was their ambition to assert over their minds; (1) it is because we remember many schools whose prosperity was due to this source with many others at this moment, present to our mind's eye where intelligent and devoted teachers master every difficulty by the force of mighty love.

There is one thing forgotten or overlooked by many of those opponents who reject the proofs of their own exper-

(1) The fact that all who conquered a name in education, owed their success to a natural affection which they entertained for youth is evident throughout almost every page of the lives of those same great men and great pedagogues.

ience. They tell us that they also made trial of the means spoken of, some that they did so before they saw our articles, others after having seen them, but they both declare them a failure. Taking their own, as a ground of example, in regard to the impossibility of relying upon a mutual love between master and scholar as a guide to the government of a school, they do not hesitate to condemn as chimerical, the idea that points elsewhere than to the means of discipline already in general use, for the art of leading classes and of maintaining there, industry, order, activity and silence, as they should exist.

We will answer these objections and we will endeavor to clear away the doubts of those who seek to consult with us in sincerity and good faith, and the better to obtain that point we will make use of their own arguments in return. But, we must first premise how very common is the error of supposing that, because our individual experience has proved unfruitful that we have acquired the right to condemn the doctrine, method or system in question. Are we justified in saying that a system is worthless, before we know how it should be employed. Before proclaiming it as inadequate to the end proposed, was it given an intelligent or fair trial, and if at all attempted, were not some of those practises so foreign to its nature allowed by the force of habit to creep in, and destroy its good effects? We feel exonerated in asking these questions, when we consider how often the best things meet with condemnation by even persons of strict sincerity and minds open to conviction no doubt, but who lacked knowledge of their true understanding and who, therefore, were unfit to give them a proper and judicious trial. May not the same be the case with those who with what they call, their personal experience for the starting point agree to banish to the land of dreams, discipline as based upon affection?

One master who till that moment had maintained the use of the ordinary means of discipline, says that he made up his mind to banish them without reserve, and that the consequence was a far greater degree of disorder and boisterousness than had ever been known. His scholars became so turbulent and unruly that he was forced to return with redoubled severity to the old rule. A second one also declares how he tried gentleness with his school. He says that he substituted remonstrance and fatherly counsel in the place of reproach and chastisement. He tried the language of reason to children who till then had only been made to listen to that of fear. He laments that his scholars do not seem to understand that style, that they do not even attend to him and are wholly deaf to his voice, that they laugh at exhortations that are no longer enforced by the dread of punishment.

Another who had always lived under the impression of the absolute necessity of severity also took unto himself the resolution of acting upon love with his scholars. "I endeavored to work upon their feelings, says the last, I told them of my regard, of my love for them, and said how ungrateful it would be if they did not repay my affection by behaving better for the future and that they must no longer be idle, disobedient or noisy, but, on the contrary, industrious, docile and every way attentive. But it was all lost time, he adds, these hardened children paid no attention to my words, they serve them but as a mockery some even went so far as to take up my words and disguise their sense, so as to make the most absurd nonsense out of them, and excite laughter and ridicule among the others."

These accounts pain, but do not by any means surprise us. A system that is but half understood and acted upon cannot be expected to answer the results otherwise looked for. Besides, a change of system demands a foregone preparation. The transition from fear, to a system based upon love, must be gradual and effected with discrimination.