

struction and are prone to encourage verbal memorizing rather than original thought. This, too, is a matter of race.

The Anglo-Saxon everywhere permits greater freedom in action to the individual citizen than is found compatible with public safety among the nations of other race descent. Perhaps this is the reason why the elementary schools in English-speaking countries lay so much stress on order and discipline. There must be regularity, punctuality, and silence—prompt and willing obedience to command. This is carried to such an extent that the pupil is constrained to sit in a certain position, to rise and pass in military order to his recitation. Even his physical exercises are conducted like military drill, in concert, with careful attention to words of command.

The Anglo-Saxon prepares in school for a life of self-government by habituating himself to conform to strict rules of school etiquette. He is safe if left without police restraint when he grows up. His second nature is to combine with his fellow men and keep step with the rest. If he finds himself shipwrecked on a desert island with a few companions, or goes to a border land to dig gold he proceeds at once to organize a civil community. Where three or more are gathered together a local self-government is formed in their midst.

Local self-government seems to rest on mutual toleration of differences. And yet the typical school of the Anglo Saxon is strict even to the verge of tyranny. Is it necessary that the youth destined for a self-governing community shall prepare for it by forming habits of implicit obedience to authority?

Whatever answer we give to this question we cannot escape the admission that the Anglo-Saxon school

is possessed of a chronic failing. It always needs reform in its methods of instruction. For if the teacher is bending his exertion to secure this mechanical conformity to prescribed rules of conduct, he is more than likely to repress the tendency of the pupil to individual freedom of thinking. And thinking cannot grow except in freedom. The teacher will frown upon pert and capricious expressions of opinion that vary from the text-book. Differences of opinion from himself will be treated as rebellion against the constituted authority. Those pupils who reproduce with little variation the statements of the text-book—those pupils who parrot-like reproduce the expressed ideas of their teacher will be awarded the highest "marks."

The same training that suffices for the will when adopted as method of discipline produces second-rate intellects when adopted as the method of instruction. It forms a habit of intellect that seeks and finds authority and rests contented. The nature of the intellect, however, is to question authority and go behind it to find more ultimate grounds. It questions facts and dead results and goes beyond them for causes. It is the nature of intellect to ascend from things to their causes and to rest only when it reaches an adequate self-cause.

This is an age of science and of the conquest of nature for the service of man. Scientific method is rapidly coming into repute. It is hostile to the method of authority. It follows that the reaction against the old methods of instruction in the school is more pronounced than ever before. It takes the form of opposition to the use of text books; it prefers the oral method; it demands a substitution of natural science for language studies; it uses the developing method in place of memorizing the dead results