

not far wrong in his address before the University of Pennsylvania, about three years ago. He said (referring to the cause for the superior popular education in Germany and Switzerland), that cause "has expression well given to it by an article in the constitution of Canton Zurich, which declares that there shall be an 'organische verbundung;' an organic connection, between all the schools of the Canton, from the lowest to the highest. It is this connection, this vital connection of popular with higher education which produces its superiority. America has been severely blamed by foreigners for contenting herself generally with instituting a good public system of common schools and leaving intermediate and higher education to chance. When one sees colleges such as Harvard, and Yale, and Columbia, one may be inclined to say that in America higher education seems able to take good care of itself. But the question will still remain, what connection does it hold with popular education? What influence does it exercise upon *that*? In England our higher instruction has no relation whatever with our popular instruction. In Germany, France, and Switzerland the case is otherwise. The popular school is naturally and properly a municipal thing. The minister dealing with it has under his direct care the training colleges where the teachers of the popular schools are formed. You can understand how this action of superior instruction upon the teacher of the common schools must affect them; how it must tend to raise their work above the common and average thing which the school work of institutions fed from the least cultivated classes and taught by instructors drawn from those classes would, of itself, tend to become . . . Therefore, I say, that what is most to be desired for the common school is an

organic connection with higher instruction, a vivifying relation and contact with it. But for this purpose public instruction must be organized as *one whole*. Intermediate and higher instruction would, in my opinion, be great gainers by such an organization. I can conceive no worthier ambition than that of training all who are born in a country like this of yours to all which is human. But it will not be done unless we can impart to popular education the contempt for charlatanism and vulgarity, the sound standard of excellence by which all serious higher instruction is characterized."

In relation to these statements of Mr. Arnold we may say that there seems to be a growing tendency in the United States to a "reapproachment" of the higher and lower schools of the educational world, but, in default of any government organization, and of a strange lack of condescension and a certain separateness of the higher schools, this influence seems strangely to emanate from the lower to the higher, instead of, as we should expect, and as Mr. Arnold argues, from the higher to the lower, thus, debasing the higher schools rather than raising the lower. One of three situations must exist; either the universities and public schools will be separated by an impassable gulf of indifference, as is now unfortunately too much the case, or the universities will draw the lower schools up into sympathetic union with themselves, or, finally, the lower schools under sordid guidance and by the sheer weight of numbers will drag down the universities to a lower level. Something like this latter alternative seems to be the situation in those institutions where special and elective studies are entrusted too early to the choice of the immature, uncultivated and ever after uncultivable boy. But in a government like the United States, where the people are sovereign, when