

than to encourage them; that is, we should regard every boy as capable of any career, even the highest, until he has been proved incompetent for it.

It will somewhat simplify matters, if we begin by asking what is the best general education for the higher professions—the church, law, medicine, teaching, and the technical professions. By ‘general’ education I mean the training which the aspirant to one of these professions should undergo before he enters upon his special professional training. Perhaps I have not quite put the question in the best way; let me rather say, the training which will best fit a boy for any of these professions; for, as I have said, it is not always possible, nor does it seem desirable, that the precise career of our youth should be pre-determined. We must, in framing or modifying our system of education, bear in mind that our aim must be to produce, not a single type of citizen, but all types. We must seek to produce the highest type of clergyman, lawyer, doctor, scientific specialist and business man. Hence, we must not ask merely how industry and commerce may be best developed, any more than how scholars and scientific specialists may be best developed: our question must be, how *all* the most perfect types should be produced. This seems sufficiently obvious, and yet we find so eminent a statesman as Lord Roseberry approaching the question solely from the side of British commerce and industry. In his anxiety to maintain the pre-eminence of England in these departments, he is led to attack the educational methods of Oxford and Cambridge, and to suggest that Greek, and perhaps Latin, should form no part of their curriculum: that they should devote themselves entirely to science, and especially to science as applied to the industrial arts. And in support of his view he points to Germany as a country that has prospered by supplying technical instruction.

Lord Roseberry’s argument seems to proceed on the assumption that the sole aim of education is to secure the highest commercial and industrial success. That such success is a worthy object of ambition no one will be disposed to question. Nor, perhaps, need we question the truth of his charge against Oxford and Cambridge, that they have not sufficiently provided for the development of science, and especially of applied science. But