

of the opposite school, the needs of life will only too quickly make of him a machine, an instrument. If "in the morning of his days, when the senses are unworn and tender," when his curiosity is still disinterested, and habit has deadened nothing, he is not introduced to the ideas and objects which alone make any life he can secure for himself worth living, these things will never "swim into his ken." How can we do him this great wrong, and not allow him the key to the doors through which he has a right to pass, seeing that that which is within belongs to him as human? Moreover, as it may be argued, if he has this entry, if he has the elements of a liberal education, he will be more likely to succeed in the struggle for life, seeing that he will fight for a greater prize. Both arguments have force, and there is to be taken account of the contention that in spite of all apparent failures, the two ends can be reconciled "on concilie tant bien que mal les nécessités physiques, et l'ambition intellectuelle" (Thaumin). It is possible in educating liberally to work for a very practical end, in educating for the whole of life to develop a character which will successfully adapt itself to any special sphere of life. This, it is held by some recent French educational thinkers (*e. g.* Demolius Leclerc) is the result of that which they admire in English conditions, as contrasted with French, and especially the absence in England of a single uniform state system, making impossible or difficult, spontaneous developments to meet special cases, and the vigorous initiative of the educational genius. They have in view, of course, mainly English secondary education, but it is probably true that in the sphere also of primary or elementary education under government control a greater variety is possible than in the same sphere in France or Germany. More elasticity indeed is allowed for by the English Code than school boards, and teachers often avail themselves of. The action of the State on the school in England, says M. Max Leclerc, "is not invasive or imperious, it counsels, suggests, controls, gives support, authorizes, hardly offers, never imposes. It took up the rôle of organizing primary education, after individuals and societies had prepared the way. It was at first modest in its demands, timid in proceedings, pre-occupied to respect the independence of associations, not to paralyze initiative, or impose uniformity." "The reason," observes M. Boutmy,