

into those regions of conscience and character which touch the deepest springs of life. The conflict must be decided, finally, by each of us for himself. I have no choice but to place myself wholly in the ranks of those who accept the highest and fullest responsibility in discharge of the teacher's office. And I do so, not because I am out of sympathy with the desire exhibited by Bain, to treat education as a science; nay, rather, it is my very anxiety to obey the canons of scientific method which leads me to reject his leadership. For it is the first law of true science to have regard to the facts of the situation. Now what are the facts that confront us in our daily work as teachers? Surely the most superficial acquaintance with child-life shows how impossible it is for us to raise an artificial psychological limit between intellect and will, or between mental and moral influence. If you, as a teacher, propose to be responsible for memory and reason, leaving character and habit in the charge of the parents or the clergy, you are adopting a course which is not only contrary to the best traditions of our profession, but contrary to the facts of experience, and to the obligations which parents and public opinion impose upon us.

Fifteen years ago in Oxford we heard Arnold Toynbee offering a re-statement of political economy. He rejected the authority of Ricardo and declared his adhesion to the ideals of Carlyle and Ruskin. I do not think that his exposition lost value in the eyes of scientific men because he sought to base his social science upon an ethical ideal; nor need we fear the reproach (if it be a reproach) of being called unscientific, in rejecting the narrower theory of Bain and reverting to the ideals of Arnold and Herbart. We must, with them, insist that righteousness exalteth a school as well as a nation; that the

first simple purpose underlying every other aim in education is the creation of character. It may be that in some quarters there are influences about us which tend to degrade our ideal, to turn the educator into a mere instructor. What else, indeed, can we expect in a period and a country where wealth and luxury abound, and where it is loudly proclaimed by public men that self-interest is the only motive worthy of our regard? If here and there we teachers find such influences to prevail about us, if we find that a high moral purpose is not expected from us by those whom we serve, we can readily distinguish what is temporary and abnormal from the abiding, the eternal facts of experience. Ours is not the only calling in which the individual finds it difficult to maintain the highest standard of aim and practice.

And yet in no profession, except of course that of the clergy, is it more necessary to admit our obligations to this standard. The medical man, or the engineer, deals in the first instance with the physical world, and he may achieve much apart from an altruistic ideal, but, in the social sciences, any attempt to ignore the fundamental law which binds us to our neighbor is fatal to progress and to truth.

This simple statement of the ethical basis of education does not, however, by itself satisfy the situation. Our view of what is possible in the teacher's calling should be checked by our knowledge of child-nature. The child is not an adult, and child-character must be treated according to its kind. In other words, while we are compelled to turn to ethics to guide us in our ultimate aim, we cannot safely rest here; we must look to psychology (or, if you prefer the term, to child-study) and seek there, by actual observation of the child, for the limitations which his imperfect de-