

# WHAT IS EDUCATION?

## *Forum Definitions*

**T**HE best educators in the world — and the worst — are parents. As a rule, parents are more concerned with upholding their authority as parents than with teaching the young idea how to shoot on its own responsibility. Failing in this, they pass on the burden to the college and then blame the college when their sons and daughters come home “college bred in a four-year loaf” with nothing to show for it but a heightened tendency to live beyond their means.

In a well-regulated family the greatest sin of childhood is disobedience; and, up to a certain point, this is as it should be. Lacking knowledge to control himself, a child must necessarily be controlled by some external force. But as he approaches maturity a youth should be given to understand that the time has come for a new experiment in control. As his parents liquidate their receivership over him, the youth is not to view his emancipation as an abandonment of all restraints; on the contrary, he is now to play a man's part and learn to control himself. One must suppose that it was of this principle of inner control that President Lowell was thinking when he said in the April FORUM that all education is self-education.

There is much confusion just now concerning educational purposes and ideals. Some say that education should be practical — that is, teach a trade. Others say that it should produce scholars, masters of learning. But when it is cultivated for its own sake alone, learning may be as irresponsible as art. The Loeb-Leopold tragedy testifies to this. These two young men were rated as extraordinary scholars by the unanimous judgment of their teachers. But they were not educated. They lacked that which is at the very centre of true education — self-control. They had submitted to only half of the educational process. They had taken the

measure of the world and had acquired self-confidence. But they had never taken their own measure and had never acquired humility; and without humility self-confidence becomes mere arrogance — the characteristic trait of the new barbarians who stand between the uneducated and the educated.

“Self-education,” said President Lowell; “self-control,” said Emerson — two aspects of the same thing. Self-education is the process, self-control the achievement; and by the achievement shall the process be tested.

Prizes are awarded for the following:

1. Education — a three-fold process developed by man in a desire to facilitate the application of past experiences to making further progress: first, a disciplining of the mind to enable it to function in its most productive manner; second, a widening of interest in the nobler things of life through intelligent understanding and appreciation; third, a discovery of one's own qualities and potentialities through impartial self-examination, leading to their development. (*Ruth B. Wellman, Deerfield, Mass.*)

2. Education — the process of getting acquainted with the universe. (*W. P. Brown, New York City*)

3. Education is the knowledge, acquired through the systematic and harmonious cultivation of one's natural powers, which gives one the ability to adjust himself satisfactorily to his physical and intellectual environment. (*Mrs. Charles Arthur, Ansonia, Conn.*)

4. Education — a subject taught in normal colleges by abnormal professors to subnormal students. (*Mary Milligan Stark, Laramie, Wyo.*)

*Next word to be defined: — HAPPINESS. Definitions, typewritten and not exceeding 100 words, must reach the Editor by October 25. Prizes of \$5.00, or any book mentioned or advertised in THE FORUM (value not exceeding \$5.00), for each winning definition.*

# OUR ROSTRUM

JOHAN BULL

*The Editor will be glad — space permitting — to publish in these columns brief letters commenting upon any article or subject that has appeared in THE FORUM.*

## The Jury

*Obiter dicta on that antiquated but sacrosanct institution as discussed in this and prior and coming issues of THE FORUM.*

Editor of THE FORUM:

The jury has been a very useful institution. I say *has been!* Whether it will continue to be, depends upon whether or not it can be remodeled to suit modern conditions.

That at present it is held in very general contempt will not be denied by anyone who has been cognizant of current comment regarding recent political and criminal trials. In practical operation it does not command the respect of the legal profession, nor of business men, nor of people of intelligence generally. Instead of being looked upon as a worthy part of a scientific establishment for the administration of justice, the common disregard in which it is held is portrayed by the jest as to the three greatest uncertainties of life: woman, a horse race, and a jury.

If one will have the patience to watch an ordinary trial lawyer through a jury trial and observe his designing methods in selecting the jurors, his quips and quirks in examining and cross-examining witnesses, the stage play in his objections addressed to the judge and repartee with opposing counsel, and the sophistry and bunkum in his final argument, one will at least perceive that the lawyer is not actuated by the same zeal for exact methods which inspires the modern scientist in his search for truth. If you ask him, he will tell you that the jury is his reason and ex-

cuse for such tactics. He does not like such practice, but he feels that his client's interest would be sacrificed if he did not pettifog. He will not employ the same methods in a trial before the judge alone.

If a business man has, with reference to the jury, any feeling that is stronger than his mistrust, it must be his disgust when he is called to serve. It is astounding how consistently he will object to serving as a juror, and how persistently he will complain about the mental calibre and want of business intelligence of the jury, and his own inconsistency never becomes apparent to him.

Yet I sympathize with the business man. The system should be reformed to command his respect, so that he could give of his time and abilities without too great sacrifice.

Is that possible? I think so. The problem is to get the general public to consider the question, for the necessary constitutional and other changes cannot be made without popular favor.

Our jury system was brought from England by our forbears, whose early struggles to secure its benefits in the new country fixed it in the popular mind as one of the cornerstones of freedom. As descendants of those sturdy men who had wrested the great charter from King John, the colonists quoted its guaranty as to jury trial as proof of their own right. And when they had gained their independence they provided a safeguard for their precious legacy in the federal constitution.

So great was the political significance of trial by jury in the public mind that every state put a guaranty concerning it into its