

they must be educated to know how practically to realize the higher standards which theoretically they have learned to desire. Despite every difficulty, undoubted progress has been made in the right direction, decade by decade, during the last twenty or thirty years. When progress depends upon the education of the entire mass of the population, it necessarily must be slow. On the other hand, when progress has been attained by this process, it means that the entire people—not simply a chosen few—have been elevated to a higher plane of public thought and life.

The Right Training of Girls under Sixteen

By Nicholas Murray Butler

Professor of Philosophy and Education in Columbia College

The form in which the subject of this paper is stated makes it plain at once that it relates to certain sections only of the country, and to a limited number of families. For, happily, in most parts of the United States boys and girls under sixteen are educated together; and, unhappily, but a very small proportion of the population are able to make special provision for the training of their daughters, even if such special provision were advisable. Obviously, therefore, the girl whose training I have in mind is a dweller in a city, and her parents are able to command for her somewhat unusual advantages.

The average young woman who grows up under these apparently helpful surroundings is, however, anything but, well trained when she arrives at the age of sixteen. Perhaps at fourteen, when she is growing rapidly, her parents are for the first time impressed with the fact that her information and mental training are very defective. She knows a little mathematics, but is not very sure of it; a little history; a little English grammar and literature; some music, and perhaps something about drawing and painting. She may also have a fair acquaintance with spoken French. Her powers of observation are undeveloped; she is incapable of drawing accurate inferences from what impresses her; and what she knows is not usually related or coordinated. As a result of the discovery of her deficiencies, she is put under a stricter regimen, and during the rest of the critical period of adolescence she is forced to carry an unduly heavy burden of study, in order that at eighteen or nineteen she may have what is humorously termed "an education."

This dreadful result is due to the inexcusable waste of time that goes on from five to fourteen years of age. This waste is due, in turn, partly to failure to utilize the untold advantages of the kindergarten, and partly to a dreary and long-drawn-out course of elementary study. For children under six years of age, and in certain cases under seven, the kindergarten is the most efficient educational agency that man has yet devised. When it is not appreciated, it is either because it is abused or misunderstood. It is abused when it falls into the hands of wholly untrained or naturally incompetent persons, who of necessity suffer it to degenerate into a routine as tiresome and repetitious as routine usually is. It is misunderstood when it is supposed to be a course of study to be completed regardless of the child's age, tastes, and capacities. One year in the kindergarten may suffice for some children; two years are enough for most; three years may be necessary for some. The true kindergartner is always on the alert to discover when the child is ready to go on with elementary-school work. It is the mechanical and superstitious kindergartner, not the scientific one, who holds children back. I am quite convinced, by experience, that a sound kindergarten training gives the young child a power and an appreciation that enable her far to outstrip her sister who has not had such training, when both enter together upon the elementary-school course.

The work of elementary schools for such girls as I have in mind is sometimes badly planned by unwise teachers, and sometimes interfered with by unwise parents.

The teacher shows unwisdom when she insists upon long

years of purely formal instruction, and that by antiquated methods; when she reviews or repeats for the last third of the year what has been done in the preceding two-thirds, believing that she is thus attaining thoroughness; and when she postpones certain studies, called secondary or advanced, until a time long after the child is able to undertake them intelligently, because they are "usually high-school studies." A language other than English, algebra, and general history are studies to be taken up when the child is ready for them, and not to be postponed to a hypothetical "high-school age," the pupil being kept "marking time" the while. American teachers have a most distressing tendency to underestimate the capacity of their pupils, and it is often quite forgotten that, bad as overpressure is and wholly as it is to be avoided, there are hardly less serious evils resulting from weakening the growing intellectual powers by failing to furnish appropriate opportunities for their healthy exercise. The result of depriving children of the mental food that they need and crave is arrested development.

The parent shows unwisdom by yielding to the persuasions of those who assure him that a young child is better off, in the long run, if she is not kept systematically at work, for a portion of each day, between the ages of eight and twelve or thirteen. This is a not unpopular fallacy. But as a matter of fact the child will be better physically, and far better intellectually and morally, both then and thereafter, for a gentle insistence on the performance of carefully adjusted school duties during those years. Of course anæmic children, over-nervous children, strong but backward children, and precocious children must not be treated alike; and nowadays we are learning not to attempt to treat them alike. The systematic observation and study of children is making teachers more individualistic in their methods of teaching, at least in those cases where they have some freedom and are not crushed under the wheels of a Juggernaut "system."

The backbone of the girl's elementary education should be instruction in the mother tongue and its use. Mathematics, history, and the study of nature should also run through the entire school course. These four studies, with what they necessarily involve, are quite sufficient for the young girl until the time comes to begin a second language. By mathematics I mean actual operations with numbers, and not a long wrestling with the logical problems and puzzles sometimes classed as "Analysis." The aim of mathematical instruction at this age is, first, accuracy, and, second, rapidity in the actual work of calculation. No amount of skill in solving puzzles can ever take the place of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of whole numbers and of fractions. History grows easily and naturally out of the story-telling in the kindergarten. It may best be begun with stories of biography, in close connection with the literature suitable to the age of the child; and later, when it expands into the study of nations, periods, and movements, it ought to be found in close contact with geography. Botany is in many respects the best gateway to scientific study for a young girl to enter, though a little later the accuracy and definiteness of physics, and its close alliance with mathematics, will cause it to be preferred. The best foreign language to begin with, at say ten or eleven, is, in the majority of cases, French. A year later Latin will be introduced, and after that the three languages—English, French, and Latin—will be carried on together, illustrating and reinforcing each other at every stage. No two foreign languages should, however, be begun at the same time. The question of Greek need not be raised in this paper at all.

There is no reason, therefore, why the girl of sixteen should not, like the boy of sixteen, be ready to enter college if she wishes to enter one. But in order to make that possible, the colleges must assume a different attitude toward secondary-school work. They must come to the only rational position, which is that not one, or two, courses of high-school study will be accepted as adequate preparation for college, but that any substantial high-school course, such as those outlined by the Committee of Ten, will be accepted. The colleges must settle the question of degrees to suit themselves, but the contention that only one kind of

high-school course will admit to college as a regular student is unreasonable and must be given up.

The test of a girl's education at sixteen is not so much what she knows, as how she knows it and what mental habits she has formed. An omnivorous memory enables some girls to make an imposing showing of apparent knowledge, but far better and more valuable is mental development, as evidenced by accurate observation, careful reasoning, and correct expression.



Easter

By Esther A. Clark

O stricken earth, snow-shrouded, waste and cold,
O hungry winds that search the barren wold,
O sapless trunks, and branches seamed and old,—
Death reigns!

O turf'd meads, where waking seed-life gropes,
O perfumed breeze from flower-studded slopes,
O tender green, the forest's budding hopes,—
Life reigns!

O sullen tomb, earth's treasure turned to dross,
O hope supreme o'erwhelmed in bitter loss,
O scourge and thorns and ignominious cross,—
Death reigns!

O riven bars, and hope new-plumed for flight,
O bliss eterne, undimmed by age's blight,
Death's vanquisher, triumphant Lord of Light,—
Life reigns!



Christ's Teaching on Social Topics

VIII.—Christ's Law of Service¹

By Lyman Abbott

And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.—Matt. xx., 27, 28.

In these successive Sabbath evenings I am endeavoring to apply the teachings of Jesus Christ to present social questions. In this sermon and the two sermons which will follow it I confine myself to certain teachings of Christ which bear upon the labor question.

First, what is the labor question?

Originally the capitalist owned the laborer. That was slavery. Then slavery was abolished, and feudalism took its place. The capitalist owned the land, and the laborer was attached to the land. The capitalist owed the laborer protection from his enemies, and the laborer owed the lord of the land his service. That was feudalism. Then that was abolished—though remnants still are to be found in England—and there was substituted the wages system. Under the wages system one class of men own the tools and implements of industry and another class of men do the work with those tools. The one class are called capitalists, the other class are called laborers. This system has grown up almost wholly within a century. I can remember when, in the remoter parts of New England, there were still the spinning-wheel and the hand-loom in the farmer's house; when the sheep were sheared and the wool was sent to the carding-mill and then brought back and woven and spun into homespun garments. Now the spinning-wheel is banished from the family, the hand-loom is gone, and the spinning-wheel and the loom are under the roof of the great factories, with a thousand men working them, and no one of them having any ownership whatever in them. In my boyhood days, going home from school, I sat on the box of the stage with the driver, who owned, at least in part, the stage and four-horse team, and it was my ambition as a boy to be sometime a stage-driver myself and

own four splendid horses. Now the locomotive engineer stands in the locomotive and carries many more passengers a great deal more comfortably and at a far greater rate of speed; but he does not own the locomotive. The locomotive and the railroad track are owned by one set of men, and those who operate them have no share in the ownership. Practically all the tools and implements of industry, except in agriculture, have thus passed into the hands of the one class, while they are employed in activity by another class. The labor question is, What is the relation between these two classes—this workingman who uses the tools and this capitalist who owns the tools?

I have spoken of these two classes as though a sharp line could be drawn between them, and all the men on one side were capitalists and all the men on the other side were laborers. But that is not, in point of fact, the case. It is true that under the wages system a comparatively small number of men control the tools, but a very large number of men own them. I believe that, in round numbers, the employees on the Pennsylvania Railroad are about the same in numbers as the stockholders. There are millions of dollars in our savings-banks. To a very large extent they are the savings of men who have earned their money by hard work. But these savings are all invested in tools and implements of industry for use by others; invested in railroads, in lands, in houses, in the things by which industry is carried on. To a very large extent the man who is the owner of one tool will be working with another's tool. We hire one another's tools to do our work. So we must regard these people as in different classes, although they are intermingled; though the same man may be capitalist in one aspect of the case and laborer in the other.

What is to be the relation between these two classes—between the tool-owners and the tool-users, or between the capitalists and the laborers? I believe that Christ enunciated three fundamental principles which would go far to answer this question. These three principles are, first, the law of service; second, the standard of values; and, third, the spirit of brotherhood. I propose to take them up separately. To-night I shall speak of the law of service.

Paganism has always discredited labor. The earlier form of relationship between capital and labor was, as I have said, slavery, and that of itself discredited labor. And that paganism, born of a strange savage selfishness and idleness, ran down through the centuries almost to our present time. In England down to the beginning of the present century a man might walk the deck of a man-of-war as a midshipman and be a gentleman, but if he drove a bolt into its place to make the man-of-war be a mechanic. He might ride his horse over a farmer's field and destroy the harvest, hunting a fox, but if he rode his horse from field to field to superintend the harvest, he was nothing but a farmer! There were three vocations in England that were open to a gentleman's son, up to a very recent period. He could be a soldier, or a preacher, or a politician. But that was all. If he added to his nation's wealth by his industry, he could not be a gentleman. The same spirit came across the ocean to our country. You can remember when the South looked with scorn upon the Northerners because we were industrious. Free labor was a thing to be scoffed at. To live without toil and have other men work for you without wages, that was honorable.

But there is one people in the world which throughout all its history has honored productive industry. That is the Jewish nation. In its old constitution it discredited war and commended agriculture. Every father was required to teach his boy a trade, and the fathers did. The boy might, like Paul, become afterward a Jewish rabbi and a teacher of the law, but he must learn some honest handicraft first. You will say, Does not the Hebrew Scripture say that God imposed labor on man as a penalty for his sin? No, nothing of the kind. On the contrary, it says that when God made Adam, he put him into a garden to dress it and to keep it; and if you think dressing and keeping a garden does not involve toil, try it next July. It was not toil, it was thorns and thistles, that is, needless obstacles and the care and worry which they

¹ Sermon preached at Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, Sunday evening, February 9, 1896; reported stenographically by Henry Winans, and revised by the author. For the previous sermons in this series and two sermons introductory to the series see *The Outlook* for January 4 and 18, February 1, 8, 15, 22, and 29, March 7 and 14.