





ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE PARENTS
ASSOCIATION of the SCHOOL of EDUCATION on
5 JUNE 1911 by ANITA McCORMICK BLAINE

This, our school, had its original and only true foundation in the mind and heart—in the purpose, of Col. Francis W. Parker. In its second phase, in which it was intended to be freed of all trammels for its work, it was founded (at the first instance of my wish, and Col. Parker's consent) by the efforts of its Trustees, Owen F. Aldis, Henry B. Favill, Cyrus Bentley, Stanley McCormick and myself; and of Col. Parker and of his faculty.

In its third phase it had its foundation in a great concourse of elements—the appreciation of its work and of its principles and of its possibilities by President William R. Harper;—the sympathetic joining with it of the faculties of three of the University's schools and of the University's Department of Education—and the consent to join the University, of all of its own authorities—which included its whole faculty.

To present to you all of the ideals which determined this broad foundation—and they make a mass which must surely help to move on this old world—is more than I am able to do.

I realize that in asking me to speak to you on this subject you have had in mind the limitations which I have in dealing with it. For that reason I am not staggered by the thought. For another reason I am not staggered by it:—As I have known this work in education, its aims and its ideals have not been divergent. I do not need to analyze for you widely separating threads with their actions and interactions. With all the varying ideas and viewpoints of such a great concourse of so many active and independent minds, the purposes of

this work have been in one great stream—the goals have all been at one great end. So that if I lead you to this stream, even though it be down one small rivulet, it is still to one large stream I bring you. For, in this current of educational effort, clashing and warring and disputing as the ideas have been—just as clashing and warring and disputing as ideas must be that are vital to the individual and to the world—they have been below that, as I have known the work, singularly and deeply harmonious. I take it that currents that are deep are swept onwards so much the more irresistibly, that the eddies do not stay the progress, nor separate nor retard the flow. And so, though I bring you to the ideals that dominated the work of the school, through my own medium, I have not the feeling that this is out of harmony with the greater force you find there.

However, I must ask you, as I go on, to bear clearly in mind that what I am giving you is my own standpoint—from which I have viewed this great school work.

At the outset of taking up the subject you have given me, it came to me to try wholly to depict Col. Parker's viewpoint towards his school—and then perhaps to add, of my own, views about the work, and parts of the work, that I should particularly want to emphasize.

The great difficulty about this process is that when I attempt the statement of Col. Parker's viewpoint towards his own school, I am so entirely inadequate for the description. Many others could give you that so much better than I could—notably our Miss Cooke, who carries on Col. Parker's work on the North Side—and equally notably, many members of his faculty whom you have with you.

I had the thought at one moment of asking to divide this hour and to persuade Miss Cooke to give you her interpretation of Col. Parker's work. I quickly retreated from this thought for the reason that if you had the chance to listen to Miss Cooke I should gain no hearing at all—and I could not think of losing this rare opportunity for an audience.

I earnestly entreat you, now that I shall have had my chance of taxing you to my satisfaction, to give yourselves the pleasure, if you can persuade her, of hearing the statement of the school work which Miss Cooke gave to the Parker School this spring. We felt that it was as vivid and comprehensive a statement of this complex subject as we had had.

Leaving you in anticipation of that possibility as a reward of patience, may I then draw you on with me? and let fall upon your head the retribution of your own choice.

The composite seeming not a hopeful attempt, I shall not try to give you the technical description of Col. Parker's school work—nor separate myself from my own view of it. This will not be the full statement of the ideals of the school which my title calls for, and no one statement could cover those in full—no one viewpoint compass them.

But I will ask you, then, to remember that it does not necessarily follow from my statement that the more responsible factors in the school work would be represented therein, and if you promise to keep this in mind, I shall go freely forward and give you what seems the only thing to attempt—the ideals of our school as seen in the foundation of it by one factor in that great and comprehensive process.

One other preliminary word is quite necessary to say:—That I shall not attempt to at all points make clear wherein the school did not fulfill its whole ideal in its performance.

It is unnecessary to state that it did not do so. To speak of its ideals is to indicate that it reached out towards goals beyond its grasp which it had not yet perfectly attained. What you ask for today is a picture of those goals. To analyze the shortcomings and find the reasons and cures for those, is the process of school work. This I am not attempting to describe in this moment. I am but trying to pass on to you—and I fear it will be but faintly—that alluring picture which I got glimpse of when I first entered Col. Parker's school—the ideal growing ground for a child—a picture that itself has grown and grown as one gazes on it and dwells in it.

The ideals—the aims of its existence—of this school which was Col. Parker's—are now yours—and ours by affection and courtesy! Let me once and for all entreat you whenever you approach this vital subject of the work of a school that is trying to set a standard for children, that you take great care to make the distinctions which give the essential idea. This move in education in general has been open, naturally and rightly, to a vast amount of criticism. We cannot approach the subject without meeting it on every hand. This school has challenged attention by its fundamental importance, and also more or less by its power to attract attention by its results. Its real upholders have always welcomed criticism—courted suggestion as a great avenue of help—and ignored the carping criticism which was manifestly trying to pick flaws for the pleasure of that in-

teresting occupation, for which new territory always offers so many easy and attractive opportunities. But there is a vast amount of keenly interested criticism which shoots wide of the mark, because it proceeds from a lack of understanding of the real ideas contained in the terms used. I have often been engulfed by the hopeless and helpless feeling that that situation leaves one in, when it is realized that a word will not straighten the issue, and that the critic will not give more than passing attention to the matter. The confusion is often deeper and more important, however, than the momentary missing of the point by casual beholders. For real criticism is the meat and drink of constructive work in education, or in anything else, and we can ill afford to have it mixed with the poison of a misunderstanding of the real idea.

It is the frequent vision of this confusion which leads me to beg you to make the correct distinctions in dealing with this subject.

The subject of a serious effort to advance education a point further in its evolution, is worth clear thinking on it.

Loose thought does more to becloud issues than we are aware of. So much so-called thought is but a game of follow-the-leader that it becomes an important matter for the leaders not to perpetuate side-tracking lines of mistake. This, no doubt, is an unnecessary reflection or suggestion to make within a University atmosphere. I must be pardoned for making it, on the score of coming into the sacred precincts from the philistine, plebeian sections of the city—of the country—of the world. But even in coming out of the outer darkness—or because of that—it seems worth while to point out the

pitfalls that may catch the steps of the unwary, who may stray from the pure light of University thought.

Such familiar battle grounds for mastery of the correct interpretation come at once to mind—as the common error of making the poor, jaded word discipline do service for the birch rod, and the power of the will, alike, and tearing it limb from limb in separating these two impersonations of it. The result in the casual beholder is, nine times out of ten, the retention of the more dramatic fact of the relegation of the birch rod to the dust heap—and the conclusion, immediate and final, that Discipline—all Discipline—is gone bag and baggage to the same quarter.

An equally ready to hand spot of confusion is the well worn topic of interest. Because interest in the mind of the child may be considered a *sine quo non* of good work, therefore your non-distinction-drawer, whipping poor interest around the stump of all of his own preconceived ideas, pictures your education as tied to the apron string of every passing whim of each separate and individual child of every group—a confusing enough result, surely, in the mind of the believer, if not in the actual fact.

These errors of the common herd are, as we have said, irrelevant in this presence.

But they serve to illustrate common mistakes which can be corrected only by the uncommon clearness of the thinking few—and therefore they may be alluded to pleadingly by a commoner.

May I then proceed to draw one distinction which I think lies at the root of the whole matter?

The first aim of this school, as I have seen it, was

to improve the conditions of school life for all children—to improve them by its immediate discoveries for its own pupils and, by that demonstration, and its influence, for all the children in the world—if possible to reach so far.

This does not fall within the territory of just trying to do what is and has been done in a yet better or more perfect way. It has in it a very different meaning, viz.: to change more or less radically, as the case may be, the existing conditions in schools for children; and it involves clearly a choice. If the former idea is quite right, then the other is not to be followed. If the later idea is right, then the former idea is in some sense wrong. This division or choice is not always a clear one by any means. Known schools would not necessarily fall into the one category or the other. But yet in what Col. Parker set forth to do for children in schools is involved in an essential way an element of choice—an element of negating another way which largely obtained and which he found to be not the right condition for children's education, and which his purpose was to supersede as largely as possible.

Thus, in the aim of his school to improve the conditions for children, is contained an arraignment of a former, and what it would have been his life hope to call an outgrown, idea in the education of children. I think any understanding of the ideas of this school must proceed from a realization of that former state and those elements in it which Col. Parker's work set forth to eradicate—it must proceed from an arraignment!

Holding the former way, then, at the bar, we must make counts against it—in all solemnity.

It received the pupil from the hands of its parents,

but it did not take all of him. At the gate of the school he, like the Gaul he was to learn so much about, was divided into three parts. His parents were told to retain two of them, keeping entire charge of his character formation and his physical well being. The school assumed the task of developing his head machine.

Due notice being thus given of what the school attempted and what it did not attempt to do, it could with perfect good faith wash its hands of all it had not undertaken—and this it proceeded to do. It held its pupils then as little integers for head work, and its educational work went on, on that theory. It became then an irrelevant—almost an impertinent—question if one ventured to inquire, whether such and such a part of school work was a salutary influence on the pupil's character—or whether the school life was conducive to the pupil's health.

Those were questions for the home to deal with wholly! Any particularly benign teacher might enter that realm with her advice. But it was by no possible construction her responsibility.

It is strange to stop to consider, in this conception of the school's function for children, what a large proportion of time and influence the school was willing to assume in the lives of children, on this basis of partial responsibility.

By this division the school took no particular account of the pupil's physical development, and the pupil had no particular way through the school of acquiring a greater store of strength than nature had started him with. The quota of gymnastics in schools in general would hardly make an appreciable limit to this statement. It is quite fair to say that it was not considered

the school's especial business to conserve or increase the pupil's store of physical vigor.

Dealing, as the school set forth to do, then, with the head work of the child, it would be fair to hope that that would be done with enlightenment. But it is more in keeping to expect that a narrow and partial conception of the whole realm of school work would be followed by a limited conception in the field which it did assume. And this we find to be the case.

In the ancien régime the pedagogic process must be declared to be faulty.

It consisted mainly in the stuffing of the pupil's mind with the thoughts and conclusions of others, and the requirement from him of the repetition of these—too often word for word—as his contribution.

It was not only the stuffing of his mind with foreign material, but in such unrelated nuggets as to make no mass which he could by any process of his own assimilate.

The result of this pedagogic conception was, no thinking process on the part of the pupil—and no possession by him of such material as he had succeeded in uttering by rote.

The standards set up by the schools of yesterday were in every case the standards set by others. They were labeled by names made sacred by an awe, which severed them from all real connection with the mind of the pupil.

With the leverage of distance and the power of superstitious reverence, the hold they gained over the pupil was absolute—so that it would never occur to a pupil to have any confidence in any departure whatever of his own. These standards became an absolute measure

of excellence—not from intrinsic appreciation, but from artificial stamp and acceptance. The result was a complete stoppage of any originality and a prime emphasis on imitation.

Discipline in the olden time was a method invented for dealing with inevitably refractory human nature—a means of catching the refraction in the shoot, and bringing it into line for the easement of trouble for the population in general, and for individual teachers in particular. It was a method applied on the outside—prickers of one sort or another, which the refractory one would come up against and wish for his own comfort in the end to steer clear of—a process convenient enough for an ease-loving and thought-shirking adulthood, but not producing in the pupil any real control whatsoever.

From the foregoing elements, it is not a surprise to reach the predicament the old education found itself in. With no physical joy to expect, no work of one's own, but only plodding through the repetition of the work of others, no free play to find one's own *métier*, nothing wanted but strict adherence to a stamped pattern;—with spikes of tongues and glances, reprimands and marks (meaning other reprimands) on every side to prevent any deviation from the lines as laid down, an incentive for such work was needed—and needed badly.

And, alas, the school—which should flash the beacon light of high motive from hilltop to hilltop for humanity—fell into the device, common to all authorities needing to hold their populace within their power,—resorted to the appeal to the lower elements of human nature—the fear of punishment and the hope of gain—the appeal to the selfish desire to escape censure, and to excel above others.

It does not follow from a clear seeing of these elements in the old education, that all school-rooms or all schools contained them.

Minds in all ages have done their part within systems on plans wholly of their own inspiration—minds have found themselves, in spite of all barriers forcing the contrary.

Schools have always been full of the surprises of minds coming upon revivifying connections of ideas—on their own unbounded uprising personality—on one and another teacher, who sees and inspires—and lives have been built on the foundations laid by such chance teachers.

But that does not go so far as to negative the statement that, in the ordinary course and by the accepted plan, at the last end of the old education, all was but left to be overcome. The end was but to begin, and perhaps the best result was the common cry that nothing was remembered.

In the realm of the physical, it was to put an adult mind on the subject and get out of the circumstances what could be rescued—and the effort probably too late at that.

If to think was needed, it was to begin by getting out of and forgetting well-worn ruts.

If a personality demanded recognition, it was at the cost of eradicating the almost ineradicable stamp. If control was to be reached, it was needed to begin all over again in the school of experience.

If co-operation could hold sway (instead of fierce rivalry and competition), it was only by uprooting that

sturdy plant of selfishness, developed by careful cultivation through all the period of youth.

We are used to crying out against human nature and railing against our civilization. I wonder if it often enough occurs to us that our civilization is made by the people of it—and that we are making in turn the civilization of tomorrow.

The minds that must mount, will. How many more might soar if we gave them the chance! How many thousands and millions may be losing their lights, in the treadmill of educational process!

It is no doubt divinely true that we must be born again—but is it divinely necessary that our educational process should leave that so wholly outside of its doors? Might not that be a gradual rebirth in which our education should play the leading part?

It is a thankless task to arraign with no outlook of possibility and hope.

We are never driven to this necessity in scoring ways past for children—for there are always ways to come. For them, ever and anon, teachers arise—prophets—to hold aloft torches to light new paths, and while we spur our search by glancing at the steps we wish to leave, we may concentrate our efforts more on that better way of discerning the footsteps traced ahead and, by the flicker of the light in advance, find which steps are the ones to follow and which to improve.

Col. Parker was one such prophet.

He founded our school in the spirit of a prophet for the purpose of seeking and finding light to shed on the path of mankind.

His school was designed to touch the lives of as many

children as it could reach, with its magic wand; but more than that, to be a school of the prophets, where new light should ever be sought and found—tested and disseminated—by new minds marching on and on—drawn by the irresistible call of the children—giving new and new waves of light, in devotion to them.

It was in this part of the picture of the future that Col. Parker chiefly exulted when he came with his school within this University—the vision of the stream of young things setting forth for their life work, catching sight of the teacher's vision, coming within these gates, and his being able to add of his store to the storehouse of the University, for their preparation for a high mission.

Children were a mission to Col. Parker. To teach them, really, as they might be taught, he held out to his students as the highest mission on this earth. He could not touch the question of teaching in any other spirit.

Children were received from their parents in his school as a sacred trust. There was no dividing of territory here—no separating of functions which left the real child falling between two. The child was in himself a trinity—yes, physical, intellectual, spiritual—but one godhead.

There was no agreement for division of duties. When the child was the school's, he was one whole splendid opportunity and responsibility. It was not that the school would do all for him—but that what it did do it would do wholly for all of him—and if it did not thus help the home to do the same, in its still higher ground, it failed.

The child was considered first as a physical being. It was realized that his whole life up to the adult point is based on growth.

It is the first necessity to rate power from the physical standpoint. How unscientific we are—how dull! We take growing things whose chief element is growth—no two of whom grow precisely alike—each one being a law unto himself—yet we rate and grade them for work by arbitrary years, and erect standards for each year by which they must toe the mark. Then we give them the totally false feeling that at such and such moments, such and such things, arbitrarily decided, must be accomplished, and we call them forward or backward as they go beyond or behind these nicely adjusted facts of our own making, and—by so doing—cut away all chance of a right adjustment by hopelessly twisting their own ideas of themselves.

The school must rate the children's work as it would fit their clothes, to their physical proportions—and then, having the right adjustment, build in all ways to conserve and increase their physical store—taking account at all points of their need for physical overflow and a chance for physical exuberance. Gymnastics and dancing and physical games, for development in different kinds, all made part of the school day.

Free periods, even for a few moments between classes, for a run, it seems to me, should be brought about.

One of the dreams of the second foundation of the school was a great playground where perhaps all of the second half of the school day could be spent out of doors in work and play.

I am sure that it is a serious and important thing for our country, with our more and more rushing life and our concentration in cities, that the schools should take big hold of the physical side of children's lives and build

for the future a sturdier race than we can say we are today.

In the pedagogic field, how shall we describe Col. Parker in his school? The thought of it reminds me of a new elemental thing in its beginnings; and his exuberant joy, in the freedom and courage of his experiments, makes me think of the god Pan with his reeds—finding every day new and diviner sounds and giving them forth to the listening, waiting earth.

He set forth on his quest to overturn school methods. He had no pattern to move by. He studied under the leaders of thought in Germany in his studying days—but that only furnished him with food for thought, not with a plan. Where was the school in this country that was making departures?

In our most vital spots, as of our children, we are most conservative, perhaps to their detriment.

Col. Parker truly set forth alone. Your own John Dewey—and his—came next in time, came equal in courage and initiative, and alongside in plan.

Col. Parker broke into unploughed territory and verily broke the ground. He discarded all precedents. His school practice was determined by two factors:

1st. The prime fundamental principles he clung to for children.

2nd. These, guided, in their application, by his own fine intuitive sense for children.

Col. Parker's principles for teaching were few and clear—as I understand them.

He held that the child is the unit, for teaching—not society. He aimed for the development of the individual to all of his highest powers, to serve and to make so-

ciety, not the training of individuals necessarily to fit society—the finished product of today.

He held that the child's mind is as a plant to let grow—not as a box to fill.

He held that thinking is the growth process, and developed thinking the result to attain—that there is no learning without thinking—and that, therefore, all teaching is but to put the mind in contact—real contact—with a subject in order to let the mind act. He held that a recitation without thought on the part of the child was no recitation.

He held that activity was a necessary condition of thinking and also a necessary product of thinking—therefore activity must be present in the child's attitude towards his work—and also as an outcome of his work, in expression of some kind.

He held that freedom is a necessary condition of activity, and therefore trammels must be taken away.

He held that interest is a concomitant of activity of thinking, in freedom, and therefore a test to apply to the whole. If real interest in the work was lacking, something was wrong—and then his way would be, not to sugar-coat, to tickle the palate, but to diagnose.

He held that to enable the mind to grow by thinking, it must have intellectual food; that this must be fitted in kind and variety to the child's place in his intellectual development, and chosen with a view to growth—not to filling.

The function of the teacher was to lead to the pastures green and the still waters—to spread the table—to furnish the opportunity and let the child feed and grow.

He held that the whole round world belonged to every child, and that to bring that circle aright to the child was the great realm of the teacher—not in unrelated, incoherent masses could it break on the child, without overwhelming and confusing him—but in correlated contacts, with man and nature, in ever enlarging circles, could he at last possess the whole earth.

He held that all of the child's powers should be used towards the gradual but complete possession of nature—including man in that category—and to this end, that the acquiring of all necessary intellectual tools and facilities should be in the course of this thought-building process, in order to prevent waste of energy and time.

Col. Parker would not have given up one of his intellectual dogmas for any person—but he would have given them all up for a child!

The second—but truly the chief and most final and determining factor in his school work—was his intuitive sense of child nature—what it wanted—what it needed—what dwarfed it or twisted it—what expanded it;—and any preconceived ideas that did not measure, in practice, the manifest good of the children, would not have been held for a moment. He was like a gardener tending beloved plants as he went about his school—and he put his finger unerringly on the needed elements—a little more sunshine here or shade there—and the plants thrived wondrously and grew apace.

What did this sense for children consist of? It is difficult to say, but into it went an unbounded belief in them—a sympathetic understanding of them and joy in them—a love of them which included them all.

In teaching, there is the intellectual element and there

is the spiritual—and I think we must come to see that the spiritual must be the predominating element in the end. It must have the real ascendancy—the final decisive voice—the ultimate authority. This is most important nearest to the beginnings of life, where the foundations are laid, in the impressionable years. But I wonder if the age comes at all, during education, when it is not equally true. With Col. Parker this was the guiding star of his whole work.

I am keenly aware, as I have tried to speak of these elements in education, that I have not stated them in technical terms. I am almost as keenly aware that I have no great wish to do so.

It is undoubtedly necessary and serviceable, when one is closely analyzing psychological processes, or pulling one nerve filament from another, to distinguish between them, to have exact technical terms for the true understanding of the matter.

But the adoption of them, without that close, urgent need of their use, is a dangerous and hampering thing. And when one is talking about the teaching of children, there are broader issues involved than these close analyses, and I have a feeling that to try to closely analyze and condense, into technical statements, matters that are too big and broad for that treatment, is to arrive at more of falsehood than of truth.

I do not think that Col. Parker stated well his principles and beliefs in education. He always said that John Dewey spoke for him better than he could speak for himself.

But he saw—and one difficulty in his promulgating what he saw, was that he said it so inadequately. But

he carried out his views for the children in a marvelous fashion, and the main point for the children was not the phrasing but the doing.

Did Col. Parker have a pride in the intellectual side of his school work?

There is hardly a point in the world where that arch enemy of the best and highest good does not gain some foothold. I do not know—I could not say he had none. It might be that his intellectual creed, like other creeds, had fences built around some of its tenets—holding some regions untouchable.

But if this were so, it boots not.

If so, it would only mean that what he held for children was so great, that it was too great for his own grasp. For the deepest fundamental principles of Col. Parker's school were on such untouchable ground that to put any mere intellectual theories into the same category must be to lower them.

It may be that, with a touch of pride, Col. Parker hedged about some of the lesser holdings of his pedagogic doctrine—and if so, all would suffer from a disturbed proportion—but even if so, we cannot let that rob us of the greatness of his greatest.

The great, the pre-eminent, the undying part of Col. Parker's move in education was to free, to lift, the soul of the child—therefore the soul of humanity. I do not want to use that term in such a way that it could provoke the discussion of what is the soul, and whether there is a soul. If I could ask you, each one, to supply your own term, to mean the highest development of the inner nature of man—that is what I would like to do. I use soul only because I know no better one.

The great move in education that he made was to put that soul—that highest possible character development—as the one standard, the one aim, the one goal, of school work—its accomplishment the one final test of the work. He put his school at the disposal of that achievement. All that would further it might stand—all that would help it must be had, if possible—anything that would hinder it must be done away with.

I am afraid Col. Parker did not live and work long enough to let us realize what that truly meant—the vital difference between that and the basis that most of our educational institutions are on—young and old alike.

They are doing the expected thing, the accepted work, and are doing, in addition, as much as they can towards improvement of the ideas in education, and of the individual pupils.

Discussions of betterings of school processes for children is very apt to bring to a close with, “We would do so and so, if we could”.

It does not follow that we should all be pace-setters—we may not have the conviction or the power for that. But it helps all, when one can be such. It is worth while to see what such a one is really doing. Even so much, it sometimes seems, it is difficult to grasp the full force of.

Col. Parker in his school could do all things that he was convinced were for the good of the children, because he would. And it was really doing—not only saying, or writing in a catalogue. All interests—all authorities even—himself, his whole school, and everything connected with it, were subjected to the one purpose to find the best—the very best—thing for children—

and no other purpose was admitted within the walls—to stay.

And of the best, that best of the best—the child's soul—was paramount. Neither angels nor principalities could have kept in that school a measure that would injure a child's soul, so far as its head could know it.

Of what would injure a child's soul he took all counsel—of his faculty primarily. They, being his chosen counselors and in the heart of the machine, their advice was weighty with him.

(He believed in the initiative in school management. I am not sure he would have advocated the referendum, for when there was a final word to say it had to be his. The recall, I am sure, would never have been needed!)

All and any light Col. Parker courted from far or near. Any who could contribute thought for a child had a hearing. And from it all, and the depths of his own convictions, conclusions were reached—and then there was never a question about action.

Artificiality of every sort was swept away. The only standard that was set for a child was that child's best. The world's leaders were not brought to him as arbiters, but as friends. Each child was made a king in his own domain, and what he gave of that princely possession, was a gift to all.

Discipline, as all else, was evoked from within, not laid on from without—and it was evoked wholly on the basis of usefulness to the community—the real basis.

If it became necessary at any point to protect the community arbitrarily, that could be done. It is amazing how seldom it was needed. With all the forces working towards self-control, how could it otherwise than

come about—rightly and completely—developing a true responsibility?

The finest flower of Col. Parker's work was in his final appeal to the child's motive and incentive. He never allowed an appeal to be made directly or indirectly to the lower, selfish instinct of a human being in his care—unless it might be in a humor which would dispose of it, as a serious consideration, perhaps more effectually than silence.

Thus all competition—that is, of the get-ahead-of-the-other-fellow sort—was wiped out.

When he took this stand, it took more courage than it would today—although I cannot say that even today education has declared competition an outworn way.

In that day, to abolish rating marks among pupils would have been considered a step towards pandemonium. But Col. Parker would have said that even if so, pandemonium would have been better than creating greed for glory, and at another's expense.

But of course it did not produce pandemonium—the courage of the right step never does. It produced only added fervor in the pupil—greater interest in the real issue of one's work, when the false issue of its rating by some one else, in comparison with some one else, was eliminated. And competition (except in the field of the friendly rivalry of play where the gamboling spirit makes it a thing of joy!), competition took its proper place, and became competition with oneself to do ever better and better work. Vulgar, sordid competition was wiped out of existence in its selfish aspects—and co-operation came to take its place.

The question for every pupil at every turn was not,

how much can I get ahead of my brother?—but, how much can I help my brother to do also?

If Col. Parker's school had no other reason for existence in fact or in memory, this alone would furnish cause for its continuance—need that it should live and not die—that in one spot, in the world, credits for self were not counted up for miserly, selfish gain; inches or dots or lines or figures were not closely estimated in order to rate one ahead of another.

Competition was lost sight of in the effort to help, and to do better oneself, in order to help more—co-operation loomed up big and beautiful for a cause—for work and the joy of it—with others in a community spirit—where contribution was so diverse and so overflowing that efforts to rate it became an absurdity, efforts to increase it a joy.

Can the ideals of our school be told in words?

They flow from the purpose of the foundation. They change in shape and color—in detail—as they go forward—as a river finds new channels from its very force.

They are to build on the old—losing none of its strengths—but, with reverence, to add forever new lights.

They are to make that great art of teaching come to seem the greatest thing in the world, so that ideals may become realities in all schools.

They are to take the child—all children—and build them better bodies—keener, truer minds—and through all, at all moments and in all experiences, lead them to be finer spirits.

And the saving clause, as we think of how we cannot, perhaps, do it all ourselves, is that, as we drop even stray

gems of ideals, the children pick them up and play with them and weave them into their lives to do it all better.

I feel sure that when the millenium comes, it will come to us through the ideals of our schools.

LB
2193
C45
B53
1911
RARE



