



CSL-AS-54 (R)
AS001359



378.54 EXA



AS-00 1359^{CSL}

[Faint handwritten mark]

180.03(7)

3ii



CSL

5
P22100-22

AN EXAMINATION INTO THE PRESENT SYSTEM
OF
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN INDIA
AND
A SCHEME OF REFORM.

SUBMITTED FOR THE CONSIDERATION
OF THE
Indian Universities Commission
BY
SATISCHANDRA MUKERJEE, M.A., B.L.,
Editor, 'THE DAWN'

7th April, 1902.

D. 80.3

I 7



CSL

AS-001359

CALCUTTA:

PRINTED BY THE WEEKLY NOTES PRINTING WORKS,
8, HASTINGS STREET.

— 54
378.524
Sat E



CSL

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

My sincere thanks are due to Babu BRAJENDRA KISHORE RAY CHOWDHURY, the public-spirited Zemindar of Gouripore, Mymensingh, for bearing the entire cost of printing this book.

The 'Dawn' Office,
BHOWANIPORE, CALCUTTA.

} SATISCHANDRA MUKERJEE,
Editor, 'THE DAWN.'



CONTENTS.

	<i>Page.</i>
I. Introductory	1
II. The University and the College: How they are related ...	3
III. University Examinations: Their Scope and Character ...	4
IV. The University-Examiner and the College-Teacher ...	6
V. Qualifications of the University-Recognised College-Teacher	8
VI. The Whole Case for University Reform in India ...	10
VII. Course of High-Standard Teaching by the University- Recognised College-Teacher	14
VIII. Conditions of Work for the University-Recognised College- Teacher	17
IX. Fallacies and Objections	19
X. Conditions of Training under a University-Recognised Teacher: The "Qualifying Certificate"	22
XI. The Tutorial System	24
XII. "Previous Course of Instruction" for Honour Candidates: Some General Principles	25
XIII. "Previous Course of Instruction" for Honour Candidates: The Scheme Continued	29
XIV. "Previous Course of Instruction" for Honour Candidates: University Examination in History	34
XV. Qualifications of the B. A. Degree Candidate ...	36
XVI. Supplemental Rules for the Entrance and F. A. Examina- tions	39
XVII. Concluding Remarks	40



CSL

AN EXAMINATION INTO THE PRESENT SYSTEM
OF
UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN INDIA
AND
A SCHEME OF REFORM.



I
INTRODUCTORY.

Lord Curzon, in his last Convocation speech, made the remark that "the great fault of education as pursued in this country is that knowledge is cultivated by the memory instead of by the mind." His Lordship further said, "Education is a very different thing from instruction," and that "knowledge is not a collection of neatly-assorted facts like the specimens in glass-cases in a museum;" and further, "what you have to do is not to stuff the mind of the pupil with the mere thoughts of others, excellent as they may be, but to teach him to use his own. One correct generalisation drawn with his own brain is worth a library full of second-hand knowledge." "If the object of all teaching," His Lordship pointed out, "is the application to life of sound principles of thought and conduct, it is better for the ordinary man to be able to make one such successful application than to have the brilliancy of a Macaulay or the memory of a Mezzofanti."

There is no doubt that the Calcutta University has, by a system of examinations which leaves very much room for improvement, indirectly encouraged cramming, and has to a very large extent justified the remark of the Chancellor that knowledge is, under the auspices of the Indian Universities, cultivated by the memory instead of by the mind. If the Chancellor should care to look over some of the examination-papers of the Calcutta University for the Degree Examinations, or even for the Premchand Roychand Examinations, specially in the literary subjects, he would find that in almost every instance the questions were set, not to test the scholar's *own* extent of reading or powers of observation, criticism and generalisation, but the object, generally speaking, seemed to be merely to examine his knowledge and familiarity with the texts of the books prescribed or suggested. The reaction of a system of examination as above described upon Indian collegiate teaching even for the higher degrees is evident. The Indian system may and does teach and reward industry and application, and may be an admirable training for the clerkship (although here people are found to differ in opinion), but it leaves the student after a five years' course as helpless in the matter of original thought and work as on the day when he entered the University. The Indian students, used to examinations of the kind I have described, have an unusual knack of picking up in very short time indeed, just the information suited for their examinations, from an analysis or tutor's note-book, and forget much in a few days. And the Indian University "paper-setter" is no match at all for the Indian College Student and the College—"Professor." In some instances, the silent competition between the "paper-setter" on the one



hand, and the "Professor" and the student (who are naturally and generally found ranged on the same side) on the other, as to who is able to get the better of whom, is carried to such extreme lengths that the former in order to survive the contest yields to the temptation of picking out things not generally known, and minute details which every wise man is content to leave to be looked up when he wants them. The result is that a kind of artificial knowledge solely for use in examinations,—Lord Curzon's "collection of neatly-assorted facts like the specimens in glass-cases in a museum"—this sort of knowledge is encouraged or engendered. The Calcutta University paper-setter, for of him I have had opportunities of making some study, so manages his work, asks such questions that what the Indian teacher has to do is merely to stuff the minds of his pupil with the thoughts of others rather than to use his own. The *carrying* power of the higher class of Indian students, the "portative memory" as it has been aptly described, the power of getting-up or of *acquiring*, is very great. And although such power is not to be despised, it will, to quote Lord Curzon again, never "carry the student out of the ranks that follow into the ranks that lead." The Calcutta University system of examinations does not encourage or reward self reliance on the part of the student, on which the Chancellor lays so much stress; and naturally, therefore, not being taught to practise it, since the days of his preparation for the Matriculation, "when something happens that is not provided for by the regulations, or that defies all precedent, he is apt to find himself astray. He has not been taught to practise self-reliance, and therefore he is at a loss, and he turns to them for the guidance which ought to spring from himself" If "this is a fault," as the Chancellor points out it is, "against which the students of the University ought to struggle unceasingly;" it is clear that the Calcutta University by setting the wrong papers and placing before students a wrong standard of proficiency do not help the growth, but only stifle all honest attempts to learn and to teach, on the part respectively of the pupil and of the teacher. The function of the tutor, as has been well said, is to guide, suggest and supervise; the function of the student is to read, annotate, consult books of reference, and to write exercises. The tutor has to stimulate the energy of the student and bring out his latent capabilities, while the true student also stimulates the teacher and is in due course able to take his place. If all this is true, the University examination system should be so devised as to bring to the front only such young men as have conformed to the above standard, and to place in a lower rank those who, unable to draw one correct generalisation with their own brains, are only full of second-hand knowledge. As things are, their positions are reversed, with the necessary result that all honest teaching is discouraged or discounted. The teacher does the work which the student should perform, and abdicates his true position. A system of examinations by the University would have to be devised *which would expect more of the student and would do more for him*. The efficiency of teachers is bound up with a right or wrong system of examinations. As the President of the Indian Universities Commission very well pointed out in his Convocation address (15th February, 1902):—"Even if the Universities ceased to be merely examining bodies, they will still continue to examine; we cannot dispense with the mechanical tests of the work done. But we are all conscious that in times past their tests have exercised a depressing influence on teacher and student. They narrow the mind of the student until he thinks only of percentages; they deprive the teacher of all initiative and independence in the choice of his subjects and in his manner of presenting them to his pupils."

Having shown myself in such complete agreement with the views of the learned President of the Universities Commission, I would in future



articles go more into detail into the subject of University Examinations and try to suggest some remedies in as brief a compass as is consistent with clearness of exposition, for the evils to which I have sought to draw the reader's attention.

II.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COLLEGE: HOW THEY ARE RELATED.

The principal feature of the older English Universities—of Oxford and of Cambridge—are the Colleges. Originally, however, the University was a community of men engaged in educational work, and a member was a *master*, i.e., one who had found entrance into the body as a duly-licensed teacher, and as teaching Arts-subjects, was an M.A., a *master of arts*; while the stage of a *bachelor* was one of apprenticeship for the *mastership*. And the masters were distributed among the several *faculties* for the different branches of academic learning. Such was the original University, a community of learned men engaged in educational work, a close and select community of teachers. The second stage of the Universities was marked by the growth of the Colleges, which have in the end come in a manner to swallow up the Universities. In England, the Colleges have through their tutors and lecturers supplied nearly all the teaching of the Universities, the lectures of the University Professors being, except in the case of the highest few among students, either supernumerary or ornamental. No sooner is a student admitted into a College, than he is assigned to a *tutor*, who throughout the student's University career has complete control over his work, advising him as to what books to read, what lectures to attend, etc., besides assisting him in his work. And the progress of the scholar is tested by each College at the end of the year, independently of the University, and if he fails, he is liable to a fine; while a second failure renders him liable to expulsion from the College. And such is the high tone of the Colleges and the moral control exercised by the tutors and the lecturers that a student as little thinks of changing his College as he would think of changing his name. Thus, it would appear that the Colleges are everything, and the University, as distinct from the Colleges, a very minor factor. Of late years, the Colleges have combined their forces and established a common system of lectures, so that there are at present (1) Inter—Collegiate lectures delivered by the various *Fellows* of the Colleges; and (2) University lectures delivered by Professors, University Lecturers, or Demonstrators. In this way, the Colleges have continually increased their teaching power, and have almost supplanted the University, or, more correctly, have almost swallowed up the University. The part which University Professors or Lecturers play is comparatively small; but there are the various University Laboratories, all centralised in the Museum, where Science-students do practical work, only one or two Colleges having laboratories of their own, which, however, are only free for their own students. We understand, then, wherein lies the strength of the English Universities; whence is the motive power which keeps in vigorous life the English University machinery. It is not so much in the University proper as in the Colleges. Now, the most important question for enquiry and decision is—what supplies the motive power to the academic work done under the auspices of the Indian Universities. Is it in the Colleges or in the University? Which is the supreme factor in the higher educational life of this country, the Colleges or the University? Undoubtedly the answer is—it is the University, not the Colleges, for the Colleges would collapse directly the University ceased to do its examining functions.



The Colleges have not originated in and have not continued in their existence through, any *raison d'être* of their own, but they have been conjured into being by the touch of the University. The University disappears and the Colleges also disappear, although they may take birth in other bodies. This, then, is the most important point of difference between the English and the Indian Universities. In the former case, the Colleges are practically the University; while in the last, the Colleges are but ephemeral products dependent for their very life on the life of the University. I have described the state of things as it is here; the University as a body influencing, directing and dominating the Colleges, by its system of examinations, and the Colleges rearing their heads under the auspices of the University and fitted only to prepare candidates for the University periodical examinations. The Indian Colleges, in fact, partake more of the nature of coaching institutions than of teaching bodies. How to convert these multiplying coaching institutions into Colleges proper—into teaching bodies in fact,—is one of the prime questions for the Universities Commission to consider. When these Colleges have become teaching bodies, the Indian University would have, as of natural necessity, in the main become teaching in character; while in its corporate capacity, it might also, if necessary, supplement the efforts of the constituent colleges by providing extra and useful appliances in the common interest of the entire body of Colleges. The *creation* of a Teaching University, even if it were not financially prohibitive, would be a revolutionising process; but that such a University might evolve under proper conditions admits of very little doubt. Now, in India, the easiest and, perhaps, under existing circumstances, the most effective way of directing or moulding the course or character of studies at the Colleges would be through the door of the examinations. It is in these examinations, success at which is valued more than Collegiate training that the practical reformer would, in the first instance, seek to find the lever whereby to raise the Colleges. Is it or is it not a fact that the Indian University very largely influences or dominates Indian Collegiate teaching by the manner in which it discharges its functions as an examining board? Is it or is it not a fact that the character or scope of the questions set by it has hitherto very largely shaped and moulded the character or scope of the teaching imparted by the Colleges—has, in fact, determined the training given in those Colleges. If the answer to these queries is in the affirmative, then, the further question follows,—Is it possible or practicable for the University to lay down such tests, prescribe such qualifications, or devise such a system or style of examinations as shall beneficially react on Indian Collegiate teaching and ensure a proper training at the hands of the College authorities? In my humble judgment, the first or preliminary steps to Indian University Reform would consist in giving due importance to this question and endeavouring to find a right solution of it. For all reform must be slow building-up, and accordingly must proceed along the line of least resistance. And the main function of the Indian University being to examine, it stands to reason that it should not be subjected to radical or violent alterations, until or unless the methods of legitimate reform that are yet open to it have been tried and have been found wanting.

III.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS: THEIR SCOPE AND CHARACTER.

Unlike the Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, the Indian Colleges are, in point of fact, though not in name, only coaching agencies, and I have pointed out that the process of development of the Indian University from



an examining board into a teaching corporation would be through the conversion of the Indian Colleges into true Colleges or teaching bodies and training institutions. The difficulty of suggesting a scheme for the purposes aforesaid lies in the fact that, whereas true teaching or training of scholars at the Colleges would have to be kept by us in view as our real or direct object, we cannot, by the necessities of the case as applicable to our Indian Universities, proceed straight on and compass that object. In England the older Universities were from the very beginning educational, *i.e.*, teaching and training bodies, a community of masters; and as the Colleges arose, they arose as so many teaching bodies, whose efforts at teaching and training served only to supplement and strengthen the efforts of the Universities. *There*, both University and College aimed straight at one thing,—teaching. *Here*, both University and College have also kept before them one primary object, but that object unfortunately concerns itself only with examinations. It would thus appear that the primary work before the Indian University and the Indian Colleges being respectively the holding of examinations and preparations for such examinations, the work of teaching has come in not as a primary or direct factor, but only as an accessory, *i.e.*, incidentally or indirectly. The great historian E. A. Freeman was of opinion that, “every examination was itself an evil, as making men read not for the attainment of knowledge, but for the object of passing the examination, perhaps of compassing its pecuniary value.” (*Nineteenth Century*, 1888, page 643.) If this is so, the evils of examinations are not minimised but only aggravated, if Universities and Colleges look, each in its own way, on examinations as its direct or engrossing occupation. Notwithstanding all this, the process of development of Indian Colleges into true Colleges and the eventual conversion of the existing examining boards into true Universities will have to be accomplished. We are not permitted to write on a clean slate; we cannot dislocate all existing arrangements by immediately demanding the impossible; we must see if the existing system is capable of improvement; and, not only so, we must see if taking advantage of the fact that examinations shape and direct the course, character, methods and scope of instruction at the different institutions, where candidates are prepared for such examinations; we must see if, having regard to this all-important circumstance, it is possible to devise a self-acting arrangement whereby the native antagonism between teaching and examinations may be smoothed down into friendship, and true teaching may receive an impetus through the compelling agency of examinations.

Recognising, then, for the future, examinations as a means and not an end, the end being the promotion of sound teaching and training, the point for consideration and solution is—what should be the character of questions set by the Universities that would promote sound teaching; that would help and not hinder the true teacher; that would encourage the honest teacher and the genuine student in their efforts to nullify the efforts of the crammer and of the crammed? Hitherto the questions have been mainly of a kind that rewarded only industry and tested only the “carrying power”—the power of acquiring, of getting up—of the candidate. The questions have been, in too many instances, set to test the student’s familiarity with the text-books prescribed; and, in very few instances, have they been such as tested the student’s range of reading, powers of thought, of generalisation, of criticism, or original work in fact. Have the questions set in any appreciable number of cases, one may reasonably inquire, been such that the candidate at examinations finds it more paying to have reasoned-out, independent thoughts of his own; and less paying, if his business has been only with books? Is it true, as is sometimes alleged, that in most cases



the questions set are such that the student is compelled to remain in a perpetual state of pupillage, and has only to read to recollect, when he is of an age to reflect, to examine and to judge? And is it true also that as the result of the system, there has been a moral break-down, a total weakening of the whole moral frame of the student, making it impossible for him to study a subject without the artificial stimulus of an examination? And coming to consider one of the indirect but important aspects of the examination system as pursued in the Universities, is it a fact that their examinations (rewarding bookishness with a very liberal hand) are of a character calculated to engender in students the mischievous delusion that brain-work that could produce nothing was yet a more respectable thing than handiwork that produced something? The Indian Universities Commission will, therefore, have to consider whether it is possible to devise a scheme of University Examinations, which would directly and principally aim at separating the chaff from the grain, at making out a clear division between those who are taught only to listen, remember, and believe, and those who are trained to see, compare, verify, and judge. The Indian Universities Commission will have, in fact, to find out how *dogmatic teaching*, which lends itself eminently to cramming purposes, may find no support or stimulus in the scheme of examinations of the Universities in India.

IV.

THE UNIVERSITY-EXAMINER AND THE COLLEGE-TEACHER.

In devising a well-organised system of examination, the thing specially to be kept in view is the mutual co-operation of students, teachers, and paper-setters and examiners towards a common end, the common end being a high standard of education; for, to quote the learned President of the Universities Commission, "Colleges and lectures and examinations are useful only in so far as they give a right direction to the minds and characters of men" (*Calcutta University Convocation Address, February 25th, 1902*). Now, an examination is a useful instrument in the hands of a teacher to test his *own* work, and to know how far his pupils have followed and profited by his teaching. Good, sound teaching being the one thing needful, the one thing for which the College, the University, and the examiner ought to exist, and the teacher or training being the person who is specially and primarily entrusted with the work of teaching, the teacher is the one person who *prima facie*, has any real claim to examine his boys; for, is it not he who requires to know and feel, more than any others, how far *his* efforts in *educating* his boys are bearing fruit? And if anybody else should at all come in and take part in the work of examination, his part would be only that of an assistant or a delegate, but never that of a superior or even a co-ordinate authority. If training is the object for which the teacher should exist—he or somebody else who is identified or equally interested with him, or derives his authority from him should be entrusted with the work of examination, or *the work of experimental verification of the methods adopted by himself*. An outside authority, one whose work in life is something else than the training or teaching of boys, must never be allowed to sit in judgment over another whose sole function is such teaching and training. If, however, a person is appointed a teacher who is ill-qualified for the work of training boys, the remedy for it is either to replace him by some better-qualified person, or to place him under the control or guidance of a true teacher or trainer, who will alone have the right to test his assistant's work and direct his efforts. But in no case does the remedy lie in appointing a man who is as ill-qualified as, or worse



qualified than, the teacher who is found wanting. I desire to make it clear that, *given the true teacher*, he is alone fitted to examine, not the outsider or anybody else who is not a teacher or trainer of youths himself. The examiner who is not a true teacher is not a help, but a hindrance to all true teachers; and an examination conducted by such an examiner takes the whole soul out of teaching; with the result that a true teacher finding himself relegated to a secondary position, is in a manner compelled to conform to an *external* standard, and soon comes to lose faith in himself, sinks into the position of his own text-books, and gives but little of his own personality to his work. Thus, it is essential that not the nominal teacher, but the true teacher, *i.e.*, one who is a genuine student or worker himself, should alone be appointed to teach and to examine. The question of testing the efficiency of the work of a teacher by means of examinations should be left to be solved by the body of well-qualified teachers in the different colleges. All the various checks and balances, the endless contrivances to weigh and appraise the work and efficiency of teachers become necessary or natural when we have once committed the initial mistake of bringing in the wrong set of men and labelling them as teachers and trainers, when in fact, they are no better than amateurs, who ought to qualify by apprenticeship under a master for the mastership in some future time. Therefore, it would appear that if an examining board like the Calcutta University is at all to develop into a teaching corporation, *i.e.*, a true University; and if the process of such development is through the gradual conversion of the coaching establishments known as Colleges, whether Government or private, into true teaching bodies or Colleges proper, the first thing to consider is whether it is possible to lay down specific conditions of work for a teacher in a College, compliance with which alone would mark him out for special recognition by the University, as a teacher *proper*, with whom shall lie principally the work of teaching and examining and of determining the course of University education. The great body of *apprentices* in Indian Colleges, although they may continue to hold the courtesy title of teacher, must nevertheless, in a well-organised scheme of education, be relegated to their proper places, occupying only a subordinate position, while all control and authority, both at the Colleges and the University must go to the body of teachers proper, *i.e.*, those who by approved work in the past or by approved work during specified periods of their incumbency, have been finally accepted by the University as such. The pivot on which the whole University machine must be made to turn would be this superior body of men whom I have designated as teachers proper. It makes a whole world of difference whether you entrust the chief share of educational work to true teachers or to apprentices. If you merely juggle with names and call men teachers who could only be assistants, and entrust these assistants—however great may be their academic distinctions—but solely on the strength of such distinctions—with the important work of teaching, and of guiding and controlling teaching by means of the University examinations, your Colleges shall remain coaching establishments to the end of time, and the University shall remain an examining board for evermore. Therefore, it comes to this that the University must lay down specific conditions of work or of competency for this superior body of teachers, so that only the fittest among the great body of teachers may find it possible or easy to find entrance into the select body of duly-licensed teachers and may be *recognised as such by brothers in the profession*. What these specific conditions for membership in the body of licensed or recognised teachers should be, I will discuss more fully hereafter; but that they must be clear, distinct and of a kind that shall leave only the fittest among teachers to survive seems—in the light of what I have said as to the paramount importance of preserv-



ing the *purity* of the body of recognised teachers—sufficiently manifest. It may be that my scheme for organising a superior type of College-teachers, with whom all power shall lie, may not commend itself to the authorities; but I would invite the special attention of the members of the Indian Universities Commission to the supreme importance of the question. For, although it is quite true that a scheme for the creation, and maintenance of a body of men—whom I have designated as teachers proper—can only be discovered and pursued at the cost of some trouble and *experiment*, still, if trouble and thought and experiment are to be spared in this great matter, the Government and University had better at once resign the hope of attaining any moral and intellectual results of real value from what they are doing.

V.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE RECOGNISED COLLEGE-TEACHER.

The object of all teaching being the training of pupils by the teacher, the giving the right direction to their minds and characters, it follows at once (as I have shown in my fourth article) that the teacher himself is the proper person to examine his boys or some one else who is equally fitted and interested like himself. The vesting of all authority and control in the body of men whom I have called teachers proper, as distinguished from others who are not teachers yet, who cannot be called *masters*, but only apprentices, although nominally holding the title of teacher,—this vesting of all authority in teachers proper is, as I have tried to show in a previous article, the first steps to a real reform of University education in India—the very first steps towards converting the Indian colleges from merely coaching agencies, which they undoubtedly are at the present moment, into true colleges or teaching bodies. Every other reform must radiate from this central of reforms and any attempt to view things merely from the outside without reaching the central fact of *teaching*, would leave things as they are, perpetuating the present character of Indian Colleges as coaching establishments and of the Indian University as a merely examining board.

The selection and appointment of such teachers in Indian Colleges as shall be competent to play the high part which must be allotted to them in any *genuine* scheme of education and examinations is, therefore, a prime question for the consideration of which no amount of trouble, thought and experiment should be accounted too much. To differentiate true teachers from others that may be hitherto enjoying the same name and privileges would be, it need hardly be said, the object of any specific tests—any specific conditions of work for the true teacher. Now, in finding such tests we can very well start from the recognised proposition that a true teacher—one whose aim is to train or educate—bring out the latent capabilities of his pupil,—never resorts to dogmatic teaching; and if such is his method, it is also clear that in examining his boys, his object would be to discover, not if they have acquired the power of listening, remembering, and believing; but if they are able *for themselves*, to see, compare, verify, judge, classify, expound or comment. This being so, it is clear that the college-teacher of whom I am speaking must not himself be a person, *which he is or apt to be here in India*—whose mind is only full of second-hand knowledge, a store-house of “neatly assorted facts like the specimens in glass-cases in a museum.” He must be a person who does not think the race won merely because he has passed certain examinations, merely because he has won high honours here in India or at Oxford



or at Cambridge or elsewhere; but he must be one who is daily engaged in some work which improves and disciplines his own powers of seeing, comparing, classifying, verifying, judging, etc. On any other condition, the teacher would degenerate into a crammer; and all teaching become dogmatic,—monkish, if I am allowed the word for the purpose of fuller expression. A teacher who has allowed his mind to rust—who looks on the store of accumulated knowledge with a sense of complaisance, whose brain does not teem with new ideas or novel combinations but only with thoughts, (however excellent) of others—such a man I should like to relegate to a subordinate position in a revised scheme of University or collegiate education in India. It follows, therefore, that the teacher proper must be an original worker himself; one who is not resting on his oars, but pushing away as best as he might into the wide sea of knowledge in a direction of his own choice; so that he might know how to whet the intellectual appetite of his pupils and direct them along lines of original thought and research. A teacher who is also a worker is alone fitted to raise himself and others from the slough of routine or dogmatic teaching and routine examinations. The collective wisdom of the Indian Universities Commission ought to be able to devise some system for the selection of the kind of men I am speaking of and to prescribe certain conditions of work such as would clearly differentiate them from the great body of assistant teachers who would work under them in our Colleges. For myself, I shall be content with throwing out certain general hints and considerations to help in the right solution of the question.

Before proceeding to give the reader the positive side of my proposals I desire to state what I may call their negative side. I desire the Universities Commission to consider whether in preventing dogmatic or artificial teaching and artificial examinations, rewarding and encouraging such teaching—it is enough to lock only to the academic honours or distinctions won by a teacher, whether, in fact, it is enough that we should for ever rest complaisantly on the *initial* presumption that a brilliant graduate from Oxford or Cambridge or elsewhere after appointment in India is not likely to degenerate into a dogmatic teacher, but, shall ever remain a *living worker*, even amidst the depressing influences of life and environment in India. An even cursory examination of the question-papers set at the different University Examinations,—papers set by these brilliant home-graduates in so many instances,—will reveal the astounding fact that the questions set are only calculated to test acquirement," *i.e.*, how far the teacher has been successful in stuffing his pupil's mind with the thoughts of others—to use Lord Curzon's pointed phraseology; and in very rare cases, indeed, have they the effect of directing and stimulating education or true training. The question papers are an ample store-house of information on the subject of University education in India—to which the Universities Commission should largely resort for purposes of study. They are the handiwork of brilliant University graduates from home or elsewhere and for ever dissipate the delusion that a good degree from Oxford or Cambridge or mere Indian experience of itself is enough to qualify a man as a trainer of University youngmen. These University Question-papers afford documentary evidence of a most convincing and even conclusive kind which who so reads may understand, and which, therefore, ought to be scrutinised and analysed by the Indian Universities Commission with a view to decide once for all whether it were not necessary to make any extra provisions to prevent artificial teaching and artificial examinations such as have existed during these forty years and more.

As far as I have been able to judge, I have come to the deliberate conclusion that the *future* college-teacher in India, although he might have passed through a course of training at the hands of the greater men of

Europe and have had opportunities of imbibing habits of original work and thought at some renowned foreign University, would soon *under existing circumstances*, cease to be a living worker in India;—and that, therefore, he would require to be helped in some way, that he might not sink into the slough of routine teaching and routine examinations that are in vogue in this country and for which his predecessors in the University must be held responsible. I do not contend that an Indian University must produce during each decade of its life—a Newton or a Darwin, a Newman or a Ruskin. But I do contend that where among college-teachers, lecturers or professors, the spirit is abroad of study and research, of thought and observation, there surely we may look forward, sooner or later to see savants and scientists, men of thought and men of ideas. And I desire to insist with all the emphasis I can command that the College-teacher—one who may be given a special name by the University—say “recognised or special teacher”—must, in addition to whatever other qualifications he might have, be so fully convinced of the value of developed faculties and good mental habits in his pupils that he of all others, should be fully prepared to shew in his own example how much he is animated by the spirit of thought and observation, of study and research. For, it is the absence of this spirit from our educational circles that has produced what consequences it has, both in the matter of teaching and examining, of which the University question-papers are documentary evidence of a clear, irrefragible kind.

I desire, therefore, to propose that a college-teacher on whom the University may elect to confer the high title of “recognised teacher” and who may accordingly be required to play a high part in the affairs of the University and the college—such a teacher must be required to conform to specific conditions of work, such as would help him in fulfilling the conditions of a true trainer and examiner of youths. The conditions of work for a University-recognised teacher and the corresponding advantages or privileges which, in my judgment, it would be feasible for the University to confer on the body of such recognised teachers, I would lay before the reader in another article. But whatever may be the merits or demerits of the scheme I propose to place before the University Commission, my submission is that the root-difficulty in finding a real remedy for the evils of Indian University education is the difficulty of discovering the method whereby to secure and maintain the *purity* of the body of men whom the University shall recognise as a body of “recognised teachers.” And I affirm my conviction that mere academic distinctions and honours however high, shall not, in the light of past experience, be held to be enough to confer, *for all time* on a college teacher the high title of University-recognised teacher.

VI.

THE WHOLE CASE FOR UNIVERSITY REFORM IN INDIA.

The whole case for University Reform in India may be thus put in the form of question and answer:—

(a.) “The great fault of education as pursued in this country is, as we all know, that knowledge is cultivated by the memory instead of by the mind” (*Lord Curzon's Convocation Address, 1902*).

Why is this so? Because the Indian colleges are not true colleges as at Oxford or at Cambridge—*i.e.*, teaching bodies or training institutions. They simply prepare candidates for the University examinations. If the the University examinations were discontinued, they would collapse; the



raison d'être of their existence would be gone. They are ephemeral products, dependent for their very life on the life of an external examining board like the University.

(b.) What, then is the remedy? The remedy is in devising some means for the conversion of the existing coaching agencies mis-named colleges into colleges proper, *i.e.*, teaching and training bodies.

(c.) Has the Calcutta University any means or power to effect such conversion? Yes, it has under the law. (1) The University by the Act of Incorporation has the power of "ascertaining by means of examination the persons who have acquired proficiency in different branches of learning; and of rewarding them by Academical Degree;" and (2) secondly, it has the power to make "regulations touching the qualifications of the candidates for Degrees and the previous Course of instruction to be followed by them." (Act II. of 1857).

(d.) Has the University availed itself of these powers? Yes, it has by instituting various Academical Degrees, examining candidates and conferring on the successful amongst them, those Degrees; and prescribing the courses of instruction for such candidates.

(e.) If the University has already availed itself of its legal powers as aforesaid, how is it that the affiliated institutions sending up candidates for University examinations are, in your opinion, merely coaching establishments and not true colleges or teaching bodies and training institutions, so that, as you say, they are bound to disappear, if the University ceases to perform its function as an examining board? The answer is that although the University is vested with full powers to direct, control, shape and mould the course of education of those who come up to it for its Degrees, still it has so used its powers that, generally speaking, candidates whose "minds are stuffed with the thoughts of others" are specially rewarded; and affiliated institutions that are able effectively to act as coaching agencies are found to be specially successful.

(f.) What ground have you for saying that the University has so used its power as to bring about the wrong results? About the results there could be no question; witness the declaration of the Chancellor of the University which has already been quoted [*vide* (a) ante.].

The only point is—how to connect the actual results with the action of the University. The point would be answered if it were shewn firstly, that the University examination questions are of a kind that mainly reward bookishness, *i.e.*, brain-work that occupies itself only with "acquiring" second-hand thoughts; secondly, that success at the University examinations being the primary concern with candidates, the action of the University in rewarding mere barren-brain work encourages candidates to resort specially to institutions, where they are specially coached for such examinations. Thirdly, that not only does the action of the University encourage and reward bookishness, *i.e.*, brain-work of a kind that is able to produce nothing original; but it also stifles all honest teaching and all honest attempts to learn, on the part respectively of the true teacher and of the true learner.

(g.) How is it that you think that the University examination papers are of a kind that reward only bookishness, when it is a fact that these papers are in so many cases set by brilliant graduates of foreign Universities? The answer is that the questions that have been set by such graduates during the last forty years are published in the University calendars for their respective years, which also give the list of text-books prescribed by the University for the different years. And scrutinising these questions for all the different University examinations in connection with the



prescribed text-books, it will be found that the questions set were of a kind that rewarded bookishness. The question-papers read by the light of the text-books prescribed furnish clear documentary evidence on the subject.

(h.) In a number of years (e. g. 1875-79) the Calcutta University prescribed *no* text-books in English for the Entrance examination, how do you think that the questions set during those years would reward bookishness?

Although there were no prescribed text-books in English during those years, an examination of the papers set would reveal the fact that most of the questions set were of a kind that lent themselves eminently to cramming purposes and were, in fact, taken from Bain's Higher English Grammar and Messrs. Rowe and Webb's Hints on the Study of English.

(i.) Do you think it possible to set papers in English or other subjects which would test something higher than bookishness and which would effectually nullify the efforts of the crammer and the key-maker?

I *do* think that it is quite practicable to frame question-papers of a kind that would at once test and differentiate candidates under two separate heads:—(i) those whose work is only to listen, remember and to believe; and (ii) those who are able to see, compare, verify, classify, judge, expound, and comment.

On a future occasion, I will explain myself more fully by classifying questions under proper heads, which would be such that a proper answer to these questions would be easy only to those who have undergone a systematic training and which, therefore, would baffle the efforts of the crammer and key-maker.

(j.) Do you think there are any other ways to which the University could be of help in not only not rewarding but in discouraging or discounting bookishness? Yes—by an improved system of marking answers; but still this improvement on the system of marking could come only as a necessary adjunct to an improved system of setting examination papers.

(k.) But supposing the University should insist that a candidate for a University examination should produce what may be called a qualifying certificate—that is a certificate from the head of an affiliated school or college showing, *first*, that he has completed in that institution the course of instruction prescribed by the University, and *secondly*, that he has, judging from a test examination to which he has submitted, reasonable chances of passing the examinations;—supposing such qualifying certificate were required of every candidate—do you not think the University would be in a position to alter for the better the existing state of things? I hardly think so, *under the existing system*. In the first place, such a certificate is actually required of candidates for the Entrance Examination; while as regards the First Arts and the B. A. Degree examinations, a modified form of the above certificate giving only the first item of information as aforesaid is also required of candidates in every case, except in some special cases. In the next place, even if the full certificate were demanded of all candidates for all the examinations, it would not make much difference. Because so long as the University paper-setters so manage their work, ask such questions that what the teacher has to do is simply “to stuff the mind of the candidates with the thoughts of *others*,” a certificate from an affiliated Indian school or college would only mean that the candidate has completed the prescribed course of instruction in that college; and in proportion as the work of coaching the candidate has been well-done in that School or College—the condition of a candidate's reasonable chances of passing the University examination would be satisfied.



(l.) But apart from the character of the questions set by the University paper-setter, supposing that the University should require that a candidate for a University examination in a particular subject should have passed through a prescribed course of instruction under a teacher specially recognised, by the University, don't you think that would make some difference? Yes, the only difference would be that a teacher who ought to teach only English for instance, and who in many cases is called upon to lecture on other subjects would have, in a system of recognised teachers in particular subjects, to teach only the subject in which he is recognised by the University as specially fit.

(m.) Don't you think that the teachers of boys by the University-recognised teachers would be of a different character from what obtains at present? I hardly think so, *under the existing system*; and for two reasons principally. In the first place, the list of University-recognised College-teachers would naturally include many distinguished men,—men distinguished by their academic distinctions who are now on the staff of affiliated Colleges and who are also distinguished and important members of the University. The mere addition of a title to their names would not make them better or worse teachers, better or worse paper-setters and examiners, *so long as the existing system is allowed to continue*—the system, I mean, whereby bookishness or barren brain-work is specially rewarded by the University paper-setter. In the next place, if any of the distinguished graduates of Indian or foreign Universities would take it into their heads to observe a lofty standard of teaching and if at the same time the University paper-setter should continue to set questions that would only require the minds of the University-recognised teacher's pupils to be "stuffed with the thoughts of others, however excellent" the University-recognised teacher and the University paper-setter would pull opposite ways and it is not difficult to foresee which is likely to survive the contest,—when it is remembered that no Indian College, Government or Private, finds it financially convenient to do without comparatively large classes, and when it is also remembered that, speaking generally, scholars resort very largely to places where the work of coaching candidates is very well done.

(n.) Is it, then, what you suggest that the college-teacher and the paper-setter must not pull opposite ways, but that they must work in concert? Yes, and something more. In the existing system of examinations, the college-teacher is in almost all cases the paper-setter; and so far the concert aforesaid is secured. But what is absolutely necessary is that there should be not only concert but Co-operation of a very healthy kind.

(o.) What should one understand by co-operation between college-teacher and the paper-setter being of a healthy kind? I mean that the College-teacher should set a lofty standard of teaching and the University paper-setter by the character of his questions and the paper-examiner by an improved system of marking answer-papers and the University Text-Book committee by prescribing the right sort of books should co-operate with the college-teacher in maintaining the lofty standard of *his* teaching, and with the honest student in his efforts at thinking, study observation and research.

(p.) How do you think it is possible for the University to secure the kind of healthy co-operation you mention between college-teacher and the University paper-setter? This could be done if the University should appoint as a paper-setter a college teacher who is prepared to set a high standard of teaching himself and who would be also under an obligation to set papers that would specially reward scholars who are willing to follow and are able to profit by such high standard.



(q.) What should we understand by a high standard of teaching? A high standard would require a teacher to teach in such a way that his pupil would be called upon not simply to hear, believe and remember the lectures, but more specially to see for themselves, compare, verify, classify, judge, expound and comment.

(r.) Do you think it is possible to set a high standard of teaching by the University appointing its own professors and making attendance at the lectures of the University professors count towards the required percentage of attendance? Yes, but would students in any number care to attend such "high-standard" lectures, so long as the University paper-setter makes it possible to a candidate to obtain distinction at the examination, although he might be unable "to draw one correct generalisation with his own brain" and, is only full of second-hand knowledge?

(s.) But supposing a University professor who is able to deliver "high-standard" lectures (in the sense in which you have explained the term) and who *does* deliver such lectures for the University were appointed to set papers at the different University examinations; would that react on collegiate teaching and improve it? No doubt it would. If, as a paper-setter the University professor would see that the questions are also of a high standard rewarding something higher than barren brain-work, college-teachers would follow *his lead* and candidates also would take the hint and turn over a new leaf. But the improvement to which I refer would be only possible on one condition, which has been already specifically mentioned; namely—that the University-professor who is to set the example to College-teachers should be himself able to and should actually impart high-standard teaching and be appointed to set the University papers in his own subject.

(t.) But supposing the University instead of appointing separate professors of its own should pick out the best men in the existing colleges and recognise them as University-recognised teachers and appoint them to set papers and to select text-books, don't you think the same end would be served? Yes—but on the condition to which I have specially referred, namely, that the recognised-teacher should be able and should actually impart "high-standard" teaching to his pupils.

(u.) In what way do you think it is possible to encourage, stimulate or enforce such high standard teaching? By means of "high standard" examinations.—understanding the expression, *high standard*, only in the sense in which I have explained it [*vide question (q)*] and by appointing as paper-setters the high-standard" lecturers or teachers; and thirdly, by devising a scheme whereby particular college-teachers who are competent to impart "high-standard" teaching and who on agreeing to impart such teaching may *during the period of such teaching* be classed into a special body of University-recognised college-teachers—being invested with special powers and privileges by the University. And fourthly, by requiring that candidates for Honours in any subject in Degree examinations must have read with a University-recognised teacher in that subject and be able to produce a *qualifying certificate* from him to that effect. These are very briefly the general principles of the scheme.

VII.

COURSE OF HIGH-STANDARD TEACHING BY UNIVERSITY-RECOGNISED COLLEGE-TEACHER.

In my sixth article, I explained in a general way what I mean by high-standard teaching—which when it is imparted by a college-teacher would alone make him eligible for recognition by the University as a recognised



college-teacher. The central idea which runs through all my articles is that there must be devised some means whereby youngmen who could think, observe, study and work independently for themselves should be specially rewarded by the University; while those whose minds are only "stuffed with the thoughts of others" should only be given an inferior place. It is clear, however, that it is always necessary and advisable that pupils should be enabled to study, understand and appreciate the thoughts of others, and that it is unreasonable that they should be called upon to think and work for themselves without having had opportunities of learning how others have thought and worked, as evidenced by their writings. But I want to make it clear that the mere reading of a book and "acquiring" its contents with a view to pass an examination which tests only such "acquiring" is one thing; while the study of a book with the intention of stimulating one's talents, power and capability—with a view to bring into activity what is within him—is another thing altogether. In the former case, the "acquiring" of second-hand thoughts is the end in view; while in the latter case, it is a means to an end, the end being the development of the higher intellectual faculties. The reading with a teacher or under his guidance standard books must not, therefore, be proscribed, but on the contrary, must be encouraged, *provided always* that the teacher so controls his pupil that the object of his reading becomes the stimulating and development of his own powers and faculties. Whence it follows that the teacher himself, in order that he may set the right example to his pupil—must not be a mere encyclopædia of others' thoughts—a merely book-learned man—but one who sets before himself in his own case the end which he wishes to inculcate to his pupils. He must be able not only to direct the course of their studies in the required direction, as explained; but his own studies, observations, lectures and work must show that he himself practises what he preaches. The course of high-standard teaching by the University-recognised teacher, therefore, naturally falls under two heads: (a) directing the work of the student with a view to lead him along lines of independent thought, observation, study and research; and (b) doing some work of his own and placing before his pupils the methods and results of his own with a view to inspire them with the spirit of original work with which he is himself animated.

I will begin by taking up the question of the University-recognised teacher's own work. By way of illustration, I will take up the subject of Economics and show in what way the recognised College-teacher may help the cause of true education of his pupils. Under the existing system, the Indian college-teacher usually gives only summaries of portions of text-books prescribed, or notes which are also summaries of other books. In many cases, as when called upon to teach the M. A. Degree candidates, he simply dictates notes or leaves them to study for themselves: I do not object to the college-teacher's asking his pupils to read books for themselves,—that is good so far as it goes;—but at present, there is absolutely no attempt on the part of the College-teacher to guide and supervise the work of the student along lines of independent thought, observation and research. The B. A. Degree and M. A. Degree candidates know full well that what would pay in their examinations would be not independent thought, work or study, but their ability to "acquire" what has been said by others. While his college-teacher who sets the University-paper does nothing to show, either by precept, or by personal example, or by the character of the questions he sets for the University—that he himself sets any higher value on education or training as contra-distinguished from bookishness or barren brain-work—brain-work that could produce nothing original. I have described the existing state of things: under a revised system, the College-teacher on whom the University would confer the high title



of "recognised-teacher" must show by the kind of lectures he delivers that he is an original worker in the chosen field of his work—and that he is therefore fit to train his pupils along lines of original work, thought and observation in that field. His lectures must not be mere compilations, but must above all things be fitted to inspire his pupils with a genuine love for, and interest in the subject on which he lectures. Confining myself to the subject of Economics in relation specially to Western industrial problems—the University-recognised teacher in his lectures may be expected to give the result of *his own* thought, research, study and observation on question like the following:—

(I.) Growth of the modern system of Industry and Commerce,—Structure of modern industry.

(II.) The Land question—population and subsistence—rent large and small holding—the agrarian question in England, India, France, Germany and Russia contrasted.

(III.) Growth of capital—joint-stock enterprise in England before and since the introduction of the principle of limited liability—forms of joint-stock enterprise in other European States.

(IV.) Present state of manufactures in India and in England.

(V.) The organization of industry—the Factory system and domestic system—problem of Labour vs. Capital.

(VI.) The policy of different States including India with regard to the provision of facilities for transport, railway and canals.

(VII.) Banking and currency; credit-agencies—international trade.

(VIII.) Home charges for India—Re-organisation of real credit in India and in other countries.

(IX.) Free trade, fair trade and protection.

(X.) Indian Foreign Emigration.

(XI.) Land Legislation in India and foreign countries.

(XII.) Labour Legislation in India and elsewhere.

(XIII.) Leading principles of public finance—Bimetallism—monometallism—Gold standard—Indian Currency Legislation. Financial Statement of the Government of India.

((XIV.) The regulation of industries and commerce—(1) Voluntary association, co-operation, Trade-Unionism, Formation of monopolies in capital—Trusts—Employers' Federation;—(2) Legal Regulation—Factory Acts. Collectivism and Socialism.

(XV.) Methods of dealing with pauperism in different countries—population question—old age pensions, employer's liability and workman's insurance.

(XVI.) Relation of statistics to economics; the bearing of economic History on the investigation of the present-day questions, the general character of the method employed.

(XVII.) The laws of evidence in relation to economic investigation: how to set out an enquiry: the collection and tabulation of information.

(XVIII.) The interpretation of Statistics—the use of hypothesis; the construction of Blue-books.

XIX.) Review of Census statistics.

Having given the reader an idea of the kind of lectures which, under my scheme—the University recognised College-teacher would be expected to deliver to pupils—in order that the University may be lifted out of the dogmatic or routine teaching and routine



examinations into a purer atmosphere of study and research, of thought and observation, I need hardly point out that to achieve this end *it is absolutely necessary to take the most effective steps to secure the purity of the body of recognised-teachers*; and secondly, to make regulations touching the qualification of and the previous course of instruction to be followed by and the rewards to be given to candidates for Honours in the Degree Examinations to be conducted by the recognised College-teacher.

VIII

CONDITIONS OF WORK FOR THE UNIVERSITY- RECOGNISED COLLEGE-TEACHER.

I have in my last, taking up for purposes of illustration the subject of Economics, gone into some actual details as to the contents of the "high-standard" lectures to be delivered by the University-recognised College-Teacher in Economics. I might similarly take up other subjects and show that, in every instance, high-standard teaching should not consist merely in the ability of the teacher to give to his pupils what others—possibly great men in their special branches of study—have written but in the ability to give his own personality to his work—in his delivering on the subject of his special study something which is most real to himself, which is most deeply felt by himself. Such teaching alone can arouse faith, earnestness, enthusiasm in a young and healthy mind—like that which the College-student may be supposed to possess in the first instance,—but which under the strain of conventional or dogmatic teaching and routine examinations is bound to die away. "If," says an Anglo-Indian writer in the press, "we examine the depreciatory criticisms launched against the graduates of our universities, we find them mostly directed against variations of a single deficiency—namely, that young India is enthusiastic for nothing. High thinking is at present the vital need of New India." In this most of us will probably agree; but what most of us are not specially aware of is that if our University graduates are unpossessed of enthusiasm—it is the natural, the inevitable result of the training they have undergone at the hands of the College-teacher and the University as represented by the University paper-setter who is in most cases a College-teacher. For, the College-teacher is also like his pupil enthusiastic for nothing, and high thinking is in him as much a desideratum as in the case of his pupil. If the College-student does not study authors, but is content only to read books, it is because the College-teacher or the University as represented by the College-teacher of a paper-setter hardly sets the example. If a book is read critically by the College-student, in order to learn what there is in it only, and not in order to find out what manner of man he was who wrote it, it is because, the College-teacher and the University as represented by the College-teaching paper setter set no better or inspiring example. And in the absence of such example, all the life-giving interests, all the great stimulants to self-development are lost, or are replaced by all the more subtle evils of dogmatic teaching and routine examinations, such as the strengthening of the rote faculties to the neglect of the rational faculties, the rapid forgetfulness of knowledge "acquired," the cultivation of quick superficiality and power of cleverly skimming a subject, the consequent incapacity for undertaking original work, the desire to appear to know rather than to know, the forming judgment on great matters when judgment should come later, the dependence upon highly-skilled guidance, the belief in artifices and formulated answers and the mental disinclination which supervenes to undertake work which is not of a directly remunerative character—after the excitement and strain of the race; and so on and so on.



It is for this reason principally that I have been at such pains to impress on the minds of the members of the Universities Commission what, indeed, appears, rightly judged to be a commonplace—namely, that it is necessary to take the most effective steps to demand a high-standard teaching qualification for a University-recognised College-teacher, in order to secure the *purity*, *i.e.*, to ensure the collective efficiency of the body of University-recognised teachers. The Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University in his recent Convocation Address speaking on the subject of forming a list of recognised teachers remarked in a very general way that the rules should be such that youngmen should not assume the responsibility of teaching history or philosophy or science until they have shown their qualifications and been duly accepted. My humble submission to the distinguished body of educational experts over which the Vice-Chancellor presides is that in forming the first list of recognised teachers,—that which would be, so to say, the very nucleus of a larger and growing body, and which may be expected to foreshadow the character of all future appointments,—a very high standard of teaching qualification should be demanded. If a high-standard qualification be the *sine qua non* for admission to the body of recognised teachers, the purity and *esprit de corps* of that body would be secured, so that the dignity of that body shall not be a mere *protected* dignity—but such as could bear the light of the severest public criticism. We must in fact go back to the earliest conception of a Master (M. A.) who before making a formal entrance upon and commencement of the functions of a duly licensed teacher must be recognised as such by the brothers in the profession. While the previous stage of his academic career was that of “bachelordom”—*i.e.*, of apprenticeship for the “mastership,” his emancipation from the bachelor's state being signalled by placing the Master's cap upon his head, when he gave the formal inaugural Lecture and was welcomed into the body of professional brethren with set speeches and took his seat in the Master's Chair.

I would humbly submit that in framing the rules for appointment to the body of University-recognised teachers, the high ideal of a Master should be strictly kept in view—and even, if possible, certain forms and ceremonies to emphasise the importance, dignity and responsibility of the high office of a University-recognised teacher should be instituted. With this preamble, I would submit for the favourable consideration of the Universities Commission—the following suggestions and observations to help in the framing of the rules to which I have referred.

Firstly.—I would suggest that it is, in the first instance, extremely desirable that a College-teacher before being appointed or elected as University-recognised teacher should be required to furnish some proofs of having done some original work himself in his own department of study. Where these proofs are wanting *in the first instance*, they may be forthcoming sometime after, under prescribed rules, but I would give special weight to the claims of a candidate who can, *in the first instance*, furnish such proofs.

Secondly.—The appointment or election by the University of a teacher in a College as a University-recognised teacher shall be limited to a period of not less than three and not more than ten years; but it shall be eligible for such teacher to offer himself for re-election or re-appointment at the expiration of his term of office and may on sufficient cause shown be re-elected or re-appointed by the University for a similar term of office.

Thirdly.—The “sufficient cause” to be shown by the recognised teacher would be the due discharge of some specific prescribed conditions of work for such teacher during the period of his incumbency.

Fourthly.—Under the specific conditions of work, I would include specially the delivery by a recognised teacher of a regular course of lectures



in a particular subject in which he is recognised by the University as a recognised teacher.

Fifthly.—The regular course of lectures shall have to be printed and published by the recognised teacher and duly submitted to the University from time to time.

Sixthly.—The University having conferred the title of recognised teacher on any particular teacher, it shall be made obligatory on all affiliated colleges to recognise him as such.

Seventhly.—The recognised teacher shall be an *ex-officio* Fellow of the University and shall represent in the University either personally, or by proxy,—who must be a Fellow himself,—the particular College to which he is attached during the period of such Fellowship.

Eighthly.—The entire body of recognised teachers or special sections thereof shall be vested by the University with powers to set papers, appoint text-books, and in other ways direct the course of education in Colleges and Schools affiliated to or recognised by the University.

Ninthly.—The preparation of the first list of recognised teachers for a particular term of office may be left in the hands of a body like the Indian Universities Commission specially legally empowered for the purpose ; but for the future, election or re-election of recognised teachers should be left in the hands of the University Fellows who shall have to exercise their power under special authority and under fixed and special rules of procedure. Such election or re-election by the University shall by law be made subject to revision by or appeal before a body specially empowered under the law and at the option of the candidate.

IX.

FALLACIES AND OBJECTIONS.

My idea of reform of University education in India may be summed up in one word—reform in the system of teaching; under which are included three separate but inter-related reforms: (1) Appointment or selection of “high-standard” or recognised teachers; (2) their appointment as paper-setters and the vesting in them of all authority and control over the general management of the educational work of the University; and (3) the making it obligatory upon them to satisfy certain specific conditions of work. A scheme of reform which does not make provision for or foster and encourage a high standard of teaching would be essentially a patch-work, a palliative, would be unsound at the very core. If it is said that the high standard of work which I propose (*vide* my articles Nos. VII. and VIII.) is very high and that, therefore, there are not very many competent men to undertake the high duties of the office of “recognised College-teacher” as contemplated in my scheme, my answer is that we should begin with demanding a high standard of qualifications and high-standard conditions of work for the University-recognised teacher; and if the number of those among College-teachers who would be willing to offer themselves for appointment to the office be too small at the beginning, we should not despair, but on the contrary there should be the greater reason to persevere. No far-reaching reforms have ever been effected by yielding to the circumstances of the moment. I have tried to place before the members of the Universities Commission an idea of the kind of teaching which we should demand and expect of “recognised teachers.” If you lower the standard of teaching by not providing for the admission and maintenance of a body of high-standard teachers; if you merely appoint as recognised teachers men who have not given or cannot or are not willing to give proofs of higher abilities that may be in them,—I conceive there is no other alternative for you but to



ask the College-teacher to set papers merely to test the student's powers of "acquiring" his subject, his powers, that is of hearing and reading, remembering and believing; as under hypothesis, that is what he is *really* fit for; and having done so, to shift the burden of blame and responsibility of education on to the candidates themselves by requiring a high percentage of marks for passing their examinations. The *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole process is clear and convincing to every unprejudiced mind. You appoint men to teach who have no special love for their subjects, who have not given or cannot give proofs of original or independent work, thought, observation and research; you appoint them to set papers which naturally are of a kind that what is necessary for the student to do to gain distinction at the examination is merely to "stuff his mind with second-hand thoughts," and then you make atonement for your sins, you visit it upon others, the hapless victims of your system, by demanding a high minimum for a pass.

It is wholly forgotten by most of us that the necessity for raising the minimum higher and higher for a pass arises only because your questions are of the wrong kind. Supposing your questions are of a kind that they can be best answered by students who have a superabundance of memory-power, why, then, of a certainty the boys reading in the lower forms of our schools would have better chances of winning success and distinction at the *University* examinations than your *University* graduates and undergraduates. And then possibly it would be suggested that what is necessary to reform *University* education in India would be to raise the minimum for a pass as high as possible. If your questions test only acquirements and memory-work, and if your teacher—call him by what name you will—be only fit for cramming his pupils with second-hand knowledge, the cause of higher education in India would not be furthered by your saying that you will not alter the style of your teaching and your examining but that the number of your passes would be relatively small, unless the students at the different colleges know how to help themselves either by a mysterious process of training *on their own account*, which their teachers have not the leisure, inclination or ability to impart, or by an extra dose of desperate cramming in which their teachers and the key-makers and annotators (who are in too many instances college-teachers) are so very ready to be of service to them. But supposing you take to the opposite course; you try to discover men who have given or can give proofs of original work, thought, observation and research and appoint them as your "recognised teachers" provisionally, for specified periods, and give them all power and then ask them to be equal to their high duties in the matter of teaching and examining,—but you do not raise the minimum for your pass, then you will find that in due course your present minimum should be found to be too high, and that the course of true education in India would not be impeded or arrested even if you lowered that minimum and that it might even so happen that, *under the new conditions I have mentioned*, a failure at any particular *University* examination would not mean such downright imbecility as is said to characterise the undergraduates and graduates of an *Indian University*.

Therefore, if you can find the right sort of men willing to abide by your conditions of work, appoint them as *University* recognised-teachers, provisionally of course, *i.e.*, with a provision for re-appointment; for we must feel our way and see how the experiment works and let some method be devised to separate the better class of our young men from the vast majority of their fellows and to make it obligatory upon Honour students to read with a *University* recognised teacher, and to require that a qualifying certificate from a recognised teacher should have to be produced by a candidate desiring to appear at the B. A. Degree Examination and offering to be examined in an Honour subject.



I must, in passing, meet one particular objection to my proposal of making all Honour students read with the University recognised teacher. It may be said that as I propose to limit the number of recognised teachers by demanding a high standard of work and qualifications and imposing specified conditions of work—such as have special connection with the delivery and publication of a course of lectures on the recognised teacher's subject, giving results not only of his reading, but also of his study, observation, thought and research on the same—it may be objected that the conditions aforesaid would unduly limit the number of recognised teachers in my scheme and would accordingly limit the number of Honour candidates willing to go up for the examination, in case it should be made obligatory upon them to read with the recognised teacher. My answer is this:—

Firstly.—If the right sort of men possessed of the high qualifications of a recognised teacher are not forthcoming, let us begin with those whom we can get and find out by a specially devised scheme a body of *specialty* qualified students fit to receive instruction and be trained by them: I would call these "honour students"; for these would be really properly trained and educated. Your present-day Honour students do not receive such training and education as is contemplated under my scheme.

Secondly.—If you begin by stating that at present we cannot get a sufficiently large number of men to do the duties of a recognised College-teacher, you assert that in the existing state of things, no high standard training or education could be given to a large body of candidates even if these last could be obtained from among College-going students in large numbers. In other words, the properly-qualified trainers would be too few, while the properly-qualified candidates offering to be trained would be too many. And in this state of things you propose that we should depreciate the intellectual currency in either of two ways:—(a) Allow the properly-qualified candidates to read with college-teachers who do not come up to the high standard of a University-recognised teacher—and then say that they have been trained under properly-qualified men when after a specified course of instruction under the inferior men you allow them to appear in the Honour examinations. Or, (b) you may not insist upon the high qualification of high standard teaching as I propose—but by relaxing your conditions, you may admit a large body of men to whom you give this title of recognised teacher and allow the properly qualified candidates to read with them: In either case, as is obvious, you do not improve the character of your teaching by demanding a high standard of work from the teacher, but you are anxious above all things to achieve certain *nominal* results,—by giving an inflated or artificial value to the products of University education—by calling men as trained and educated under proper conditions when, *under your very hypothesis*, they are not so trained and educated. Where there is such an undue anxiety to shew results apart from their intrinsic value, it is needless to say that the cause of University education must suffer.

My idea, however, is that although there might be some *initial* difficulties in the launching out of my scheme of high-standard teaching under high-standard teachers, the difficulties would disappear, *once* the new system has been seen operating for some time, and that then from amongst the body of teachers in our colleges, both private and Government, there would be found a sufficient number of men who, when the dead-weight of the present system has been removed and both teacher and pupil are enabled to breathe a purer and freer air,—my idea is that under a new impulse when it has communicated itself into the whole educational body, a larger and larger number of men would be forthcoming—willing and qualified to take their proper places as University recognised teachers with whom the work of training and educating the Honour Students shall principally lie. In the mean-



time, to tide over difficulties, but as a temporary measure, the University might import the proper men on its own account, men who would fulfil all the high conditions of University-recognized teacher and depute them to lecture at different centres in the Mofussil in connection with different colleges or groups of colleges, so that the supply of University-recognized teachers might be commensurate with the demand for them, in case the Honour students are too many. If it is not possible for the University to appoint *on its own account* such recognised teachers as aforesaid, in appreciably large numbers so as to keep pace with a possible demand for them in the Mofussil, Honour students must either migrate to centres where there is the requisite supply of recognised teachers, or they must do without education under a recognised teacher. But in no case should the cause of high education be made to suffer by lowering the standard of teaching to be required of a recognised teacher or by lowering the value of an Honour's Degree by conferring the same on candidates who have not obtained the advantages of training under the University-recognised teachers.

My last submission is that in case the Indian Universities Commission should *not* consider it advisable to alter the character of the Honour examinations by requiring that a candidate offering an Honour subject shall have to be trained under a recognised teacher and to produce a qualifying certificate from him; my submission is that keeping intact the existing system, we can create a new class of Honour students with a special name—namely those who will have opportunities of undergoing training under a recognised college-teacher, giving preference to these in matters of scholarships &c. This would at least be introducing the thin end of the wedge—the beginning of the end towards the reconstruction of Indian Colleges into teaching agencies—their conversion, that is, from their present character of coaching establishments into true teaching bodies.

And this would at once lead me to the consideration of the kind of training which the recognised teacher may be expected to impart to his pupils.

X.

CONDITIONS OF TRAINING UNDER A RECOGNISED TEACHER : "THE QUALIFYING CERTIFICATE."

Having in previous articles treated at some length of the qualifications of men who under the high title of University-recognised teacher would direct all University teaching in the country and impart to it a high tone and purpose, I proceed to determine the previous qualifications of the young men who will undergo training at the recognised teacher's hands, and who when they will have received their degrees after undergoing such training will be placed in the very first rank of University graduates. The period of training of this special class of graduates may be divided into two parts:—(a) Period of previous training; (b) period of training under the recognised teacher. Before proceeding to deal in some detail with this question of training, it is necessary at once to strike the key-note and to give what I consider to be the very essentials of training; for the qualifying certificate to be produced by the special Honour candidates derives all its importance and its value from the character of the training which, above all things, the certificate should tell. And the proposition with which I start is that the qualifying college-certificate should tell what an examination by the University can never tell or can tell in very small measure, indeed. The University examinations do reward industry; but we have to inquire into the motive for this industry—we have to inquire, that is, whether the labour was undertaken, the work was done under the strong incentive of eagerness



for success, or under compulsion, or in the absence of temptation, for under other circumstances; as when the University examinations have been completed, the young man's zeal might flag, as is very often the case with Indian students. *Energy, good mental habits and tastes go far to make a man what he is, and of these examinations tell us nothing.* The energy of the more successful of our Indian graduates is very often of the spurious or spasmodic kind. Taking even the commonest and most superficial test of education, namely, a taste for reading and desire for information in the hope of deriving moral, intellectual or material benefit from such reading or information, the fact that even the metropolis and the intellectual centre of intellectually advanced Bengal has to let its only public library founded by the zeal of an Englishman die for want of support, and to be revived by the energy, public spirit and foresightedness of an Englishman who now holds the destinies of this country, the fact also that it cannot boast of a single paper or magazine with anything like a staff of trained writers or a public willing to pay for their labour is proof positive that not only the education but even the reading habit of educated India ends with his College course. If the effect of education is to quicken and inform the intellect and make it eager for further advance in knowledge; if the effect of education is to create a wish for the growth of literature, the cultivation of the arts, the spread of manufactures and the general diffusion of knowledge and taste by means of libraries, museums, literary and scientific societies, well-conducted periodicals; respect for merit, irrespective of worldly conditions, or a disregard of the blandishments of unrighteous wealth, then, indeed, must it be said that the University-educated India has to be educated still and under improved methods.

Therefore, the training under the recognised teacher must consist in developing in the Honour students good mental habits and a taste for his subject, and the "qualifying certificate" should tell the University how far the Honour candidate has profited by the lectures and the guidance of the recognised teacher; how far that is, the teacher has been successful in developing good mental habits and tastes and energy in the student who applies for permission to appear at the University Honour Examination. The qualifying certificate should run in this form:—

'Mr. A. B. has read with me.....(here give the subject) for.....(here give the number of terms) and has given me satisfaction by faithfully carrying out my instructions. I am of opinion that he has been able to profit by my lectures and the course of training which he has undergone, and I accordingly consider him a fit and eligible candidate for the ensuing University examination in.....(here give the subject and the name of the examination).'

And in a footnote to the above I would insert the following explanatory statement:—"No one is to be considered a fit and eligible candidate for a University Honour Examination who, in the opinion of the University-recognised teacher has not been able to develop a taste for his subject and good mental habits."

Having given the essentials of the training to be received by the Honour student, namely, the development of good mental habits and of a taste for his subject,—I will go into some detail as to the methods whereby the object might be secured. *First*, the recognised teacher would examine a candidate on his own account and see whether, in his opinion, a particular candidate has the necessary aptitudes, powers and acquirements which should make it possible for him to carry out the instruction, and immediately undergo special training at the hands of the recognised teacher.

Secondly:—If after such examination, he is admitted to such special training—the student should be given to understand that he will have



to read certain chief books or portions of books in his subject—with or without reference to the books recommended by the University,—and the whole period of instruction by the recognised teacher being divided into particular terms—the student will have fixed work allotted to him for particular terms. *Thirdly*, the student will have to read his books under the special direction of the recognised teacher, and the teacher will have to grant to every one of his pupils a *written* expression of opinion at the end of each term as to how far the pupil has been able to satisfy the condition of work imposed on him by the recognised teacher. *Fourthly*, the student will be required to write out fortnightly or monthly papers on a subject appointed by the teacher and read them out to him and will also be required to orally discuss the same with him. I would attach special importance to this oral discussion as this would be a very good training for the Honour Student, and further as a preparation for the University *viva-voce* test which in my scheme I would make obligatory upon every Honour candidate. (See article No. XV)

Having done with the scope and character of the training under a University-recognised teacher which I should enforce on the Honour candidate, I would describe the "previous course of instruction" to be received by him. For this I will refer the reader to another article.

XI.

THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM.

At Oxford or Cambridge, every student as he enters the University by being admitted into a College, is assigned to a tutor, who throughout his University career has complete control over his work, advising him as to what books to read, what lectures to attend &c., besides assisting him in his work. It is evident that the College Tutor plays a very important part in the English University system, while his efforts are further supplemented by the coach. Between the coach, the tutor, the Lecturer and the University professor (the lecture of the last being, *so far as the vast majority of students are concerned*, either supernumerary or ornamental), the English University keeps the machinery of academic education going in vigorous life. It is easy, therefore, with the example of English Universities like Oxford and Cambridge before us, to suggest that the salvation of an Indian University lies in the wholesale adoption of the entire programme from the West. But it is necessary to consider that such adoption would be financially prohibitive, even it were otherwise desirable. It would be at once far too costly for everybody concerned, for the University, for the College and for the Indian student. Even the institution of the College Tutor for Indian Colleges would not be, even if financial considerations were ignored, calculated to be of such service as *a priori* arguments might lead us to suppose. The function of the English College Tutor I have in my humble way performed in an honorary capacity in my relations with various classes of youngmen reading for University examinations in Calcutta, and in every case I have found that my work has been of a most uphill kind, principally because the system or style of examining by the University and the system of teaching by the College lecturer or "professor," as he is more usually called here, are of a character that leaves the honest learner and the honest "tutor" completely at the mercy of some uncontrollable and uncontrolled agency. My experience has been, as I have said, with various classes of College students, some of whom have already won distinction at the Indian Civil Service and the University examinations in England and some of whom are yet undergoing training in England after having distinguished themselves in the



Calcutta University, besides many others who are preparing for the higher examinations of that University;—and this experience has been uniformly of the character that, to prove of real service to my students, I must chalk out an independent path, that I must prescribe a course of instruction which is not subsidiary or supplementary to the College course, but which must be quite of an independent character, which must stand on an independent footing. If the present “system” were kept intact, the “Tutor” must either give in and become part of the “system;” or he must assert himself and induce the student to assert himself in the matter of teaching and studies—whatever may be the results in the University examinations. Therefore, I must insist that the question of reform of Collegiate education does not begin with the adoption of the institution of College-Tutors as it obtains in the West, but that such adoption may follow, but can never precede the more vital reform of Collegiate teaching by means of “high standard” lecturers and of University examinations with the help of the *same body* of College lecturers. And I would go even so far as to contend that the institution of College-Tutors as a separate body becomes necessary as a general or comprehensive remedy, *only* when the system of classification of students, of division of class from class, of their separation in studies under the system of college teaching and University examinations has not been of a sufficiently thorough kind. And, therefore, in my opinion, the college *tutorial system* is not to be adopted to remedy the defects that may be found in the qualifications or capacities of the College Lecturer; or the defects in the system of University examinations, but that it must be adopted as a sort of what may be described as a “residual remedy”—as a general provision to afford such helps as may be necessary to enable the student to help himself. For the main thing, I must repeat, is to reform our system of teaching and of examining, so that from the point of view alike of the teacher and the student, work shall be more a source of pleasure and profit than a burden; with the result that there shall be more of life and energy in teachers as well as students, and less of apathy and monotony, less of the mechanical or the routine element in their labours.

XII.

“PREVIOUS COURSE OF INSTRUCTION” FOR HONOUR CANDIDATES: SOME GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

In determining the previous course of Instruction for Honour students, we require to look at the question as part of a whole. For the Honour course marks the upward limit of a course of academic studies; and it is in relation to those who do not or cannot reach the higher standard, but are by want of natural parts or other circumstances forced to remain at the lower ranges of the ladder—that the course of present instruction, and also of previous instruction for Honour students as expressed in terms of University tests—have to be determined.

On the occasion of the recent debate on the Financial Statement by the Government of India (March 26, 1902), speaking with special reference to the Indian Universities Commission, Lord Curzon said—“There is one consideration that I would ask the public to bear steadily in mind. Education, if it is to be reformed, must be reformed for education's sake, not for the sake of political interests, or racial interests, or class interests, or personal interests. If that golden rule be borne in mind both by the Government and the public we shall get through. If it be forgotten, then the most strenuous of effort may be choked with disappointment or may perish in recriminations.”



There is no doubt that the rule laid down by Lord Curzon is golden ; and must be carried out at all costs. But the rule seems to be laid down in India at least for the first time by the Government of Lord Curzon ; and in the meantime vested interests have arisen, wrong motives for academic education have been created, which can neither be grappled with nor uprooted in a day ; and in determining the course of the University for the future, the course of that Institution in the past must have to be taken into account in order that that the gulf between the past and the future may not remain unbridged. Although the Act of Incorporation declares in the Preamble that the establishment of the University of Calcutta was due to "a desire for the better encouragement of Her Majesty's subjects in the pursuit of a regular and liberal course of education," still the whole previous educational policy of the Government may be summed up in the words of a despatch from the Court of Directors to the Governor-General, dated 29th September 1830,—

"There is no point of view in which we look with greater interest at the exertions you are now making for the instruction of the natives than as being calculated to raise up a class of persons qualified by their intelligence and morality, for high employments in the Civil Administration of India ;"—supplemented by the following recommendation of the Council of Education, the immediate ancestor of the University of Calcutta,—

"The absence of any efficient mode for affording an extended professional education to our most advanced students is beginning to be severely felt and to force itself upon our attention. The establishment of a University with Faculties of Law, Arts and Civil Engineering could supply this desideratum and fit our more proficient pupils for devoting themselves to the pursuit of learned practical professions in this country." (*Annual Report of the Council of Education, for 1844-45*). The circumstances, therefore, that led to the foundation of the University all tend to show that it was intended in the first instance to supply the State with a class of educated young men capable of filling the various grades of the subordinate civil services, of "holding the higher offices open to natives after due official qualification and of commencing the practical pursuit of the learned professions ;" for it is declared in the same Annual Report from which the above is taken, that "*the only means of accomplishing this great object*, is by the establishment of a central University, armed with the power of granting Degrees in Arts, Science, Law, Medicine and Civil Engineering."

Therefore, it appears that throughout the better part of a whole century under British rule a force has been created tending to place a high market-value upon University instruction as being the only passport to official recognition and distinction. While therefore fully recognising and appreciating the ideal set up by Lord Curzon, I submit that it would be unwise in any practical scheme of University reform not to give due weight to the fact that every form of University certificate has its market value ; and giving this due weight and so conciliating public sentiment and ensuring public co-operation, it would still remain open to us to frame our proposals for a true scheme of education under the auspices of the University. The Indian educated public will, I conceive, naturally take some time to grasp the significance of Lord Curzon's declaration that—"Education if it is to be reformed must be reformed for education's sake and not for the sake of other interests." And therefore so long as the market-value of the University certificate stands at a high figure in public estimation, we cannot ignore the fact ; but if we do so and build our edifice of reform upon such non-recognition of fact, the struggle for a lowering of standards, the struggle for power in the senate among opposing coteries—the bringing to bear upon Fellows and everybody concerned all sorts of undue influence in a desperate fight between the outside Indian public and the Indian University authorities—all this and more



will, sooner or later, make themselves painfully felt. Therefore, recognising the above circumstance of a University certificate having a prestige all its own, that is a high market-value, which it has acquired through the long, long years of official recognition,—I would not oppose it in the face, but would try to overcome it by every manner of indirect attack. The wisdom of my position will be understood when we remember that at present the University Entrance test is regarded as a sort of *unit*, and proficiency even in newly instituted examinations by the Government is sought to be expressed in terms of that *unit*. Thus, the recent introduction of the elements of Commercial Education into our High School system by the Bengal Government will be followed up by a course of recognised examinations by that Government; and it is announced that a certificate of proficiency granted to a successful candidate at the Government Commercial Examination will be regarded by the Government as equivalent to the University Entrance certificate. Therefore, the University Entrance Examination being made to do other duties besides the proper one of a University examination for testing competency to enter upon collegiate life, I would like to “demonetise” it and set up a sort of a gold standard for those who would desire to enter the University. But even here I would follow the line (by adopting the indirect plan of attack) of least resistance, as I have already explained.

First: let us have the Entrance Examination as usual; but with this innovation that there shall be two sets of papers in every subject, (1) General Papers with comparatively easy and general questions, and (2) Special Papers.

Secondly, that no candidate will be deemed to have passed the Entrance Examination unless he has passed at least in the General Papers in all the subjects.

Thirdly, candidates wishing to enter the University must have passed in at least two of the subjects in the special papers and also in the other subjects in the general papers.

Fourthly, a candidate failing in a special-paper subject will be deemed to have failed in the Entrance Examination; and there should *not* be instituted any system of equivalent marks. This principle is most important in my scheme, as making it clear that the aspirant for University education must be judged by an absolute test. If the principle of equivalence, for purposes of converting one class of proficiency to another, were once introduced, the demonetisation I have spoken of will not have been effected; while at the same time the Entrance Examination in the special papers will have lost the exclusive value which I would attach to it as being the *University* Matriculation Examination. It would be just as if there were two separate examinations by different and independent authorities, such that success or failure at one shall have nothing to do to determine success or failure at the other. My idea then is that the Entrance Examination has not hitherto been a true *University*-examination, but has been a sort of a general test, for reasons mainly of a political character as I have previously explained. Whence the Entrance certificate has passed current in the Indian market as a common measure of value. For the future, however, as I have said, it is necessary to bring about a separation of functions by instituting two independent and incommensurable tests (as explained above) although both will come under a common designation, under my scheme.

In opposition to my plan of a common University Entrance Examination, it may be proposed that the University should not concern itself with any sort of examination that is not immediately meant for those who have no intention of entering the University. My reply is that the University Entrance certificate has already “acquired” a high market-value; and it would be sometime before a certificate emanating from any other authority would possess an equal value. Therefore, so long as the University enjoys the *prestige*, certificates from it will be in *demand*; and unless there are open



legitimate ways of getting at them, means will be found by the guardians of candidates to force a supply by means of a lowering of standards of examination, by the device of "grace" marks and so on; and then in the words of Lord Curzon, "the most strenuous of efforts at University reform may be choked with disappointment or may perish in recriminations."

And as for the Entrance, so also for the F. A. Examination of the University. There ought to be two sets of papers in each subject—the general and the special papers; the former being comparatively simple, short and easy; the latter demanding the exercise of a developed intelligence. Those who aspire to go in for higher—*i.e.*, the Degree studies must have to take up two *special* subjects of their own choice, the rest being *general* ones; and it should be made absolute that there shall be no conversion from one standard to another, candidates failing in a "special" subject being deemed to have failed altogether at the examination of the year. The principle on which I base my recommendation of having two sets of examinations as aforesaid for the F. A. is that there shall be many amongst eligible candidates who have entered the University, who may be disabled on account of various causes from rising to the higher ranks of the academic ladder, but who would nevertheless find it depressing to stop only at the University Entrance. The same causes operating, the same consequences follow;—the market value of having passed a higher University test than the Entrance, (so long as the University enjoys its present prestige) making it necessary to issue university "proficiency" notes to all candidates who without aspiring to University Degree Honours still look to some sort of University culture as a passport to social and other kinds of distinction. I fancy the motives which would prompt a candidate to study for the F. A. without aspiring to go up higher are neither to be despised nor to be ignored. For, so long as the demand for a higher form of University certificate than the Entrance exists and continues (while you prescribe the *same* test for the *University* as for the *non-University* candidate) the process of equalisation between the *supply* and the *demand* will continue, to the detriment of the true *University* F. A. test which, in the absence of the lower *general* test which I propose, will slowly undergo a process of undermining or continued depreciation.

It may be supposed that a shorter method of differentiating the two classes of candidates who under my scheme are known as special and general candidates for the Entrance and F. A. examinations, may be found in setting the same sets of question papers but in demanding a higher percentage of marks from special students, and a lower from the general student; while everything else in my scheme may be allowed to stand. Now, I object to setting the same papers to both classes of candidates for the following among other reasons:—

(a.) I have pointed out in a previous article that so long as the University question paper remains as it is, a higher percentage would practically mean, or would assuredly involve an extra dose of cramming.

(b.) *Secondly*, supposing the questions set were of an improved character, demanding and rewarding something higher than bookishness, the class of candidates whom I have called general candidates will be needlessly required to undergo a test which the University would specially devise for those whom it would like to train up on its own account. For there is no reason why the same examination should equally apply to *all*, seeing that that examination would be specially intended for those whom the University would like to take under its special protection.

(c.) Besides obviating the "needlessness" to which I have adverted, I submit that if there be adopted the system of two altogether different and inconvertible sets of papers, there would be some special gains and also the prevention of some special risks. *In the first place*, in setting a paper



which is intended for both classes of candidates, there might be an unconscious tendency on the part of the examiner to make it of a *mixed character*, and so to lower the standard for University candidates. *In the second place*, the setting of a common paper would of itself have a natural tendency, notwithstanding the differences in the required percentages of marks for different classes of candidates, to place both classes of students under a sort of a common category, and to make it appear that the differences between them are differences only in degree; whereas under my system, provision in respect of separate papers and also against conversion from one class to another would have the inevitable result of making the differences between the two classes of non-University and University candidates—differences not in degree but in kind; and so of not only raising the intellectual standard but along with it creating a sense of superior dignity, a sense of superior academic self-respect. *In the third place*, a system of general papers and special papers would enable University candidates to take up under my scheme two *special* subjects and offer the other subjects as *general* subjects; with the result that teachers and students will have the opportunity of concentrating attention and energy on two subjects only for purpose of efficient, progressive study; while, as for the rest of the subjects, they would have time to obtain a general working knowledge. This would ensure a course of general training and also habits of comparative thoroughness in respect of particular subjects. This would enable the student to reap all that is good in a system of bifurcated studies without the evils of narrowness and bigotry which *early specialisation* would naturally create and against which every University as a seat of liberal culture and learning should be prepared at all times to take its stand. Further, a system of general papers for all non-University candidates will remove the high strain and pressure upon the vast body of youngmen whose work in life lies outside the University, *i.e.*, in no real relation to it. Again—by instituting a system of general papers for some subjects and of special papers for others at the choice or option of the University candidate, and making the aggregate of marks in the special subjects determine the place of the candidate in the University list,—much of the strain and pressure upon the mind and body of the University candidate would be taken off or removed; whereas if the same paper were set for *all* candidates, the University candidate would try to come off high in *every* subject, unless it were specially made obligatory upon a candidate to choose and notify beforehand the two particular subjects which he would offer as special subjects. It would be more natural to assume that under a system of common papers, what would happen would be that a candidate will be allowed to answer every paper as much as he can, and if he is able to obtain a certain percentage of marks in *any* two subjects, he would be allowed to read for the F. A. or for the B. A. Courses, as the case may be. This would not admittedly remove the strain and pressure I am speaking of, upon the health and the mind of the candidate, and would not therefore ensure thoroughness, but would necessarily lead to some forms of cramming; as it is clear that “cramming” must come in as soon as study becomes a source not of pleasure and profit but a burden, as it must be under a system of high pressure.

XIII.

“PREVIOUS COURSE OF INSTRUCTION” FOR HONOUR CANDIDATES: THE SCHEME CONTINUED.

In order to make my position clear with reference to my proposed system of general and special papers for two distinct classes of candidates—



namely, those whom I have called respectively University candidates and non-University candidates for the two examinations—the Entrance and the F. A.,—I would proceed to give the reader an idea, in some detail, of the character and scope of the questions that are to constitute the two papers. But before doing so—I would for purposes of clearness give formally my definition of University candidates and non-University candidates.—A University candidate for the Entrance Examination is one who has an intention of continuing his academic studies at least up to the F.A. standard (General Paper Standard) of the University, after passing the Entrance test; and who shall not have qualified for such further studies unless he should have passed in two subjects in the special papers and in the rest of the subjects in the general papers. All candidates for the Entrance Examination who offer to be examined in only the general papers in all the different subjects are non-University candidates. Similarly, a University candidate for the F. A. Examination is one who has an intention of continuing his academic studies at least up to the B. A. Pass standard of the University after having passed the F. A. Examination; and who shall not be deemed to have qualified himself for such further studies unless he shall have passed in two special subjects and in the rest of the subjects in the general papers. All candidates who offer to be examined in only the general papers in all the different subjects,—are non-University candidates for the F. A. Examination.

Taking the subject of *English*—I would propose the following Model Papers for non-University candidates for the Entrance Examination. I would have three papers in English for these candidate and give three hours' time to answer each paper :

PAPER FIRST. (GENERAL.)

- N. B.—*Only one question has to be attempted.*
- I. Write out a clear, connected narrative from the following correspondence :—
[Here give the correspondence.]
 - II. Write out a clear, connected statement of facts from the following materials :—
[Here give the matter in question.]

PAPER SECOND. (GENERAL.)

- I. Write out in simple English your ideas on any *one* of the following subjects or questions :—

PAPER THIRD. (GENERAL.)

- I. Translate into your own Vernacular the following :—
- II. Translate into English the following passage :—(the passage must be in the Vernacular of the candidate),

For University Candidates for the Entrance Examination, I would have four special papers. The first three *special* papers would be exactly of the same nature, (*i.e.* so far as the *form* of the Question is concerned) as the general papers; but the "correspondence," "subjects," "passages" or other "matter" set must be of a more difficult character to understand than for the general papers.

PAPER FOURTH. (SPECIAL)

TIME FIVE HOURS.

- I. Explain :—

[From the text-book.]

N. B.—The answer must be in.....sentences. [The paper setter will put in a particular numerical figure in the blank space. In this way the crammer or the key-maker will be to some extent at least held in check.]



II. Explain :—

[The passage must be unseen.]

III. (a) Give the central idea in.....sentences (put the figure in the blank space) in the following connected passages :—

[N. B.—The passages must be from the text-book and will usually be a paragraph from a chapter, or occasionally two or three paragraphs, if necessary].

(b). Show also how the other ideas in the above passages are related to the central idea you suggest.

[N. B.—Questions (a) and (b) are not two separate questions but form one whole question ; so that no separate marks will be awarded for either (a) or (b).]

IV. The same as Question III (a) and (b), only the passages given must be unseen passages.

V. Support the following propositions or statements by illustrations or arguments or in whatever manner you think fit.

(a).—The proposition must be contained in a sentence or two and must be from the text-book.

(b).— ditto.

VI. The same as Question V (a) and (b), only the passages set must be unseen passages.

VII. Criticise the following statement or statements :—

[The statements must be taken from the text-book.]

VIII. Criticise the following statement or statements :—

[The passages given must be unseen ones.]

IX. Complete, *in your own words*, the ideas in :—

[N. B.—Put in the blank space some “incomplete” passages, *i. e.* portions of passages taken from the text-book. The passages from the text-book must give some important ideas or sentiment well worth remembering. The examinee will be asked to allow the portion given to stand, while he will be required to finish in his own words the incomplete extract. The examiner, in order to defeat the crammer or the key-maker, must add the following note to the above question :—The answer must be in.....sentences, (the particular number of sentences in which the examiner wishes the candidate to answer the question being put in the blank space).]

X. Make up the following sentences into any kind of single sentence, taking care to preserve the sense :—

[N. B.—The sentences must be unseen ones].

XI. Split up into a number of sentences the following sentence, taking care to preserve the sense :—

[N. B.—The sentence must be an unseen sentence].

XII. Write out the following in the form of a dialogue :—

[N. B.—The passages must be unseen ones].

* *

SYSTEM OF MARKING ANSWERS.

In awarding marks, the following rules may very well be adopted :—

1. A full answer to a question on an unseen passage or passages would carry twice the number of marks allotted to a question on a passage from the text-book.

2. Negative marks have to be given when an answer reveals such gross ignorance that a candidate may very well be suspected of “parrot-work” in making even a correct answer.

3. When a candidate makes mistakes in spelling, in answering a particular paper, and the total number of such mistakes exceeds a prescribed



limit, the candidate must be held by reason of that fact to have failed in that paper, and he will be credited with no marks in that paper.

4. In awarding marks, correct punctuation should be specially considered.

5. Where the full number of marks for a particular paper is 100, three-fourths of the total marks—*i.e.*, 75 shall be distributed among the different questions; while one-fourth of the whole shall be kept back to be awarded according to the impression obtained when a paper is read, not question by question, but as a whole.

N.B.—The above rules have been framed with special reference to a paper in *English*, but they may be extended to other subjects, as far as they are capable of being applied; while Rules 2 and 5 *must* be made compulsory in all cases.

*
*
*

NO SEPARATE GRAMMAR PAPER IN ENGLISH IN MY SCHEME.

It will be seen that I have altogether dispensed with a separate Grammar paper in *English*: *Firstly*, I am opposed to too many examination papers; and *secondly*, the English Grammar paper even at its best lends itself readily to some sort of memory manipulation at the hands of both coaches and candidates. And *thirdly*, under my scheme a Grammar paper would be unnecessary, inasmuch as, to obtain high marks in my English papers, a student will have *necessarity* to learn all the essential facts of English Grammar; with this most important difference, however, that he will have, in my system, to get up the subject for purposes of writing correct English; whereas under *the present system*, the primary or immediate object of the candidate's learning grammar (from the stand-point alike of the practically minded student and the practically minded teacher) is to enable the candidate to answer certain special kinds of questions—generally of a technical nature—which most of the members of the Universities Commission will probably find it somewhat inconvenient to answer—but which could be “got up” from text-books on Grammar. In the Calcutta University papers of the later seventies and also of the eighties of the last century, the evil of technical questions in English Grammar was most rampant; while in the nineties, (and even now) the evil existed, although in a less pronounced form. If, however, it is deemed desirable to retain the English Grammar paper in the Entrance Examination of the Universities, the following rules must be made obligatory on the Grammar-paper-setter:—

Rule I. Questions must never be asked, asking the candidate to reproduce any rules of grammar or in fact anything connected with grammar which lends itself readily to reproduction from memory.

Rule II. Questions in Grammatical Analysis must never be set.

My reason for the second Rule is that the exclusion of questions in Grammatical analysis would prevent undue attention being given to the *technical* aspects of the subject—the mere *form*—while the teacher is engaged in construing a sentence; for a written answer to a question on Analysis—always involves the use of *technical* terms and expressions which are never correctly understood by the vast majority of young learners, but which are taken by them to represent the essence of the subject. The wholly artificial character of the knowledge acquired by the student will be seen when it is remembered that on coming out as a graduate, he has to learn the subject anew if he is at all required to teach the subject to anybody. The chances, however, are that he would be most glad to have done with the subject, once for all.



TWO GENERAL PAPERS IN SANSKRIT FOR THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION.

FIRST PAPER—(GENERAL.)

TIME—THREE HOURS.

- I. Translate the following passages in Sanskrit into your own vernacular :—
- II. Write in your own vernacular a short essay on any one of the following subjects—[The subjects must be expressed in Sanskrit.]

SECOND PAPER—(GENERAL.)

TIME—THREE HOURS.

Translate the following passages (in English) into Sanskrit :—

[N. B.—The passages must be a simple translation of some simple Sanskrit prose.]

* * *

SPECIAL PAPERS IN SANSKRIT FOR THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION.

In the Entrance Examination—there will be only two special papers and not more for University candidates ; and the form of the questions set would be the same as for the General Papers in Sanskrit ; but the passages on which the questions are set must be more difficult to understand than for the General Papers. That would be the only difference on which I would like to insist. I think it is always necessary to set our face steadily against too many examinations in the same subject.

* * *

F. A. PAPERS IN ENGLISH.

Leaving the subject of examination in the languages for the Entrance Examination, I would take up the same subject for the F. A., and here I would have the *same* number of General Papers and the same number of special papers in English ; and I would have the *same* number and the same form of the Questions as in the Entrance. But paper for paper, the unseen passages for the F. A. must be more difficult to understand than those for the Entrance. That would be the only difference I would have between the two examinations. As I would prescribe no text-books for a candidate offering to be examined in General Papers in English, at the Entrance Examination ; so I would not prescribe any text-book for a candidate similarly circumstanced at the F. A. But I would prescribe text-books for the fourth special paper both in the Entrance and in the F. A. Examination ; and so far the "seen" passages must also differ for the different examinations.

* * *

F. A. PAPERS IN SANSKRIT.

As for the F. A. Examination in Sanskrit—I would have two General Papers and three Special Papers. The character of the two General Papers for the F. A. will be the same as that of the special papers for the Entrance ; only the passages on which the questions are set must be more difficult in the one case than in the other. As for the first two special papers for the F. A., the character or form of the questions set must be identical with that for the F. A. General ; but the unseen passages for the F. A. Special must be more difficult to understand than the unseen passages.



for the F. A. General. The third paper Special in F. A. (Sanskrit) would run thus :—

I. Correct the following, giving reasons for your corrections :—

[The reasons may be given either in English or in Sanskrit but if given in Sanskrit will bring higher marks than if given in English].

II. Give in Sanskrit your ideas on any one of the following subjects :—

N. B.—The answer must be given in at least.....sentences [Put in the particular numerical figure in the blank space] Time allowed for each of the F. A. papers must be three hours. It would appear that I have prescribed no text-book either for the F. A. General or F. A. Special; but it is clear that a goodly amount of simple Sanskrit Prose and Poetry must have to be read, and some Grammar also, in order that a candidate may be able to pass in any of the F. A. and the Entrance papers. The Colleges may be given perfect freedom of choice in the selection of their own text-books so long as the University paper-setter requires of every candidate a good working knowledge of the Sanskrit language. I would prescribe text-books for the B. A. Degree Examination in Sanskrit, but not earlier for reasons which would appear when I come to discuss the subject of Question Papers for that examination.

XIV.

"PREVIOUS COURSE OF INSTRUCTION" FOR HONOUR CANDIDATES: UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION IN HISTORY.

I have in my last article framed certain types of questions for purposes of examination, in the English and in the Sanskrit Language, of Entrance and F. A. candidates. As I am not going to make this series of articles exhaustive but only suggestive and explanatory, I will not pursue the subject of examination-papers further than by showing how we can tackle the question of examination in what has been called "information-subjects" (like *history*) as contra-distinguished from "faculty-subjects" (like the Languages).

Certain studies endow the pupil with the *faculty* of doing something he could not do before, such as that of translating foreign languages, or of solving mathematical problems. Subjects which thus lead to the development of a special "faculty" may be called "faculty-subjects." An examiner can easily discover if the pupil has acquired this 'faculty.' But there are certain studies like *history*, which come under the category of "information-subjects." The "information-subjects" it is really very difficult to treat with a view to detect "shallowness" in the examinee; for they could easily be crammed and as easily forgotten. For B. A. Honours in History and also for the Pass examination in the subject, I would therefore have a searching *viva-voce* test, so that the candidate may be put to a searching cross-examination on the answers he has put in. In my scheme, a system of progressive elimination of inferior candidates has been sought to be introduced, with the result that the number of those going in for the Honour Course in any subject or even for the Pass Course would not be too large, and the difficulty of instituting a system of *viva-voce* examinations specially in the "information-subjects" like history and literature (and even in subjects like psychology, and the moral and mental sciences),—should not be very great. Again, in Pass History I will have three papers, each paper giving only *one* question, or requiring only *one* to be answered out of some three or four questions. In this case, the standard to be exacted must be sufficiently high, the candidate



being given plenty of time to answer the paper. In Honour History I will have six papers, resembling the Pass History papers in everything except that the Honour Standard must be higher than the Pass. The reason why I would have six papers in Honour History (and, indeed, six papers in every Honour subject in the B. A. degree examination) would appear more fully when I come to discuss the subject of the qualifications of the B. A. candidate. At present my point is that for the higher examinations in History, the *viva voce* test is absolutely necessary in order that the interests of University education may be duly safe-guarded. But this *viva voce* test would not be so easy to adopt in the Entrance and the F. A. examinations, from the difficulty of numbers. In the case, however, of these lower examinations, we can very well introduce the system of "one-question" test as above explained and to exact a high quality of answers. This would be the first step I would take to lift historical study out of the groove of routine teaching and routine examinations. The next step would be to frame the right sort of questions for historical examinations. Historical questions fall under various heads, and it is necessary to arrange the heads in their order of difficulty and set the lowest in point of difficulty in the lowest University examination. At present this principle is not observed in the setting of historical question-papers. My idea is that a graduated course of studies in history ought to be able to develop in the student his capacity to *understand and sympathise with the past*. It is not enough for the University graduate in history to be well-posted in all the latest researches in the field of ancient or modern history; it is not enough for him to be able to reproduce broadly the statements of others and even to give them in carefully-reasoned arguments, supported by appropriate quotations and apt foot-notes.

An examination to test how far the candidate has been successful in getting up what has been aptly called the "documentary side of history" is not worth much and may be left wholly or mainly in the hands of the college teacher, from whom a special qualifying certificate *in respect of the above*, a candidate may be required to produce before he is admitted into a University examination in *history*. The *University* examination, however, must have a different object in view,—different from merely testing the student's power of recollecting what he has prepared. That object would be to inquire if the candidate is being trained into acquiring an insight into a remote age, differing in culture, politics, manners, religion etc., from his own. Has he any impression of a great historical Epoch? Is he able to realise and paint an historic scene? Has he studied eagerly, sympathetically any Age? Has he been able to obtain a firm grasp of the idea that the Greeks and Romans were living men and not cold marble statues? And is he able to look at their politics, institutions and religions as if they were things not of the dead past but of the living present? If he has studied the Middle Ages of Europe, has he been able to understand and even appreciate 11th century popes and emperors, monasticism, feudalism and scholasticism? Or is he able only to quote from memory elaborate citations of chapter and verse for every historical statement? As far as I have been able to judge, the historical questions that are set by the University paper-setter are mainly of a documentary character. But if history be "a prose narrative of past events," it must have (1) a documentary side; (2) an ethical and psychological side in relation to (a) epochs and events, (b) institutions, and (c) individual personages; and lastly (3) an evolutionary side—in relation specially to the rise, growth and decay of societies, and of institutions in particular societies.

In my opinion the first or the documentary side comes properly under the head of "information-subjects" and ought not to be the subject of a University Examination, but may be provided for by being left to be tested,



in any manner he chooses, by the college-teacher and by requiring the candidate to produce a qualifying certificate from him in respect of his knowledge of the documentary portions of history. But this provision, as would be seen, would be necessary only for candidates for the B. A. and higher Degree Examinations.

As for the *third*--or the evolutionary side of history, the Entrance or even the F. A. candidates are not the fit persons to profit by a study of it, their thoughts and their capacities at the stage in question are too feeble for the purpose. I would therefore omit all questions bearing on the constitutional history of political states from the Entrance and F. A. papers in History; although I would *tentatively* introduce the subject in the Pass B. A. papers and make it obligatory, in parts, on Honour candidates. Coming to consider the second side of history--that dealing with the Ethical and Psychological side of Epochs, and events, and institutions, and individual personages, we find that this side lends itself least to cramming. This side of history might also be called Descriptive and Biographical side of history and is undoubtedly most fitted to appeal to the mind of the young learner; and it would also naturally require him to always exercise not only his thought powers but his artistic faculties. In this way, by eschewing the "information" or "documentary" side of history and requiring the pupil to develop his insight into character in its bearing on epochs, events, and institutions and persons, the study of history might be made fruitful and University examinations in history in the earlier stages might be made to test the growth of a "faculty,"--the historical faculty in the candidate,--of realizing the features and lineaments of past scenes and events and of great characters and of painting them with the necessary artistic skill. To sum up:--In the B. A. Honour Examination in History,--questions on the "documentary side" might be put in a separate paper, but then, there ought at the same time to be a searching *viva voce* test on the subject-matter of the paper. In the B. A. Pass Examination no questions on the "documentary side of history" are to be set; but a qualifying certificate from the college teacher testifying to the candidate's *elementary* proficiency in it will have to be produced. In the Entrance and F. A., historical papers both general and special, only questions from the Descriptive and Biographical side of History shall be set. Further, the same questions may be given for both Entrance General or Entrance Special history; but the standard to be exacted in the case of the Entrance Special must be considerably higher than for the Entrance General. So also in the case of the F. A. Special and the F. A. General. And further, for all the historical examinations from the Entrance upwards, I would adopt the "One-question" system, requiring the candidate to answer fully and perfectly one question *only* in a paper of not more than three or four questions. And the *viva-voce* test shall be applied in the case of B. A. Degree Examinations (Pass or Honours) in every subject, History included.

XV.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE B. A. DEGREE CANDIDATE.

Coming now to discuss the qualifications of the B. A. Degree Candidates--I would lay down the following rules:--

(a) A candidate who has passed in special subjects (two as already explained) in the F. A. shall at his option be entitled to take up Honours in one of those two subjects in the B. A.

(b) Honours in more than one subject in any particular year shall not be allowed to any candidate.



(c) A candidate taking up Honours (in one subject) shall have also to take up two other pass subjects.

(d) Candidates not offering Honour subjects shall have to offer *three* general subjects.

(e) *Viva-voce* tests shall, at the option of the examiner, have to be submitted to by all Pass B. A. Degree Candidates after the written answers have been marked; and on the subject-matter of the answers put in. The paper-examiner may at his option exempt any candidate from undergoing the *viva-voce* test on the ground that, in his opinion, in the case of the particular candidate the examination is unnecessary. As for Honour Candidates, *every* candidate shall be subjected to a *viva-voce* test by the examiners.

(f) In the *viva-voce* test, the examiner shall award no *positive* marks; but may award negative marks, where he is satisfied on oral examination on the answers put in, for a particular paper that the candidate has not the required insight into the subject of examination.

(g) The *viva-voce* test shall be held as soon as practicable after the written examination is over and after the written answers have been marked. In case, a candidate should have during the interval *specially* got up *only* the particular questions set in the written papers, and if the examiner should suspect that the candidate is otherwise generally "shallow" in his particular subject, he will after putting to him *general* questions in his subject have the option of awarding negative marks on *general* grounds of "shallow knowledge."

(h) The B. A. Honour Candidate shall have to produce a special qualifying certificate in respect of the Honour subject from the recognised teacher with whom he may have read, such certificate being in the form given in a previous article. (No. X)

(i) A candidate for Honours in a subject shall be examined in *only* that subject by the University. As for the two other (pass) subjects every Honour shall have to offer, [Rule (d) above] the following system of examination by the College authorities may be adopted and deemed as equivalent to a University Examination:—

(1) The Honour student will have to attend the pass lectures in his pass subjects along with the pass B. A. students; and he will be required to shew a certain percentage of attendance at such lectures in common with all pass students.

(2) There shall be two periodical examinations in the course of every academic session for all students attending *pass lectures in any subject*, such examinations being conducted by a college-teacher teaching that subject. The examination shall be conducted in the following manner:—

The teacher shall announce that on a given date a batch of not more than ten pass students will be required to attend a certain special class to discuss a particular question bearing on the subject of the pass-lectures delivered. The subject will be announced about a fortnight previous to the day of the meeting; but the names of the particular candidates who may have to take part in the discussion shall not be announced beforehand. Then, one of the selected number will be required by the teacher to open a discussion on the subject and every one of the remaining members shall be called upon by turns either to attack or defend the position taken up by the opener and each member shall be called upon to support his own position against the criticisms of others. The discussion may last for any number of hours, or so long as the teacher-examiner thinks fit to continue it with a view to satisfy himself as to how far his pupils have been following his lectures and been profiting by them. This meeting shall be open to all teachers of colleges, who shall be entitled to watch the



proceedings, and the University itself will have the option of sending representatives to watch the proceedings. The results of this examination will have to be announced in due course and the pass students examined will have to be classified as "excellent," "good," "fair" or "indifferent," as the case may be. In this way, batch after batch will have to be taken up and candidates showing an inferior capacity to the "indifferent" class shall not ordinarily be allowed to attend an advanced course of pass lectures, but shall be compelled to attend the same old course of lectures. In this way, after a successive course of some two to four periodical examinations, the Honour candidate offering two pass subjects and after obtaining a qualifying certificate in those subjects from the college-teacher shall be permitted to appear at the University examination in his Honour subject; and shall not be subjected to any *University Examination* in the pass subjects. As for the pass candidate, he shall *not only* have to produce the Qualifying Pass Certificate after undergoing the above-mentioned college examinations; but he shall have also to undergo a further *written University test* on his pass subject; and if still "shallowness" is suspected in him, he shall be further compelled to submit to a *viva-voce* test as provided for by Rules (f) and (g) above.

(j) For Honour candidates, I will have *six* papers, each paper not containing more than six questions and the candidate being invited to answer not more than two questions.

(k) For Pass candidates, I will have three papers for each subject—being altogether nine papers for the three different subjects which the pass candidate shall be required to offer.

(l) I would make it obligatory on the University to publish the answers of the Honour graduates, so that the University shall always be required to pitch its behaviour high in the interests of a high standard of University education.

(m) In the Languages I should like to have prescribed text-books for the B. A. Pass and Honour candidates: but not in any other subjects.

(n) The Honour candidates, so far as teaching in the Honour subjects is concerned, shall be wholly in the hands of the University recognised-teacher; but I would have the University make it compulsory on every University recognised-teacher to deliver an independent course of lectures in his particular subject, (I have specially dwelt on the absolute necessity of this in my earlier articles), and I would make it compulsory on all Honour candidates to attend such lectures, such lectures being also open to all teachers of colleges, and also to all pass students, and to the public under special, published rules. As previously explained, these lectures will have to be printed and published and copies duly forwarded to the University authorities for their information. (*vide* article No. VIII.)

(o) I will make it optional with a B. A. candidate to read different subjects in different colleges. Thus, a student reading Honours in Science at the Presidency College may at his own choice read his two other subjects (pass) in two different institutions. Or, a candidate offering pass subjects (three in number as already explained) for the B. A. examination may have, at his choice, read the three subjects in three different institutions. In this way there shall be set up a healthy rivalry between different colleges, each trying to offer the best teaching in the particular subjects which it would agree to teach. This would necessitate the introduction of a system of fees for a course of lectures in a particular subject and would promote thoroughness and prevent waste, through the wider application of the principle of division of labour. The rules of affiliation of colleges may be altered to bring in a provision under this head.



(p) A candidate who has obtained Honours in a particular year will be at liberty to offer himself for examination in Honours in a *second* subject in *another* year, provided he has complied with the usual regulations for examination in an Honour subject.

(q) A candidate offering to be examined in a *second* Honour subject need not show that that subject was also his "special" subject in the F. A. examination, which, but for this provision would be necessary (as previously explained).

(r) Successful Honour candidates shall be grouped under two classes:—The First Division and the Second Division.

(s) Only a first class Honour man shall be allowed to offer himself for examination for the M. A. Degree in the particular subject in which he has obtained a First Class.

(t) A second-class Honour man keeping term for another year and undergoing the necessary training at the hands of a recognised-teacher may apply for permission to appear for the second time in an Honour Examination with a view to obtain a *first class* in his old subject, provided always that he is able to produce a *special recommendation* from his recognised-teacher. A candidate producing such special recommendation shall be examined in the Honours subject for a second time; and the qualifying certificate in respect of his old pass subjects previously obtained by him, shall remain in force so as to validate a second examination in Honours.

(u) I would classify *alphabetically* in two classes, all successful pass-candidates by the aggregate of the marks obtained by each candidate.

(v) There are in regard to the subject of *history* some special provisions given in article XIV. to which I beg to refer, as falling also under this chapter.

XVI.

SUPPLEMENTAL RULES FOR THE ENTRANCE AND F. A. EXAMINATIONS.

(1). In the Entrance and the F. A. Examinations, it is always necessary to provide that the number of examinations shall not be too many, and the number of subjects also not too many. With this view, I would adopt the following plan:—

(a). Let there be a fixed number of subjects which every candidate for the Entrance or the F. A. shall have to take up. So far, all these subjects are to be compulsory subjects. But there need not be written *examinations by the University* for every compulsory subject. Let a candidate be given the option of offering particular subjects—say three in number (two special and one general, or three general, in accordance with my scheme already explained) for the *University Examination*. The rest of the compulsory subjects may be left to be tested by the affiliated school or college in any manner it chooses. Thus, a candidate going up for the Entrance or F. A. Examination may be required to produce a special qualifying certificate to the effect that "he has attended a certain course of lectures in the *non-examination* subjects and that in the opinion of the head of the school or College, he has acquired an *elementary* knowledge of the non-examination subjects and that he is also otherwise competent in respect of the *University Examination*-subjects."

(2). As in the Pass B.A., I would also classify in two classes all successful *non-university* candidates for the Entrance and the F. A. Exami-



nations. [For the definition of 'non-university candidate,' see article No. XIII.]

(3). I would add in a footnote the following *explanation* in connection with the expression "moral character" as given in the certificate from the head of an affiliated school or College required to be forwarded under the present system with the candidate's application for admission to the Entrance or the F. A. Examination of the Calcutta University.

"I certify that I know nothing against the moral character of the above-named candidate etc., etc." (*Vide Calcutta University Calendar for 1901*).

Explanation.—⁴ A student who in the opinion of the head of an affiliated school or College does not ordinarily make proper attempts to understand any subject which he is required to learn shall be deemed to be guilty of conduct which would prevent him from obtaining the above certificate.

XVII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

As for the special functions which the University in its corporate capacity may be called upon to perform, none is higher than the organisation of well equipped University Laboratories for the promotion of the various branches of scientific learning. These University Laboratories may be freely availed of by all colleges without distinction; while the nucleus for such laboratories may be found in the Government Presidency College and Medical College laboratories and in the laboratory of the Indian Association for the Cultivation of Science. To expect private colleges to maintain *well equipped* laboratories of their own would be to expect too much, specially when we remember that at Cambridge, no more than two or three Colleges possess laboratories of their own; while the vast majority have to fall back upon the University Laboratories located in the Central Museum.

AS-001359



CSL

CSL-AS-54 (R)
AS001359



378.54 EXA



CSL



31 ✓
dm ✓