ELEUTHEROS

OR

THE FUTURE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

For a full list of this Series, see the end of this book.

ELEUTHEROS

OR

THE FUTURE OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Desultory Dialogue

BY

J. F. ROXBURGH

Headmaster of Stowe School

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD
BROADWAY HOUSE: 68–74 CARTER LANE, E.C.
1930

TO THE

FIRST THOUSAND STOICS,

WHO,

SOME PAST, SOME PRESENT,

ARE ALL

MAKERS OF STOWE.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY MACKAYS LTD., CHATHAM

"The phrase 'a liberal education' originally meant education for a free man—an ELEUTHEROS —as opposed to a slave. The slave's job in life was just to work; the free man's job was to be the best possible kind of man. Nowadays everybody has got to work, but some people can afford to have a shot at becoming the best possible kind of man before they start working."

Dr. ARCHDALE.

τὰ τοῦ διαλόγου πρόσωπα	*The Persons of the Dialogue*
Αρχιδιδάσχαλος	Dr. ARCHDALE
Πολίτης	Mr. BURGESS
Λάμαχος	Col. CALLAGHAN
Ξένος Γαλλικός	M. D'ORSAY

There is a form of education which should be given to our sons not because it is useful and not because it is necessary, but because it befits a free man *and because it is noble.*

There is a distinction between those activities which are worthy of free men *and those which are not. . . . We must reckon as a base activity the acquisition of any skill or knowledge which renders the body, soul or intellect of* free men *less effective in the pursuit and practice of virtue.*

It becomes neither a free man *nor a great man to look every time for what is useful.*

Our ancestors made music a part of education. In their view it takes its place among the occupations regarded as proper to free men.

It is not clear whether we should aim at the cultivation of the intellect or at the formation of the character. The educational practice of to-day only confuses the issue, for there is no agreement as to whether the subjects taught should be those which are practically valuable or those which make for virtue.

Those who let boys devote themselves too much to athletics and allow them to grow up uninstructed in essential things, in reality degrade and debase them, making them valuable to the community in one department only.

ARISTOTLE, *Politics*, Bk. V.

ELEUTHEROS

SCENE : *The smoking-room of the Voyagers' Club. Time* 11 *p.m.* DR. ARCHDALE, *Headmaster of Grantchester, and* MR. BURGESS, *his friend, are smoking pipes and discussing a public dinner from which they have just returned.*

Mr. Burgess: I liked your speech to-night, but you cannot possibly believe all those things you said about the Public Schools.

Dr. Archdale: I believe all the things I said, but I did not say all the things I believe. After all, I was replying to a toast, and that is not a good moment for criticism.

Mr. Burgess: No, and I suppose you would not be headmaster of a Public School if you were not on the whole a supporter of the Public School system. Well, of course, you are entitled to your opinion, but personally I think that there won't be any Public School system to

support before very long, and wanting it back will be like wanting back the Corn Laws—a picturesque form of eccentricity.

Dr. Archdale: Thanks; you are very encouraging. We are to disappear unregretted in a generation, are we?

Mr. Burgess: I am not risking any dates, but we can leave it at "a generation" for the moment. You are bound to disappear before long, because you are not really any good to anyone nowadays, and because you are abominably expensive. It costs pretty well the price of a Rolls Royce to educate a son at a Public School. At least that is what you people at Grantchester will soon have got out of me for young Jim, and he would have learnt more if I had sent him to the County School for the price of an Austin Seven. I wish I had, too, now.

Dr. Archdale: Are you really sorry that Jim came to us?

Mr. Burgess: Well, of course, there is the personal question. I am glad he is under you, and I like that fellow Stamford, his housemaster, too. You both do a good deal for him—I don't deny that. And I expect the boy will like to call himself an O.G. later on and wear the O.G. colours, and so on. But after all, they teach infinitely better at these State-aided Day Schools, and, what is more, they do make the boys work.

Dr. Archdale: I believe they are excellent. But are you quite sure that the Public Schools teach badly and don't make their boys work?

Mr. Burgess: Well, I cannot remember a thing they taught me at Exminster, and anyway it has never been of the slightest use to me. And as for making us work, well, you were always a worker, I know, but I hardly did a stroke. Do you remember that comic fellow called Taschereau who tried to teach us French?

Enter COLONEL CALLAGHAN *and* MONSIEUR D'ORSAY.

Dr. Archdale: Hullo, Colonel! You are just in time. You have saved me from a story of how Burgess wasted his youth at Exminster, and I expect you have saved him from hearing some of my platitudes on education.

Col. Callaghan: Glad I have been of some use. . . . Have you met Monsieur D'Orsay yet, Archdale? He is over in London on some diplomatic business, and the Committee have asked him to be an honorary member here.

Introductions. The newcomers take chairs.

Col. Callaghan: Been talking about the Public Schools? They say you made a

deuced good speech about them at the Scaremongers' dinner to-night, Archdale. I am glad you gave them a pat on the back, because people don't always realize how valuable they are. If some damned Socialist Government goes and abolishes them, it will be a bad day for us all. No other country has got anything to touch them. You ask D'Orsay about that. The French know what our Public Schools are worth, don't they, D'Orsay?

M. D'Orsay: Yes, indeed. There is much in your Public Schools that we find admirable.

Dr. Archdale: I am glad about that, for my friend Burgess here finds nothing admirable in them at all.

Col. Callaghan: Why, what is the matter with the Public Schools, Burgess?

Dr. Archdale: Burgess thinks that Exminster did not make a very good job of him. He says he cannot remember a thing that they taught him, and that he never did a stroke of work there. Personally I think he is rather a good advertisement for Exminster. Of course he does not remember the details of what he learnt there, but, as I was just going to tell him a moment ago, your education is what is left when you have forgotten everything you have ever been taught. (Educational Platitude number one!)

The result of Exminster's work on the

raw material presented to it by Burgess' parents should be measured not by what Burgess remembers now, but by what he is and what he can do. I do not want to flatter him, but I believe we should all agree that he is a sound fellow and can do a great deal. Anyway, he can build up a big business and develop it on good solid lines, and if you read his letter in *The Times* the other day about "Modern Languages in Business," you would see that he knew how to think clearly and write cogently. I do not know who laid the foundations of so much competence, if it was not the much abused masters at Exminster. A good many men who abuse the Public Schools forget that they would not be able to express their abuse as effectively as they do, if they had not learnt to think and write at one of the institutions they decry. Anyway, Burgess, I do not think that you have any right, judging by results, to say hard things about Exminster. I am sure, Monsieur D'Orsay, that Frenchmen do not complain so ungratefully about their *lycées* when they have left them.

M. D'Orsay: Frenchmen often complain about their *lycées* when they have left them, but I agree that their complaints are generally of a different kind. But surely, even among Englishmen, Mr. Burgess is exceptional in complaining that he

learnt nothing at school. Most Englishmen who have discussed their youth with me have indeed told me that they have learnt nothing at school, but they have told it me as a matter of pride, not of complaint. They have boasted of it, not lamented it.

Mr. Burgess: That sounds a bit like you, Colonel, doesn't it? I am sure I have often heard you say that you were always bottom of your form and never got a prize in your life, and that nobody had ever made a scholar out of *you*, and so on—and you did not say it exactly as if you were sorry about it, I must admit.

M. D'Orsay: The Colonel is always glad of an opportunity to depreciate his own merits. But you know, of course, that foreigners are often surprised by the indifference of Englishmen to the intellectual side of School life. You speak of it generally with a laugh, and you do not seem to conclude that because a boy has made little progress in his studies and little use of his brain while at school, he has wasted some of the most important years of his life.

Col. Callaghan: Of course we don't. As often as not a boy who did badly in his work at school does better in after life than the little "sap" who is always top of his form. We are a practical people, D'Orsay, and we do not pretend

to be clever. We get along in the world because the schools we go to give us common sense, decent manners and a capacity for sticking it—" guts," in fact, if you know the word. There is really no other expression for it.

M. D'Orsay: Yes, I know the word. Everyone who has been in England knows it. It is not beautiful, but it expresses a real quality, though sometimes Englishmen speak as if they had a monopoly of that quality, all the other races being apparently—how shall I put it?—*without viscera.*

Col. Callaghan: We are pretty offensive sometimes, I dare say, but we do not mean to be—especially to the French. I do not in the least suggest that we have got more " viscera " (as you put it) than other people, but I think we do value them more than other people—and evidently we talk about them more, too, as you seem to have found. Anyway it is " viscera " that we expect to get from our schools, especially from the games. However much Latin and Algebra we learn as well, it is " viscera " and practical common sense that we go to school to get.

M. D'Orsay: And you do get them. It is for that reason that we admire your Public Schools—because of what they do for the characters of your boys. But we are puzzled all the same about certain

things. We wonder, for instance, whether will-power and courage cannot perhaps be developed by intellectual effort as well as by physical effort. Surely no one can work well without self-mastery. It needs what you call " guts " to study successfully for an examination, or to teach oneself a difficult subject thoroughly.

Dr. Archdale: Hear! Hear! You cannot deny that, Colonel. You must have seen friends of yours toiling away to get into the Staff College. A man cannot do hard brain work without some will-power. It is not only games that develop character. Ordinary school work does require of a fellow what Arnold used to call " faithfulness and duty."

Col. Callaghan: Yes, I suppose you need a bit of self-control to keep your nose down to your books. But after all, a book worker works for himself, whereas a member of a team plays for his side and learns to care more for his side than he does for himself. There is generally something selfish about the fellow who is always terribly keen to be top of his form.

Dr. Archdale (parenthetically): Or top of the batting averages.

Mr. Burgess: I think this " team spirit " business can be overdone. What about the units that make up the team?

Have they got no rights? Has not a fellow got the right to develop himself and become an individual?

Col. Callaghan: Yes, of course he has—within limits. But I must say that the sort of fellow who is terribly keen about developing himself and so on, generally manages to develop the most unpleasant parts of himself. It is not a virtue to be eccentric, and the sort of man who always wants to be original usually seems to me just silly. And it is not a virtue to be selfish, either. I cannot see the point of developing oneself if the self one is developing is a bad one.

Dr. Archdale: Anyway a man is not prevented from becoming an individual because he is a member of a team. It is certainly not the members of the teams (School teams, House teams, and so on) who seem to have the least individuality as a rule at School. Of course there is a lot of nonsense now talked about the team spirit, but for pure nonsense you won't beat the modern chatter about self-development.

Col. Callaghan: In any case, there is a lot more that one gets from games than the team spirit. For one thing there is the power of quick decision, which you do not get from school work, whatever you say, and which you do get from playing three-quarter for a rugger team, or from

batting against a bowler who "mixes them up a bit."

M. D'Orsay: You have not mentioned the idea of playing fair. That is another thing which you learn at your schools, and it probably explains why your Civil Service has so fine a tradition of integrity and why quite a number of your politicians are honest. They will not do what is "not cricket"—a phrase, by the way, which has a curiously exasperating effect on foreigners. But still we wonder. Because your boys' characters are trained, I suppose it is not therefore impossible that their brains should be trained also. Yet you do not appear to care whether they are trained or not, and that seems to us strange in a people which generally knows where its interest lies. You tell us, Colonel, that you are a practical race and do not pretend to be clever. Yet I have met many clever Englishmen, and my political friends tell me that the English "experts" at international conferences are the ablest and best informed of all. Then you have scholars and writers on learned subjects who are the equal of any. In your profession, I know, it is different. People tell me that clever men are discouraged there, and I can well believe it, for I have read books by some of your Generals. But at the Univer-

sities, at the London hospitals, at the Bar, in Lombard Street and in the Civil Service there are intellects which could not have sprung from a race that is " not clever ", and yet you seem ashamed to admit that you may be intellectually, as well as in other ways, a very gifted people.

Mr. Burgess: I think I can explain, Monsieur D'Orsay. It is untrue to say that we are " not clever ". At any rate, we are no stupider by nature than anybody else. When we try to do brain work, we generally find that we can manage it all right. But we *are* a practical people, and we are not interested in anything that does not seem to have a bearing on practical life. I don't mean that we are always out for material profit, but I do mean that we like what is concrete and seems real, and instinctively distrust what is abstract and academic. We are preoccupied all the time with reality, or with what we think is reality, and. . . .

M. D'Orsay: And education does not seem to you concerned with reality?

Mr. Burgess: No, frankly, it doesn't. At least, education in the academic sense doesn't. But that is not altogether our fault. It is the fault of the kind of academic education that we were nurtured on for years in the old days. You know what quarrels there were in England before the War about the " classical

education ", which even now some people support. Well, for generations we English people who have always been preoccupied with reality and interested in life, were subjected, thanks to the classics, to a form of education which did not seem to have any bearing upon reality, or any relation to life. This curious system—a survival, of course, from the Renaissance—consisted in teaching to every boy, whatever his bent might be, two extremely difficult ancient languages and practically nothing else. To be successful in one's school work one had to be good at Latin and Greek. If one was not good at Latin and Greek, one was " stupid," and that was all about it. Well, most fellows were not good at Latin and Greek. Some had no gift for languages at all, and were therefore bored by these languages and did badly at them. Some might have been interested in modern languages and could have stood one ancient language for the sake of one modern one, but even that was not allowed. They just had to learn both the ancient languages, and that was that. So they were bored, too, and did badly. Only a few boys had enough literary gift to get any distance with Latin and Greek, and it was only those few who liked their work and did well at it. It was they who got all the distinctions that were offered,

while fellows who had a flair for science or history or spoken languages never got a chance to follow their own line. So the majority of Public Schoolboys were bored with their work and perfectly content to do badly at it, the honours being carried off by a few bright sparks who were born with a touch of scholarship in their nature. Meanwhile, every day people saw men who had never shown up at school at all (because they were poor performers at the classics) making a tremendous success in after life, while many of the bright young sparks got buried in the Civil Service and were never heard of by name again, until they were knighted. Consequently most men in this country got it well into their heads that academic education had nothing to do with life or reality, and bore no sort of relation to success in the world. We have never got over our dislike for school work, as we knew it in the old days, and our complete distrust of its usefulness. Of course things in the schools are better now. Lots of other subjects are taught besides classics, and they say that the classics themselves are now being treated in a human sort of way. But the old days are not forgotten, and if anyone asks you why Englishmen are suspicious of everything academic, and firmly believe that school work does

not matter a rap, you can tell them that it is because the Public Schools went on teaching the classics fifty years longer than they ought to have.

M. D'Orsay: I wonder what the Headmaster thinks of that?

Dr. Archdale: Not much, I am afraid. It reminds me of the arguments of a lazy schoolboy who always thinks he can do well in a different subject from the one he is working at—just a "rationalization" of his indolence. But allowing for exaggeration, I agree that there is something in it. We did make a tremendous mistake in giving both Latin and Greek to every boy. They are, as Burgess says, extremely difficult languages, and one is quite enough for the normal boy if he is to get any distance in it and do anything else as well. I firmly believe that every boy ought to have a literary education of some sort, whatever he gets in addition; for everyone, even a scientist, has got to read and write and think and speak. I also believe that for every boy who is going to stay at school until eighteen or nineteen, the literary part of his education ought to be based on Latin. It takes time, but it gives a training in thought and expression that cannot be equalled. But Greek is different. It is a luxury —the finest luxury in the world—but not a necessity like Latin.

Col. Callaghan: I can't think why you are so keen to teach your fellows Latin, Archdale. It cannot be any use to them afterwards, unless they are going to be parsons or lawyers.

Mr. Burgess: He thinks it is a good training, Colonel. Besides, you still need Latin to get into the University, don't you, Archdale?

Dr. Archdale: Yes: for Oxford or Cambridge you need either Latin or Greek—which in practice means Latin. And the other Universities (all but one, I believe) demand Latin from everyone who wants to take a degree on the literary or "Arts" side. It is rather striking that the Universities should be so nearly unanimous about that. And at Oxford and Cambridge you will often find that science and maths Dons prefer to get undergraduates who have done a good deal of Latin at school. I remember that a Mathematical Fellow of Trinity, now a professor in America, speaks up strongly for Latin. He says something like this: "If in after life your job is to think, render thanks to Providence which ordained that for five years of your youth you did a Latin prose once a week and daily construed some Latin author."[1]

[1] *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*, by A. N. Whitehead, LL.D., Sc.D., F.R.S. (Williams and Norgate, 1929), p. 100.

No—his regulation dose of elementary Latin never did a normal schoolboy anything but good. It was not compulsory Latin that made our education ineffective and ill-thought-of. It was the compulsory addition of Greek that did the damage. For, after all, boys' minds are of different types. Some types can never get far with anything literary or linguistic, and having done the necessary minimum in that line such boys must be put to work of a different kind—work in which they can do well—if they are going to develop properly. To include Greek in the " necessary minimum " was a grave error. It prevented the unliterary fellow from getting any distance with Latin, and, of course, he did not get any distance with Greek either. As a result, a number of boys in every generation got no distance with anything, and as Burgess says, wasted pretty thoroughly all the hours they spent in school. But they were not a majority, and for most boys the training, if narrow, was effective. I feel certain that the great majority profited by it. Burgess' answer does not account for most of the trouble, though I must admit that I believe it accounts for some of it.

M. D'Orsay: And do you account for the rest on the " lazy schoolboy " theory? You agree perhaps with Colonel Callaghan

that learning is antipathetic to the English temperament—that you are constitutionally disinclined for intellectual discipline, particularly in youth? If that is really the case, then it must, as you say, be a matter of what psychologists call "rationalization" and simple people "sour grapes." Because learning is distasteful, you proclaim it to be useless.

Dr. Archdale: Isn't that putting it rather unkindly? The usual hypocrisy of the English, I suppose?

M. D'Orsay: No, indeed. Such an idea was far from my thoughts. I made my suggestion in the hope that you would contradict it. For when I consider your history and your literature, I find it impossible to believe that learning is antipathetic to the English temperament. As soon as you had an "upper middle class" at all, you had a high culture co-extensive with it. You were the first people who bought books in such quantities that authors could live on their earnings. When you say that you are naturally an uncultured race, I refer you to your own Eighteenth Century and to the world of Dr. Johnson.

Col. Callaghan: The Eighteenth Century? You mean those unhealthy-looking fellows that you see in old engravings either with long wigs or with things like turbans on their heads? I

always think they must have been a poor lot. Most of them ate and drank far too much and took no exercise at all. Besides, that little London society was quite a small affair and did not represent the nation as a whole—thank goodness!

Dr. Archdale: It represented as much of the nation as could afford to be educated. But, of course, the education was a literary one—nothing else was possible before science became an everyday affair—and it did very little for the sort of people whom we now find cannot get beyond the beginnings of a literary education. The field was a narrow one, but so it was everywhere in Europe. I must say I agree with Monsieur D'Orsay that England has always been as capable as most countries of carrying a high form of culture and a widely spread one, too.

Col. Callaghan: I suppose it is because I am an uncultured person myself, but I cannot get up much enthusiasm for a high form of culture in England—at least not if it is to begin in the schools. I don't like the young highbrows one meets occasionally at Oxford, who are all for Lenin and Epstein and that fellow D. H. Lawrence and so on—a rotten type, I think, though pretty rare still, thank Heaven! Monsieur D'Orsay will forgive me if I say that the highly cultured young men who come out

of the Paris *lycées* do not attract me either—not just a few odd ones, I mean, but the standard product. I have a nephew who is putting in a year at the Sorbonne, and he trotted me round a little on the Left Bank when I was coming back from Antibes the other day. I did not a bit like the look of the first year undergraduates or the young fellows taking the *bachot*, or whatever they call it. But my nephew says they are no end good at their work, and know far more about most things, including English literature, than he does.

M. D'Orsay: If you had stayed longer on the Left Bank and seen more of the young students there, I think you would have liked them better. But I agree that they are different from most young Englishmen of the same age, and have not some of their advantages.

Mr. Burgess: The Colonel is afraid that if an English Public Schoolboy ever did learn anything he would immediately adopt the morals of the Quartier Latin. I am not with you there, Colonel. I wish to goodness the Public Schoolboy did learn something. Of course English people are capable of acquiring any amount of culture and doing any amount of brain work. My complaint is that the Public Schools neither care themselves about culture and brain work, nor teach their

boys to care about them. They are leaving the job of educating the new generation—which has got to be a brainy one if we are not to go under altogether—to the big secondary schools and the State-aided schools generally. That was what I was complaining about when you two came in. A secondary schoolboy really does work, because he has practically nothing else than work to think about. But a boy at a Public School has so many other things to take up his day and his thoughts that work comes in a bad second every time.

Dr. Archdale: You mean games?

Mr. Burgess: No, I don't. Public Schoolboys don't play games a bit too much, and they don't think about them any more than their fathers do. In any case games are the only thing a Public Schoolboy gets in his extremely comfortable existence that is any sort of preparation for the rough and tumble of real life. Your fellows are so sheltered and looked after that a lot of them can't face up to things at all when they find themselves in an untamed kind of country like Canada or Australia. No—the more Rugger you give them, the stouter fellows they will be. It is not games that I am complaining of—not a bit of it. But there are so many other things that occupy a boy besides his games.

Dr. Archdale: For example?

Mr. Burgess: Well, when a boy is small he is always being organized, and when he is big he is always organizing other people. The youngster is continually being hustled and bothered about fagging and games and discipline and all that, and these things seem more important to him than work because they affect his personal comfort more. And he has to be made humble, too—pressed into the particular shape which the boys at his school are expected to take, and generally compelled to remain inconspicuous. All that involves a strain on a young boy—and a good deal of misery for him, too, if he is of a certain type—and prevents him from having leisure of mind for his work. Then when he is a prefect, he has to do the repressing business himself and run all the machinery which organized him and kept him humble when he was small. He probably takes himself terribly seriously and spends hours each night yarning with the other prefects about a new system for junior nets, or with the housemaster about the tone of the house and how much better it is than it used to be, and so on.

M. D'Orsay: Then do most boys become prefects at their schools before they leave?

Dr. Archdale: No, of course they don't

—only a small minority. Burgess is exaggerating as usual. And those who do become prefects have time for any amount of work as well. In fact in some schools it is only the boys who do well at work that are given prefectorial powers at all. What about the fellows who never become prefects, Burgess?

Mr. Burgess: Well, of course, there is the intermediate kind of fellow—neither a small boy nor a prefect—and there is sometimes comparative peace to be found in that stage, I admit. A certain type of cleverish fellow gets into it fairly quickly and never gets out of it at all. But there are not a great many like that, and they are not thought much of at school, though they often do well afterwards. In fact, they are just the fellows who do succeed in later life, because they had time to do a bit of work at school—not that they got any thanks for it then.

Dr. Archdale: But all this talk about repression, Burgess—surely it is a little exaggerated?

Mr. Burgess: Not a bit of it. You know quite well that the Public Schools impose upon every youngster who joins them a complete social and moral code, and that if he values his peace, he is bound to conform to it. Now to treat young people like that must be bad. Young people ought to be allowed to be

themselves, and how can a boy possibly be himself if the first condition of his comfort is that he shall be someone else—a conventional, traditional, humbled someone else?

Dr. Archdale: Wait a bit. I don't agree that the Public Schools treat boys like that. A boy does not have to be "someone else" when he is at School—though he sometimes finds it wise to be his best self and not his worst—at least not his most egotistical. The real wonder is that he should be as free as he is to behave naturally. I see a large number of Public Schoolboys every day of my life, and I marvel at their patience with one another. They live at extremely close quarters, remember, and you know how abominably irritating other people can be when one lives very close to them for weeks on end. And of course it is worse if they have what may be called sharp social corners. Sharp social corners do get rubbed down in the end at School, but so they ought to be, and unless the boy who is cursed with them is offensively selfish or absurdly bumptious, the process is a slow and kindly one. As a result of it all, I deny that a boy's mind has been standardized, but I claim that he has been made into a citizen, able to obey orders and give them, and trained to consider other people's feelings in the small

exchanges of ordinary life. The Public Schools don't turn out people who stand talking in the door of the Tube lift, or leave paper about after picnics or clean their golf-balls on the face-towel at the Club House. There *are* people who do all these things, but they don't mostly come from the Public Schools. That is one reason why a Public Schoolboy gets on afterwards in almost any society. He is accustomed to " fitting in " with people. He is accustomed to managing people too. He has a pretty good idea of seeing that what he wants gets done. Surely you do not really disapprove of the self-governing principle, Burgess? Don't you think that all this organizing of their own activities by the boys teaches them a great deal that is valuable?

Mr. Burgess: Well, I suppose the actual prefects get some ideas about running things and taking responsibility. But most of their occupations are not worth the time and energy spent on them. Even so, you yourself say that the actual prefects are a small minority, and I do not know what the rest get out of the repressing and organizing process in which they all take some part—active or passive.

Dr. Archdale: Judging by results they get a good deal. The curious thing is that the normal, undistinguished boy from

a Public School who has never been a prefect or held any particular position, seems far more able afterwards to take responsibility and run things than similar boys educated elsewhere.

M. D'Orsay: I have heard so. What gives him this ability to make things run?

Dr. Archdale: I think the explanation is that he has been accustomed all his school days to seeing fellows only a little older than himself taking charge of a house of fifty boys or working up a Cricket eleven, or leading a Rugger pack, or presiding at a debate, or editing a magazine, and he takes it as normal that when such jobs come a man's way he accepts them and finds himself quite able to do them. Then when his own turn comes in later life, he just takes over naturally and does what is required and thinks nothing of it. Believe me, Burgess, when you say that work takes second place at a Public School because there are so many other things to do there, you may be right or you may be wrong, but when you suggest that the "other things" are useless in themselves and a waste of time, then you are wrong.

Col. Callaghan: Of course he is, Archdale. So long as this country and the rest of the Empire are run on their present lines, there is going to be an endless

demand for fellows who can manage things and take charge of situations and get people to follow them, and so on. Such men are wanted far more than youngsters who can pass exams or write poems, and it is only the Public Schools that can produce them.

Mr. Burgess: But, my dear Colonel, this country and the rest of the Empire are not going to be run on their present lines any longer. They cannot afford to be. We have got to compete against people who not only have got brains, but believe in brains, and who are learning now to develop character as well—I mean the kind of "character" which we most admire and are inclined to think of as specially English. Look at the Germans. They are all becoming crazy about games and outdoor exercises and physical fitness, and so on, and yet they are working harder than ever in their schools and universities. They say you cannot get a job even as a shop assistant in Germany now unless you have passed an exam of matriculation standard. Consequently every young man, besides keeping himself fit, works at his books like a slave, for he knows his career will depend on what he does. If we spent as much energy on rubbing up our brains as the Germans do on rubbing up theirs, we might do as well as they do in the

world. But we don't—at least our class doesn't. So the Germans are leaving us behind. The Public Schools ought to be helping us forward and showing us the way, but they are far too self-satisfied for that. All they do is to say "look at the wonderful character training we give and the leaders we produce." And the rest of us just echo these words "character" and "leadership," and look ridiculously pleased with ourselves. "Grand thing these Public Schools of ours," we say; "fine chaps they turn out—hall-marked you know; you can tell a Public Schoolboy wherever you meet him." I agree about that, anyway. The type is usually only too recognizable.

M. D'Orsay: By what do you recognize it, Mr. Burgess?

Mr. Burgess: Oh, well, good clothes, good manners and a totally empty head, are the commonest characteristics. There is often some strength about the type, I admit, and some power of practical initiative. I agree that it has its uses. But its uses are limited. The truth is, the typical Public Schoolboy is acceptable at a dance and invaluable in a shipwreck, but he is no earthly good as an ordinary citizen on ordinary occasions. He does not like work, for one thing. He has always been accustomed to put other things in front of it and he never loses

the habit. Then he does not like thinking, and he has no interest of any kind except his own amusements. He knows and cares nothing about the affairs of the country of which he is said to be one of the leaders. He is a sound Conservative, no doubt, but his conservatism is so narrow and ill-informed that he creates more Socialists than he will ever outvote. He won't think, he can't talk, and a new idea shocks him as if it was immoral. He considers all foreigners intolerably odd, and thinks he has been abroad because he does winter sports each year with an hotelful of English people. And I say again, he does not like work. I know the type. I have had a fair number in my office. I meet dozens every year at Mürren and in the Highlands, and I expect I shall have a good specimen in my own family when Archdale here has finished with my young son. Excuse this outburst—" exaggerated " as usual, I expect, Archdale, but, by Jove, it's sincere. I am tired of the Public School type and I think it is time we had something better. If you people cannot produce it, the secondary schools will.

M. D'Orsay: The "secondary schools"? Can you explain a little? Are the Public Schools then not secondary schools? I am sorry to be so ignorant. Your terms are still strange to me.

Dr. Archdale: Yes—of course the Public Schools are secondary schools. They would not like to be confused with primary! But when Burgess says "secondary schools," he really means the secondary schools which are supported by public money. The expression ought not to be used in that sense, but it very often is. We have a great many such schools nowadays—publicly maintained secondary schools. There must be twelve or thirteen hundred of them, I expect, including girls' schools, and they are of all sorts and sizes. Some are old grammar schools, some are schools which were once independent but have now applied for the support of public funds, and some are quite recent creations—generally put up by the enterprise of local authorities. They have originated in a dozen different ways. But they have many common qualities. They are (practically speaking) all day schools, they all depend on public money, they all charge very low fees and they all admit a percentage of children from the public elementary schools. There is no single word that fits them all, though I once heard a Frenchman distinguish them from the Public Schools by calling them "*écoles subventionnées.*" You see, the Public Schools get no money from public funds. Consequently they are quite independent—and consequently

also they have to charge high fees. However you define a Public School you have got to include those two points in your definition. The subventioned schools, on the other hand, are all controlled by public authority of some kind and are very cheap.

Mr. Burgess: I don't think there is any difficulty in defining a Public School. It is just an independent boarding school that costs £200 a year.

Dr. Archdale: That will do quite well as a rough definition—always remembering the day boys at Westminster.

M. D'Orsay: I understand. And Mr. Burgess says that the subventioned schools pay more attention to the intellect than the Public Schools do, and that they do not turn out the young man with the empty head, whom he has so feelingly described?

Mr. Burgess: Exactly. They teach their boys that work matters and encourage them to use their brains. That is why, as I was telling Archdale here just now, they will cut the Public Schools out altogether before long.

M. D'Orsay: You think that the Public Schools now perform no useful function?

Mr. Burgess: I think they are a picturesque but mischievous survival. You probably know our social history as

well as we do, Monsieur D'Orsay, and I expect you will agree with me that the type of society which the Public Schools were evolved to serve has disappeared. Till the end of the Nineteenth Century, the professions were for the most part a preserve for " sons of gentlemen "(good old Victorian phrase !) and were therefore chiefly manned from the Public Schools. Then, for Public Schoolboys who did not go in for a profession, there were ample opportunities in the army, in the management of land, in the opening up of India and the Colonies, or in some family business already started—for new businesses seem seldom to have been launched by Public Schoolboys, though often by their fathers and grandfathers. Well, that comfortable old world has gone now. The State-aided schools are turning out hundreds of boys each year perfectly fitted to enter the professions, which tradition can no longer reserve for one social class. Business has become an affair of huge organizations and intense competition, wherein you cannot succeed without exceptional ability of one kind or another. Even the outlying parts of the Empire do not need the pioneering type of man now as much as they used to. They need scientific agriculturists, biologists, engineers, and fellows with clear heads who can sit in offices and

organize. Wherever you go and whatever you do nowadays, you have got to make your way by brain work. Of course character is needed, too, but it is no earthly good without brains, and that is what the Public Schools do not realize.

M. D'Orsay: But the parents of the boys, do they not insist that their sons should be taught to use their brains? Can they not refuse to send their boys to schools where work is not given first place?

Mr. Burgess: Yes, they can send them to the secondary schools, and that is just what we shall all be doing before long.

M. D'Orsay: But you do not do it yet?

Mr. Burgess: Well, my boy is at Grantchester, as you know, but I only sent him there out of sentiment and because I was at school with Archdale. If I had a second son——

Dr. Archdale: You would send him to Grantchester, too—you know you would. It is a matter of sentiment, as you say, and it is also a matter of caste. Even if you were prepared to send a son to a State-aided school, your wife would not let you. And in your heart of hearts you would agree with her.

M. D'Orsay: A matter of caste?—that is to say, a matter of rank?

Dr. Archdale: No—not exactly. I do

not mean that the Public Schools are schools for the *noblesse*, though, of course, the *noblesse* go there. They are schools for the Oligarchy.

M. D'Orsay: The Oligarchy? That is what you call the governing class? I know the phrase from your newspapers.

Dr. Archdale: Old newspapers, perhaps, Monsieur D'Orsay. The modern "ruling few," if they rule at all, only do so socially. Our grandfathers did indeed speak of "the English governing class," but they meant something small and homogeneous. The Oligarchy is something vastly larger. It is, in fact, a conglomerate of classes—a big section of the entire *bourgeoisie*. It contains, for instance, what you call the *noblesse*, that is, a dwindling remnant of the "nobility and gentry" of the last century; it contains officers in the Services and men in the learned professions; it contains families enriched by commerce or industry two or three generations ago, and the sons of families enriched one generation ago; and, of course, it contains a number of individuals who have risen to importance by their personal gifts or efforts, and have schooled themselves to acquire an outward likeness to Oligarchs native born. What I call "the English Oligarchy" includes all these and all combinations of these.

M. D'Orsay: One cannot call it a plutocracy, I suppose?

Dr. Archdale: No. It includes people of many different levels of wealth—the Old Rich, the Fairly New Rich, the Old Comfortables and the New Poor—but, of course, it does not include the Real Poor or the Quite New Rich. On the economic side its members are united only by their ability to keep their sons at school until they are eighteen or more, and pay (whether easily or with difficulty) school bills of £200 to £300 for each son for each year. Wealth up to this level is, I agree, a quality common to all oligarchs. But it is not their distinctive quality. Their distinctive qualities are all social, the most obvious being the clothes of the men and the speech of both sexes. The clothes may be old or new, but they must be in the prevailing style and they must have been expensive when first bought. The speech is what detractors caricature as the " Oxford accent," and it is absolutely uniform except for a few disputed pronunciations and the droppin' of g's by huntin' people. You recognize it at once —even down the telephone—and an oligarch rung up by a stranger knows immediately whether he is being addressed by another oligarch or not. A tramp who speaks like a member of this club must once have been an oligarch. But

a well-dressed man who pronounces "round about the town" as a Cockney does, though he may become the father of little oligarchs, cannot be or have been one himself. Our grandfathers would have said "gentlemen" where I say "oligarch," but "gentlemen" has now become a moral, not a social term, and cannot be used with a negative except by way of insult. I expect you have seen enough of England to understand what I mean when I try to describe the English Oligarchy—though I do not think there is an exact parallel to it in other countries. It is a class (or rather a group of classes) having, as its members believe, an ethical tradition of its own; marked, as everyone can see, by certain social peculiarities; and, rich enough as the facts prove, to spend £200 or more per year per son on education. But apart from these matters, it is both the creature and the creator of the English Public Schools. The young would-be oligarch can scarcely qualify except through a Public School, and at the same time it is oligarchic sentiment which gives the Public Schools much of the prestige which foreigners find so surprising—the rest being due, I believe, to their real merits.

M. D'Orsay: I think I understand what you mean by the Oligarchy, but the

phrase itself is new to me. Apparently, then, it is at least as much for social and moral reasons as for intellectual reasons that British parents send their boys to the Public Schools.

Col. Callaghan: I don't know what you mean by "social" reasons. My son would have been a gentleman wherever he went, but I sent him to Eton because I wanted him to be brought up with the kind of fellows he will mix with afterwards, and because they have got a wonderful tradition there which I knew would make a man of him.

Dr. Archdale: Quite, Colonel. But that fits in with Monsieur D'Orsay's comments. "Social and moral," as you say, Monsieur D'Orsay—some parents putting more emphasis on *social* and some on *moral.* Colonel Callaghan wishes his boy educated at a school with great traditions, so that he will have a better chance of developing to the full the virtues expected of an oligarch. The social side will be looked after at home. Other parents who have not the social tradition of the Callaghans, put more emphasis on the manners than on the virtues which their offspring are expected to acquire. But practically all parents who send their boys to the Public Schools instead of to the aided schools (which could put them through the same

examinations) do so because they want them to turn into men of a particular type —a type which is well known to everyone in England (being both morally admirable and socially unmistakable), and which provides the males of what I call the English Oligarchy.

Col. Callaghan: A very good type it is, too. Don't you agree?

Dr. Archdale: Yes, I do. But there is perhaps not quite enough variety about it. A boy's mother said to me yesterday —" I don't want my son rolled out flat and returned to me as a typical English gentleman." I was struck by that, partly because I share the lady's point of view to some extent, but also because it was a very unusual remark for a Public School parent to make. Most parents do not seem to fear uniformity even as much as I do.

M. D'Orsay: But is uniformity unavoidable?

Dr. Archdale: To a certain extent it is. You see, the Public School machinery takes pretty complete charge of the boys between thirteen and eighteen, and it is not surprising if it presses a definite shape on them during that time, besides giving them rather a machine-made look. But what makes most for uniformity is the " herd instinct " of the other boys. That is always to be reckoned with at

school, especially at a boarding-school. Boys insist on everyone conforming to accepted standards. But on the whole the standards are high, and as outward conformity is all that is required, a boy's soul usually remains his own.

Mr. Burgess: I don't know about that. You could hardly imagine a more conventional creature than the ordinary Public Schoolboy.

Dr. Archdale: I don't think that matters, if the conventions are only social ones. There is a great deal to be said for the social conventions. They save an immense amount of trouble and settle innumerable small problems. You meet a friend—and you do not need to ask yourself "What do I do now?" and weigh up the respective merits of bowing, kissing and rubbing noses. Convention settles the point. You shake hands and the greeting is over. No thinking has been needed. Then, convention has already decided what you will wear at dinner to-night. No thinking will be needed—about a subject not worth the expenditure of thought. Many School conventions are of this kind—just a convenience, just machinery which regulates the outer man and so sets the inner man free. But the piling up of prohibitions about waistcoat buttons, hands in pockets, methods of carrying books, etc., results in

exasperation in youth and an exaggerated respect for convention in later life—or sometimes an exaggerated hostility to convention. Prohibitions of this kind have not the virtue of the Dartmouth rules by which tooth brushes must be placed running North and South at night —such rules being merely the glorification of the virtue of orderliness. And orderliness *is* a virtue. I am not inclined to think a man clever just because his desk or his hair is untidy. I don't care a bit if the boys' speech, dress and manners are all more or less of one pattern, so long as it is a good pattern —which I think it is—though I should care a great deal if their minds were all of one pattern. But they are not—or at least not more so than they were born to be. The assumption that original genius would be common if the schools did not crush it, seems to me unsound. Originality and genius are always rare. But this " herd " pressure can be a danger none the less. It can produce an excessive fear of being conspicuous, which works against that very power of initiative which we like to think we produce. Curiously enough, it varies a good deal in different schools, and I think that some of the less famous schools have a more liberal tradition in this matter than the greatest. That probably

accounts for the remark which I saw made by a General in some newspaper the other day—" my best officers in the War came from schools no one has ever heard of". I do not expect that all the Generals found that, but it is interesting that some did. However, I am digressing. I must get back to your question, Colonel. Yes, I do think that the type is a good one. If I did not, I should not be a Public Schoolmaster. I see lots of faults in the Public School type, but I am always angry if someone else points them out to me. In fact, it is the working faith of my life that the Public School boy is very nearly the salt of the earth—and could be quite, if the schools did all their duty instead of most of it. Yes, a good type—a very good type.

M. D'Orsay: And when Mr. Burgess declares this type to be intellectually deficient, you do not agree—either of you? He is a voice crying in the wilderness?

Mr. Burgess: If it is a wilderness, it is a pretty populous wilderness. I know hundreds of men who are saying the same thing. I dare say that before the War the British father did not care as much as he ought to have about his boy's work, but that is all changed now. People are finding out that you can't even earn your living if you don't know how to use your

brain, and they are beginning to ask whether a Public School career helps a boy to use his brain or not.

M. D'Orsay: But Dr. Archdale does not think that his school will soon be deserted in favour of the subventioned schools?

Dr. Archdale: No. I am afraid that Burgess shares the very common delusion that all the aided schools have a higher intellectual standard than the big Public Schools. The fact is that the aided schools outnumber the big Public Schools by pretty well ten to one, and it is only a few of the very best that can compete with them at all. If you take the lists of scholarship awards at Oxford and Cambridge which are published every year about Christmas time, you will find that though the Public Schools are so much fewer in number, their boys and the boys from the aided schools come out about equal—I made a rough count myself last year and the totals were almost identical. But even if the Public Schools were outclassed in the scholarship lists, that would not prove their neglect of the intellect. Only a few boys in any school can hope for a scholarship. The test of a school's efficiency is the training it gives to the ordinary boy. At an aided school most of the ordinary boys leave at sixteen or seventeen, or as soon as they have

passed the School Certificate or the "Matric." Only the best as a rule stay on, and they do highly specialized work with a view to scholarships. But a Public School keeps practically all its boys till they are eighteen or nineteen, and its job is to give them the best education it can during the whole of that time, whether they are clever or not. If you judge it by the way it does that job, you will not find too many reasons for condemning it. No, if an oligarchic parent is going to send his son to an aided school in the hope that he will find a higher general standard there than at a Public School, he will have to select one of the very best, or he will lose on the exchange. Then, when he has selected one, he will have to go and live beside it, because, of course, it will be a day school.

M. D'Orsay: And that he will not do?

Dr. Archdale: He will be very unwilling to do it—partly because it may be very inconvenient, partly because he does not want to have his boy at home for 365 nights out of 365, and partly because he probably believes in what he calls the "community life" of a boarding-school and in just those communal activities which Burgess thinks such a waste of time. Of course, there is another side to the day school question, but for the few

who take the other side, Westminster and one or two other famous places cater admirably and sufficiently. Generally speaking, oligarchs want boarding-schools, apart altogether from the "social" question, and I think they will go on wanting them as long as they can afford to pay for them. Certainly the Public Schools are in great favour just now. What you might call the Public School population has gone up by about 30 per cent. in 16 years. The figures were worked out in one of the reviews the other day.[1] The increase is far greater than the increase of wealth during that time can explain.

M. D'Orsay: So, though the delusion that the day schools teach better is common, yet the deluded still send their sons to boarding-schools? That suggests that parents do not care much about the teaching, does it not?

Dr. Archdale: Well, a school with a notable examination record will always be in demand, but parents do not care about work as much as Burgess thinks. In the course of a year at Grantchester I talk to between 400 and 500 parents who want to put their sons down for the school, and

[1] From 17,089 in 1912 to 22,373 in 1928. See Mr. Stephen H. Foot's article in *The Nineteenth Century*, for January, 1930. The figure for 1928 takes no account of new foundations.

I am always surprised to notice how few of them ask questions about the work of the place—methods, subjects, results and so on—or show the least interest in what we are likely to do for the boy intellectually. Those who do refer to the work are usually concerned about some specific examination—for Woolwich, perhaps, or for a University scholarship—towards which they have ambitions. Of course there are always a few parents who are interested in their boy's work in a general way, both prospectively and after he arrives, and those few are invaluable to us. But as a rule the school is far keener about work than the home. In spite of what Burgess says, there is still a very large number of British oligarchic parents who do not care a scrap for the academic side of education. They are indignant if a necessary examination is not passed, but they are wholly indifferent to learning, culture, the widening of interest or the improvement of taste, and even to training in thought and expression. In some of the worst cases this indifference to education is easily explained—for you will find that there are still some oligarchs who are quite uneducated themselves, being devoid of ideas, unwilling to read and unable to punctuate. But they are exceptional, thank goodness. Indiffer-

ence does not necessarily mean stupidity. There is no shortage of brains either in England or in the oligarchy, though English people don't bother themselves to use their brains, as a rule, until they are obliged to.

M. D'Orsay: In general, then, I gather the material you have to work on is good, as well as plentiful? I wonder if you would give me an idea of what you aim at doing with it?

Dr. Archdale: That is rather a big question. I suppose the shortest way to answer it would be to say that I try to see that boys sent to Grantchester get a liberal education.

M. D'Orsay: Could you explain a little further?

Dr. Archdale: Well, Public Schoolboys, as we were saying, are boys who can afford to stay at school till they are eighteen or over, and who for the most part do not have to begin earning their living at once even then. Indeed there is usually no economic compulsion upon them to begin even making direct preparation for earning while they are at school. They do that afterwards—at the Universities, or at Woolwich, Sandhurst or Cranwell or as learners in "business" of one kind or another. Consequently there is only indirect preparation to be made at school, and the

Public Schoolboy can really go on being educated till he is eighteen or nineteen, whereas the great majority of English boys have to begin earning at fourteen (it is to be fifteen now, thank goodness !) and many of the rest at sixteen. That is why I said " liberal education," because I take it that the phrase originally meant education for a free man—an *eleutheros*—as opposed to a slave. The slave's job in life was just to work ; the free man's job was to be the best possible kind of man. Nowadays everybody has got to work, but some people can afford to have a shot at becoming the best possible kind of man before they start working. That is the process I call " getting a liberal education." I do not claim that as a matter of history I have explained the origin of the expression correctly, but my use of it is not entirely fanciful—as you would know, Burgess, if you did not glory in having forgotten your Aristotle.[1]

M. D'Orsay: And that process includes the " indirect preparation " for earning of which you spoke ?

Dr. Archdale: Yes. The idea is that if a man's mind has been developed fully, and if the best has been made of it before he begins to acquire the technical knowledge needed for the work of his life, he will do that work better in the end.

[1] See page eight.

But the work of his life is not the whole of his life, and there is much more in a liberal education than indirect preparation for a profession.

M. D'Orsay: You mean there is the development of the man and his powers?

Dr. Archdale: Exactly. When a boy grows up he will have to be something more than a producer. He will certainly have to be a citizen, he may have to be a father and husband, and he will always have leisure to employ as well as work to do. Our first aim, therefore, is to turn out a man who can respond as he ought to all these claims upon him—in fact, as I said, to turn out a good specimen of humanity.

M. D'Orsay: And you feel that you are doing so? Your boys when you have finished with them are what you call "good specimens" intellectually as well as morally and physically?

Dr. Archdale: The best of them would be hard to beat even intellectually. A Sixth Form boy from a big Public School is usually far from ill-educated for his age, and he would compare favourably with the young men of other classes and countries. But I won't deny that our average product is less good than I should like it to be.

M. D'Orsay: The true artist is always dissatisfied with his work.

Dr. Archdale: I'm afraid there are good grounds for dissatisfaction in this case. I don't go the length that Burgess goes, but when I think how much the Public School class might do for the country intellectually, and how little in fact it does, I am filled with gloom. Men who had a liberal education till they were eighteen or nineteen ought to be worth infinitely more in later life than men who were never educated at all after fourteen. They ought to be the leaders of English thought and taste and the chief creators of an enlightened public opinion.

M. D'Orsay: And they are not?

Dr. Archdale: They do not do nearly as much leading as they should—and we so badly need leaders just now. It is more important than ever it was before to have a large class in the community capable of seeing the events of to-day against the background of all the yesterdays; capable of taking up new knowledge and making it part of the general consciousness; of resisting superstition, mass suggestion and stampeded opinion; of taking the wide international point of view on public questions; of comparing modern art and literature with all the art and literature that have gone before—in fact of leading English taste and English opinion, and doing for the country what it is the business of a cultivated class to

do. But the average ex-Public Schoolboy is not really a leader either of taste or of opinion. If "taste" may include manners and dress, I admit he does well in them—very important they are, too, as symptoms of civilization at least. But if you take "taste" more narrowly, things are different. The Public Schoolboy is certainly of some use where architecture is concerned. Having lived in beautiful, and perhaps noble, surroundings while he was at school, he knows a shoddy thing when he sees it, and he does not like the jerry-built (or "bungaloid") villa. But in art he is rather apt to be —well, just *uneducated*—the type of person for whom the baser sort of Academy picture is intended. However, I do admit that we are all doing more now than used to be done in this matter of æsthetics, and the next generation is likely to be better than the last. It will certainly be much more musical.

Then, as a leader of opinion the average Public Schoolboy fails because there are so few subjects on which he troubles to have an opinion at all. In that sense Burgess is right when he says that we cannot get our boys to use their brains. The Fifth Form boy's lack of general knowledge sometimes appals me. The Fourth-Former, of course, is vastly worse. He is often indifferent to everything out-

side his own occupations, except news paper cricket and perhaps some mechan ical matter which he does not really unde stand. But the Fourth-Former at scho may still be regarded as raw materia The trouble is with our "finished pro ducts." Some of them are never finishe at all and just remain Fourth-Formers a their lives.

M. D'Orsay: And you don't attribut this to a defect in your material?

Dr. Archdale: No—partly because there were such a defect it would clearl be the business of the schools not t complain about it but to overcome it, an partly because when the environment right the results are right, even if th material is not first-class. There ar always a few boys at Grantchester wh though not a bit clever and not likel ever to reach Sixth Form standard, ar extremely active-minded and intelligen That is to say, they are interested i numberless subjects, read everything the can get hold of, think for themselves an in fact use their brains. Now the reaso why these boys are more intelligent tha the rest, is not that they have a bette intellectual outfit, but simply that the have more intelligent parents and ar accustomed to hearing more intelligen conversation at home. When the en vironment is good, you see, the results ar

good. Then again, there is no doubt that some schools, like some families, are much more successful than others in turning out fellows with active brains. For the most part, I believe the most successful are just those which have the highest standards academically—do the best in examinations and so on. I suppose the fact is that a stimulating atmosphere encourages a boy's brains to be active, and if you have got a school where everyone is working and thinking, you get a stimulating atmosphere, and consequently a lot of mental activity even outside school work. Well, what some schools can do all schools ought to do. The conclusion seems to me absolutely unavoidable that if schools in general, including my own, wish to produce a type of man willing and able to lead English opinion, they will have to give up asking Providence to supply them with a different kind of English boy, and concentrate their efforts on doing better by the boys they get at present. That is, we shall have to set about raising the general level of our teaching.

Mr. Burgess: Does that mean the level of your staffs?

Dr. Archdale: I did not mean that, but I am afraid it is true that the schools do not attract the very best men from the Universities, as they once did—the best

intellectually, I mean. Certainly few of us are up to the level of the French "*professeurs agrégés.*" And a more serious trouble is that not many of us know as much as we ought about the scientific basis of our craft. We are all amateurs, or at least begin as amateurs, and I feel sure that in future we shall have to do more than we are doing to secure proper professional training for ourselves. Then again the profession suffers a good deal from in-breeding. The average Public Schoolmaster is apt to be just a Public Schoolboy who has had four years at a University between his departure as a Prefect and his return as a Master—to the same School or to another like it. I am not sure that any young man ought to start School-mastering until he has seen the world a bit. There would be a good deal to be said for making the minimum age of joining 27 or 28. But that is not a practical proposition at the moment. On the whole, of course, the standard of teaching in the Public Schools is high and in the best of them very high indeed. Still we ought in most schools to be doing better than we are doing.

Mr. Burgess: I'm glad to hear you say that, Archdale. At any rate, you do not think everything is perfect in the Public Schools.

Dr. Archdale: No. But I don't think things are any better in the aided schools. The best liberal education now being given in this country to ordinary boys is being given in the Public Schools, and as good a liberal education as can be had in Europe is being given in half a dozen of the best of them.

Mr. Burgess: Can you give the names of the half-dozen?

Dr. Archdale: If you want to know their names, you had better watch next year's lists of Oxford and Cambridge scholarships in *The Times*. The schools I mean are pretty sure to get more scholarships than the others. I do not suggest that the scholarships themselves have anything to do with the ordinary boy, but merely that those schools which get the most scholarships seem also to be those in which the ordinary boy is best taught. Of course, I know that the aided schools get plenty of scholarships, but that does not affect the issue, because they do not keep their ordinary boys as long as the Public Schools, or make such a point of doing well by them.

M. D'Orsay: You conclude then that the first need of the Public Schools is a general raising of their intellectual standards?

Dr. Archdale: Yes, that's it.

Mr. Burgess: And you are afraid that

if they don't raise their standards they will go under?

Dr. Archdale: Not in the sense you mean. They won't be beaten in open competition by the aided schools. Apart from their actual merit, they have an enormous handicap in their endowments and traditions, their great reputation and the fact that so many English people believe in boarding-schools. But I do see two or three dangers in front of us. The first is that if the bureaucratic idea goes on spreading, our schools may be absorbed into the national system—which would mean loss of individuality. At present, Public Schools differ from each other just as people do. In fact they have personalities, and it would be something like murder to extinguish them. In this country, institutions have a habit of developing personalities. It is a result of our fondness for independence, I suppose. Even our museums have personalities, and still more, of course, the big hospitals. There is always a tremendous loss, I think, when individual living growths cease to live and grow as individuals. There is no room in England for the sort of bureaucrat who rejoices to think that he has arranged for every boy of a particular age to be doing the same page of the same book at the same

moment throughout the kingdom. English institutions would never function —or at any rate never flourish—under that sort of régime. I don't mean, of course, that the Board of Education imposes uniformity like that. Indeed the Board's respect for the individualities and different histories of schools does it infinite credit. But local authorities are not all so liberal-minded, and the Board itself may not for ever resist the temptation to prefer organization to life. After all, it *is* a Government office. For myself, I should regard it as a disaster if the Public Schools, which at present are not " public " at all except in so far as they do not belong to private individuals, passed under the control of a public authority, however enlightened. A worse (but certainly less likely) disaster would be confiscation by the State or even sheer abolition. It is, of course, quite possible that if the Public Schools cannot prove that they are valuable to the whole community, a reforming Government may one day make it economically impossible for them to carry on. And the same thing might be done by an extremist Government out of sheer class feeling. Still another danger is that if the boys they send out are not successful in the tremendous competition of modern life, it may become impossible to resist a

demand for a purely utilitarian education, which would turn the Public Schools into "technical" or "commercial" institutions.

Mr. Burgess: It would not be a bad thing if they were a bit more utilitarian than they are, I should think. You seem desperately afraid of teaching anything useful in your schools.

Dr. Archdale: As a matter of fact, we are extremely utilitarian, and almost everything we teach is useful. But we do not use the word "useful" in the same sense as you do, and we regard any work as useful which helps to turn a boy into a competent man—the sort of man who can learn a new job quickly and do it well. It is an unpractical policy to teach a boy useful accomplishments and leave him with a half-developed brain. It is better to develop his brain and let him learn the accomplishments later. Of course we have got to fit a boy to do a job in the world. But schoolmasters start with the boy, and you want to start with the job. My whole object is to make the best of the particular mind entrusted to me—to induce it to develop itself to its highest point.

Mr. Burgess: I suppose that means getting the boys to do a bit of honest work.

Dr. Archdale: That is what it comes to.

Obviously a mind develops itself by exerting itself, and my first business, therefore, is to get boys' minds to exert themselves. It is better to have compulsory exertion than no exertion at all, and it is better to have spontaneous exertion that leads to nothing—memorizing cricket statistics and so on—than to have no spontaneous exertion at all. But what we really want is spontaneous exertion that does lead to something—something valuable, like power, knowledge, vision and an illumination of experience. Therefore the first thing you have got to do is to try and find a subject which a boy likes working at—as he likes working at his pet hobby in the holidays—a subject for which he has an aptitude and which at the same time is really *worth* working at. Of course this is a counsel of perfection. It can't always be done. For one thing, a boy's aptitudes may be very narrow, or he may not seem to have any at all, and in that case you will have to fall back on compulsory exertion over the whole field. And in any case with most boys you will have to put up with compulsory exertion over part of the field, because clearly there are lots of things that everybody has got to tackle whether he likes them or not. However, the sensible boy—and most boys are sensible—can usually be induced

to supply the compulsion himself. Examinations sometimes provide a motive. That is one of their chief uses, I think. But my point is that the centre of every boy's education is (or ought to be) the work he does on a subject that appeals to him—provided, of course, that it is a subject worth working at. That is why, when I am arranging the programme of a boy just beginning to specialize, I insist on being guided by his own tastes and aptitudes rather than by his father's views on what will be useful to him later. And, as I say, we only allow subjects that we think are really worth working at —what I should call "educational" subjects.

Mr. Burgess: What is the difference between "educational" subjects and other kinds?

Dr. Archdale: I call a subject "educational" if it provokes more mental activity than is required for mastering it. A subject is educational if it stimulates your imagination while you work at it, or if it induces you to think about something beyond the actual task you are engaged on, or if it gets you to draw conclusions of your own from the data given, or to work out problems on principles which apply outside them, or if it compels you by any means to form judgments or to exercise taste or to originate ideas and

devise methods of expressing them. Most school subjects do some or all of those things, besides leading to knowledge, and therefore they are educational, though, of course, they differ in educational value. But the mere acquisition of accomplishments is not educational. If you learn typewriting, for example, you learn typewriting *and that is all.* Nothing happens inside your head while you are learning, except the memorizing of the keyboard and the development of the required motor associations. History and some mathematics and languages and science are different. Every bit of work in one of them that a boy has to tackle, provokes, or ought to provoke, more mental activity than the tackling of it actually needs.

M. D'Orsay: And a boy has a fairly free choice among such "educational" subjects as these?

Dr. Archdale: Yes—nowadays. We have mostly abandoned the old "classical side" and "modern side," which were just devices for producing two opposite types of deformity. But, of course, the subjects that a boy cares for are likely to be of one type and not of all the types. Either they will be scientific and mathematical, or they will be literary and linguistic.

M. D'Orsay: I suppose that within

these groups you have to advise and guide boys in their choice?

Dr. Archdale: Yes. The scientific or mathematical kind of boy generally settles his own destiny without much hesitation. The purely mathematical type is easily recognized, and the purely scientific type usually decides early between the biological side and the physical and chemical side. But there is a real difficulty with the literary kind of boy. In the past he usually did classics, changing over to history later if his classics came to nothing. Those who were at all good at either classics or history were well on the way to becoming educated by the time they left their schools—but there were precious few of them. The rest formed, and still form, the great army of uneducated (or semi-educated) men, who endanger the future of the system which produced them —and darken the lives of headmasters with the consciousness of failure!

Mr. Burgess: I did not see much consciousness of failure about you to-night when you were speaking at the Scaremongers'. What are you going to do about it, anyway?

Dr. Archdale: Heaven knows! I have no panacea. But there is one line that I think we might follow up more than we do—though my idea about this is not

very popular in the schoolmastering world.

Mr. Burgess: All the more likely to be some good. What is it?

Dr. Archdale: Well it concerns modern languages. I do not think we have ever had quite the right idea about modern languages.

Col. Callaghan: If you want to learn a foreign language you have got to go to the country and learn it there. No one has ever learnt a language at a Public School. My own boy was top of his Division in French last half, and his report said he was pretty good at it. But when I had him over in France he did not seem able to say a word.

Dr. Archdale: You parents think of nothing but fluency in conversation. If a man can order his breakfast in the platform restaurant at Bâle in French, German and Italian, you say "What a linguist!" without troubling to find out whether he really knows any of those languages thoroughly. But if your boy lacks confidence and hesitates when he first tries to talk to a Frenchmán, you say that he has learnt nothing at school. In actual fact he may have learnt a great deal—all the part that matters in the end, but does not show at first. Conversational fluency is the least important part of the learning of a language, and

the most easily acquired. But you think it is the only thing worth troubling about. There was a time when schoolmasters seemed to agree with you and when the "reformers" thought of nothing but conversation. But you cannot learn a language through conversation if you can only converse for an hour or two a week, and in any case, mere fluency is quickly achieved and quickly lost. What a school ought to do and can do for a boy is to teach him grammar, give him a wide vocabulary and a good knowledge of idiom, lay the foundations of a proper pronunciation and get him over the worst of his self-consciousness. If it does that for him, he can do the rest for himself in a fortnight if he goes to live in the country. Everything except conversational fluency can be taught at school. Witness the Dutch, whose schools seem to perform miracles in the way of language teaching.

Col. Callaghan: Well, no one will ever learn *their* language.

Dr. Archdale: That only means that they have a stronger motive for learning foreign ones. The point is that they do learn them in a very wonderful way, and they do it by better teaching and harder work.

M. D'Orsay: Apart from their usefulness, do you think that modern languages

can be used as an instrument of real education?

Dr. Archdale: A good many people at Oxford and Cambridge say that they cannot, and I do not feel sure that they can, so long as they are taught as they often are just now. One has got to put a good deal more into a modern language course than the mere learning of the tongues concerned. We have got to rope in the historian, the geographer and the literary critic to help the mere linguist. The kind of course I should like to see established everywhere would be one designed to lead to Modern Greats at Oxford rather more than to the Modern Language Tripos (as it is at present) at Cambridge. A course like that can quite well be devised, and you could find the beginnings of one in several schools already. I think one of the chief jobs we have got to tackle in the next few years is to establish a method and tradition of modern language teaching which will make the study of Europe and European tongues the basis of a really satisfactory liberal education.

Col. Callaghan: Spanish is a deuced useful language for fellows who are going into business nowadays.

Dr. Archdale: Yes, if your business is concerned with South America. But from the point of view of education, it is

German that I want fellows to learn next after Latin and French. It is much more difficult than Spanish and Italian, and much more important, too, for every purpose except trade with the Argentine and touring in Italy. It is also much more remote from English and French, and consequently translation into it and out of it could be made to have almost the effect of the old Classical "proses" and "unseens." You cannot translate from English into German without thinking out exactly what the English means in every detail, and you cannot translate from German into English without exerting yourself to find the best English idiom to represent the meaning of the differently shaped German sentences. Half the benefit of the old classical education came from the continual practice that it gave to boys in thinking out exactly what they were going to say before they said it, and in choosing English expressions with care and taste. German gives practice nearly as good. I look forward to a time when the average, ordinary Public Schoolboy who is not a specialist in classics or science or mathematics, will have been taught both French and German quite thoroughly before he leaves school and been taught them by men who are scholars as well as linguists. Not only would such a boy be trained in

the correct use of language, but he would also be sufficiently steeped in the traditional culture of Europe to be a much better European than most of us are. Spanish and Italian could be added later, or one of them could be learnt at the same time as German by a clever boy. There is the question of poetry, too. I myself am an unrepentant Greek lover, but you have got to be pretty far on with the language before you can enjoy any Greek poetry except perhaps Homer. But French poetry is the most obviously charming and easily enjoyable poetry in the world, and German poetry has more affinity than any other with English. Then European history and modern philosophy cannot be adequately studied without German books, and, of course, travel, which is so easy nowadays, is far more educative if one knows the principal languages of Europe. No more illuminating experience is possible for a young man than to live for a spell in a foreign city if he can talk freely and listen effectively. This means that modern languages, besides providing the basis of a liberal education in boyhood (as I believe they can be made to do) provide the means of continuing that education later. What is more, as you all keep saying, they are definitely useful, and it is not to be forgotten that boys work with

more interest at subjects which they believe to be useful and which they think will lead to something practical later on. Your letter in *The Times*, Burgess, showed how valuable a working knowledge of French and German is to a young man entering business.

Mr. Burgess: It won't help as much as it ought till employers who do business with the Continent are a bit more enterprising and know European languages better themselves. Spanish is valued by firms that deal with Chile and the Argentine, but South America is only one market of many, and people always seem to forget that.

M. D'Orsay: Do many boys from the Public Schools go " into business " ?

Dr. Archdale: Yes, and more still will be going soon, I hope. A few of our cleverest boys are destined to become Dons, research students, or schoolmasters. A bigger section, but still a not very big one, go into the Civil Services (Home, Indian and Colonial) and the professions. Then you have got to count a fair number of soldiers, a few flying men, and a very few sailors. These three sections with the addition of one or two farmers (mostly destined to go abroad) make up about half the total. The other half either go into business, or ought to go into business, sometimes through the University and

sometimes direct—" business " being used to mean both industry and commerce both at home and abroad.

M. D'Orsay: Then you make special efforts to prepare boys for business, I suppose?

Dr. Archdale: I should like to say " yes," but to prepare for business is more difficult than it seems. One could not provide specialist preparation for every branch of commerce and industry—and it would be no good if one could, because boys rarely know what openings they are going to get. Obviously a boy with scientific gifts who has done a lot of science at school will leave us reasonably well prepared to enter industry on the technical side. But for commerce and for the organizing side of industry there is no one definite thing that a boy has to know, because, of course, we only teach economics as an " educational " subject and it can hardly be more than that at school. Every now and again one finds leaders in the business world making pronouncements as to the qualities they like to find in their recruits from the Public Schools. But their lists vary enormously and the only qualities common to them all seem to be concerned with character. On the intellectual side there is no agreement. Men who are totally without a sense of proportion include hand-

writing in their lists, and some of them put it first. These are the men who want boys to go into business at fifteen and who mostly add that *they* did and have not regretted it. There are perhaps fewer of this type nowadays, but I believe that what failings there are in the present leadership of English business are due to the predominance of men who started work before they were fully educated. It is they who think that typing, shorthand and a good clerkly handwriting are all that a man needs for business, besides an acquisitive instinct. Happily the biggest and best of modern business firms do want properly educated young men. The representative of a fabulously successful business house declared the other day that recruits for the business world ought to have passed "the highest intellectual tests available." As a rule, firms like this do not mind what subject a man has worked at, provided that he has passed the "highest tests" and shown that he has really good brains. It is a little like the Indian Civil. You can get into that whatever your best subject is, provided that you are clever enough. When they have selected you because you are an able fellow, they give you a "vocational" course afterwards to teach you what they want you to know. So far as I can see, that is the only sensible attitude for

"business" to take up. Certainly it is the only one which makes co-operation with the schools really possible. We are to produce first-rate material; the business world is to train and use it. Our job is simply to educate our boys—to develop their natural capacity to the utmost, whatever precise form it may take. We have done our part when we have produced educated men. From the commercial point of view that means not men who know the details of business already, but men who can learn the details of business quickly, men who have the habit of accuracy and thoroughness, who can think clearly, express themselves effectively, take large views, originate ideas, accept responsibility and have enough imagination to see the other man's point of view. That last point is important, I think. The essential job of English commerce is to sell things abroad, and the man who is going to sell things abroad must in addition to knowing the languages concerned, realize that everyone in the world has not exactly the same mental processes as the middle-class Englishman.

If the standard Public School product has the qualities I have described, the standard Public School product will eventually be sought after by all business men who know where their interest lies,

and we shall see established between the schools and commerce a similar connection to that which is beginning to exist already between the Universities and the technical side of industry.

M. D'Orsay: Does commerce, then, not seek your product at present?

Dr. Archdale: Private firms are recruited too much from the families of the principals, but apart from that there is a good deal of doubt about the Public Schools in the commercial world, and some in the industrial world. The big new combines take the best brains for their industrial sides and a few really good men among the less gifted for their administrative sides. The great oil and tobacco concerns take a small but steady stream of useful though not necessarily very clever fellows. The Stock Exchange takes a certain number who have special personal qualifications. London commercial houses are on the whole inclined to welcome Public Schoolboys, and some which have branches in India, Malaya and other parts of "the East," actually seek them. But in the Midlands and in the North the business world shows great distrust of the Public School type. I do not deny that this is partly the fault of the Public Schools themselves. Too many fellows offer themselves for "business" because they have failed to get openings

in anything else. But there is more distrust than the facts justify, and in any case I feel sure that we have only got to produce the right article in order to create a demand for it. There is no part of our destiny which I anticipate more confidently and desire more earnestly than the recognition of the Public Schools as the source from which commerce will draw its best recruits, and as institutions which will be proud to prepare a large number of their best boys for commercial careers.

Mr. Burgess: Good for you, Archdale! And what do your best boys think about it—of commerce, I mean, as opposed to the professions? I suppose the old snobbery about that has gone now?

Dr. Archdale: Almost entirely, and, of course, it is obvious that the professions cannot hold all the boys who come out of the Public Schools. The difficulty nowadays is that it is very hard to get openings in commerce unless one is somebody's son or nephew, and there is no proper machinery for co-ordinating the schools and the offices—at least none that the heads of the big offices are agreed upon using. Then, of course, some boys are still afraid of a business life—"all office-work and no exercise," and so on. It is natural enough, when they have played games from two to four every

afternoon all their school days, but most people are beginning to realize now that if you insist on having an "out-door life" you will probably have nothing to live it on—unless, of course, you are rich enough to be a farmer. Both boys and parents are far wiser than they used to be about business, and in modern times I personally can see no reasons why a boy with brains and character should not consider that commerce gives his ambition a field as wide and as worthy as the professions do.

M. D'Orsay: Then if the Public Schools become the recruiting grounds for commerce, the oligarchs will have a monopoly of business positions?

Dr. Archdale: Oh, no!—but having had a better education than the rest they will have a better chance to do well, and on that ground they will commend themselves to employers. Of course, there must always be promotion from the ranks. Wherever merit is found, it has got to be brought to the front, and merit does not depend only on education. But it does depend on education to some extent, and I think it would be right for us to take into our schools a certain number of boys who are not oligarchs at all—boys from the Government elementary schools or the new "senior" schools—and give them the education that our fellows get.

Of course they would have to be real good boys—good all round—or it would not be fair to take them away from their usual surroundings, to which they would infallibly return. But good boys would fit in quite well, like the cadets from the ranks at Sandhurst, provided there were not too many of them. It would be necessary in any case not to have too many of them. Public Schoolboys come from homes where circumstances and tradition have established a highly civilized way of life and set up a certain standard of refinement which it is not snobbery but merely sense to recognize. If such boys are too much diluted with boys from homes where poverty makes life less civilized than it ought to be, the community will suffer loss. There is nothing worse than equality achieved by levelling down. I agree that homes where life is lived on a low level of civilization ought not to exist. But that is a political and economic trouble. We schoolmasters can do nothing to put it right, except, as I suggest, to take in a small number of good boys from poor homes and fit them to found better homes themselves later on. I should not a bit object to that, provided that all the schools did it, that each had a fixed quota, and that the finance could be arranged. We should then become not

only a training agency for the professions and business, but a recruiting agency, too. That is the function we should aim at fulfilling.

M. D'Orsay: Then do the boys at the Elementary Schools learn the same subjects as you teach in the Public Schools?

Dr. Archdale: No, unfortunately they don't. Our Latin and French are going to be a real trouble there. What is more, the boys now leave the Elementary Schools soon after eleven and they cannot come to us till they are thirteen. But these two difficulties may cancel out—the interval between eleven and thirteen can perhaps be spent in learning the subjects we require. It is really only a matter of organization.

Mr. Burgess: Some of your parents would not much like you to take in those elementary schoolboys, would they?

Dr. Archdale: A few would kick, but they would have to put up with it. That is the way the world is moving nowadays, and though we must not lower our standards, as I said, we must get the best fellows into the biggest positions—whoever their fathers were. That means that the best fellows must have the best education. I see in my dreams a time when the Public Schools will be regarded

as the schools to which all the best boys in the country will naturally and necessarily be sent, just because they are the best schools and can make the best use of their material. Many of the boys will, no doubt, pay their way; others will need to be helped by some quite new form of scholarship. The details will have to be worked out as we go on. In any case I am sure that the financial difficulty can be overcome. The real difficulty will be that of selection, for the best boys do not all seem the best at thirteen, and examinations cannot test a quarter of the qualities we want to find. But even that difficulty will probably be overcome if we are not too proud to learn from the psychologists and the eugenists. My point is that if the best of the English Public Schools (and I believe there is nothing better in the world) can select and secure the very best young Englishmen of each generation, this country will begin to build up a new aristocracy of character and capacity such as the world has not hitherto seen. At present we do not get all the best. But we must eventually get all the best and only the best, if we are to do what I believe we can do for the country.

Mr. Burgess: Meanwhile, I trust you are going to teach the boys you do get to pull their weight in commerce. You

could hardly make a better start than by doing that.

M. D'Orsay: But—forgive my interrupting—this training for commerce—you think you can achieve it without abandoning your effort to give a liberal education?

Dr. Archdale: I see no incompatibility between the two aims. Nothing, of course, will turn the "academic" type of man into the "practical" type. But there is room in the academic world for all that are by nature academically-minded, and there is not the least reason why the practical man should be illiterate or narrow-minded or philistine, or in any other way uneducated. The men we send out ought to have characters so developed and minds so trained that they are fitted both to organize the world's work and to lead the world's thought. The Americans, who generally know what they want, are pursuing just such a double aim. They have always wanted business efficiency, and now they want culture also.

M. D'Orsay: One does not always associate the idea of culture with the U.S.A.

Dr. Archdale: Well, of course, a new country can't have an old culture, and the civilization of the States does not go back to Julius Cæsar as yours does, Mon-

sieur D'Orsay. I admit, too, that a cultured American sometimes seems to have assumed his culture rather hurriedly and left some of the buttons undone, as it were. But I admire the culture of the Americans because it has been achieved and not inherited, and because I am convinced that there are more people (proportionately) in America than in any other country who believe in disinterested learning and want to know things and experience things just for the sake of knowing and experiencing them.

Mr. Burgess: There seems to be a pretty big proportion of people in America who refer to literature and scholarship and so on as " bunk," and pride themselves on knowing nothing about them.

Dr. Archdale: There is quite as big a proportion of people in England who don't refer to them at all, but just ignore them. English Philistines are dangerous because of their numbers and their inertia. American Philistines talk more, but I believe they do less damage. But comparisons are not really possible between an old country and a new. My point is that there is a real disinterested desire for culture in America, and that the pursuit of wealth is partly due to that desire. There is something splendid, to my mind, in the effort which that astonishing country is making, not only

to be the richest but also to be the most civilized country on earth. It is like a man who is equally determined to make a fortune and to use it well—or like old Schliemann who set out to become rich in order to dig up Troy and Mycenæ. I don't say, of course, that the Americans always go about things in the right way. I fancy that so far as education is concerned, they undervalue discipline (both intellectual and moral) and generally that they are in too much of a hurry to get results. But they do believe in education, and even though some of their business men may describe scholarship as "bunk," the business community as a whole does want its young recruits to be educated men, and does see the value of theoretical training as well as practical training. At least two Universities in this country have started courses in "Commerce" for intending business men, but the business world only smiles at them. Yet in America the commercial course at Harvard can't turn out enough men to satisfy the demand for its product.

Mr. Burgess: The English courses are a bit too theoretical, I expect.

Dr. Archdale: Perhaps, though I have heard that they are not more so than the Harvard course. But in general, I think it is true that the Americans believe in education more sincerely than we do. I

am sure that there would be a better welcome in America than there is in England just now for the type of boy which our Public Schools turn out in small numbers already and should soon be turning out in quantity—the type which has been educated as an *eleutheros*, but as an *eleutheros* destined to live in the modern world. In England, as I said, I believe that the supply will create a demand, but in America it is the demand which has created the supply. One up to America there, I think.

Mr. Burgess: Well, you had better hurry up and let us have the supply, Archdale. Then we will see about the demand. I admit I quite like the type you describe, the kind of "educated" fellow you say we ought to want and will want when we see him—pretty useful, I daresay.

Col. Callaghan: Yes, I expect he would be useful enough. But he might be a bit selfish, mightn't he? I'd like to be sure he'd look after the Scouts in his district or help in a working boys' club, and join the Territorials and go in for all that sort of thing, while he was a youngster, and after that do a bit of work on his County Council or as a J.P. or something.

M. D'Orsay: The Greeks would have agreed with you there, Colonel—and so will Dr. Archdale, I am sure. His

eleutheros would not be a true *eleutheros* if he were not a good citizen, too.

Dr. Archdale: No, indeed. You cannot be a good specimen of humanity if you are not a good member of your own community. I don't think the Public Schools have forgotten that.

Mr. Burgess: Well, I hope you are teaching your boys to take a part in Local Government. I am sure that is the best field nowadays for the activities of what you call Oligarchs—unless or until they go into Parliament. I do not believe I had ever heard of a Borough Council when I was at School. But no doubt the modern boy knows all about such things. You are all supposed to be teaching "Civics" now, aren't you? Does it come to much?

Dr. Archdale: It prevents fellows leaving school totally ignorant of how the machinery of the country works, and it does create a certain amount of interest in public affairs and get boys to read the papers and so on. But of course the most important work the schools do in the way of teaching citizenship is not done in the classroom at all. It results from the ordinary life of the place, and from the habit of being loyal to a community, which every boy unconsciously picks up. But even so, the teaching of civics and history, and, of course, modern

languages, is needed to prevent the loyalty being too narrow and the community too small. Much more is being done now in that way than in our time, Burgess. You and I left school without knowing anything about politics or about other countries—or about other classes than our own, for that matter. Things are distinctly better now. The doctrine of social obligation is being taught more sincerely and accepted more readily than ever before.

M. D'Orsay: "Social obligation"—that is——?

Dr. Archdale: The obligation upon every man to pay the rent for his room in the world—and the better the room the higher the rent.

Mr. Burgess: There was a School Mission in our time, but I don't remember much about it except the terminal demand for five bob.

Dr. Archdale: Schools make much better contact now with their mission districts. Some have dropped the word "mission," thank goodness, and all of them have dropped the patronizing attitude that the word suggested. Then, of course, there is Toc H, which is far the best agency in existence for giving Public Schoolboys and ex-Public Schoolboys the right idea of service and opportunities for realizing it, too.

We really are farther on now, as far as citizenship is concerned. But, of course, we have got to go farther still. We always did try to turn out good citizens, but the good citizen of Victorian times is not what we want now. We want someone more unselfish and more intelligent, too. Our modern oligarchs inherit no such unquestioned supremacy as their predecessors had. The "rule of the few" can only be established commercially or justified socially if "the few" offer voluntary service more freely and think more clearly than the rest. If they can do that, the word oligarch will have a real meaning and the oligarchic schools a real justification.

M. D'Orsay: I wonder if Mr. Burgess now feels more hopeful about the future of your Public Schools? He was prophesying their disappearance when the Colonel and I first came in.

Mr. Burgess: Dr. Archdale has certainly put up a case for them. You were always a plausible beggar, Archdale. But even if the Public Schools deserve to survive, I very much doubt if they will be allowed to. You know the Labour people hate them like poison, and it is only a question of time before we have a Labour Government in power. Then, of course, there is no doubt that taxation is going to get worse and worse, and there are going to

be fewer and fewer people able to pay your fees. And you won't be able to lower your fees, because your endowments will be shorn closer and closer by the income-tax people.

Dr. Archdale: I don't deny those dangers. But the Public Schools are pretty deeply rooted, and I am sure that so long as people have got any income at all they will try hard to stretch it to cover Public School fees for their boys. The real danger is that they will try *too* hard—and limit their families to one boy or two. Expensive education is thoroughly bad eugenically, and I am afraid our high fees (which we cannot possibly reduce as things are just now) are one of the causes of the slow suicide of the old Oligarchic families. But of course a good deal can be done by insurance nowadays if one starts early enough. What I feel is that, for better or worse, English people of our class have made up their minds quite definitely that they want boarding-schools for their sons. The State is not at all likely to start boarding-schools of its own, and unless it is made absolutely impossible for us to carry on and preserve our character, somehow or other people will manage to afford to send their boys to us. At any rate, whether or not we go under in the ultimate future, our job for the present

is to deserve to survive—that is to be as useful to the country as we can, and to turn out as good recruits as possible for the professions, for the Services and for business.

M. D'Orsay: It is difficult to imagine your country without its so characteristic Public Schools. Whatever happens, you will have made your mark on English history.

Dr. Archdale: That is true, I think. The mark we have made on English education is certainly indelible. The best of the "subventioned" schools, which are bound to survive in any case, have already borrowed a lot from us and they will soon have reproduced everything of ours that a day school can reproduce—the house spirit, the prefect system, the old boys' associations, and so on. Of course, being day schools, they cannot get as far with any of these things as we can, and they don't seem able to develop individual characters of their own quite as Public Schools do—the kind of thing that makes a fellow not only a Public Schoolboy, but also a Marlburian or a Wykehamist. All the same, on the moral side of education they do fine work—which would not have been as fine as it is if the old Public Schools had not been there for them to learn from.

Mr. Burgess: The Public School idea is spreading downwards, you think?

Dr. Archdale: Yes—downwards and outwards, and both at home and abroad. The great "preparatory schools" of America are inspired directly by the English Public School idea. The Germans have done with some of their great country houses what we have done with some of ours. Most of the Dominions have schools directly modelled on ours and partly staffed from them. Yes—we have a pretty large progeny abroad. Then, at home our own number is being continually increased by new foundations, though, of course, these will stand or fall with the system. But an immortality that cannot be taken from us, even if it is not of a very substantial kind, is being assured to us by what I was describing just now—by the spread of our ideas and our spirit among the "aided" schools all over the country. Whatever happens to us, that process will continue. The question of our own destiny is not an educational question. It is a political question—a question of the distribution of weath. The Public Schools are a natural growth in England; they have been created by the English character and they provide what English people want. If they ever cease to exist it will be because, directly or indirectly, politics

have killed them, and not because English people have ceased to want what they provide. But the important thing is that even if they do go under, the ideas they have tried to work out will certainly survive them—just as the idea of chivalry survived the institutions which developed it. The Public Schools will live on in one form or another—either as themselves or as mighty ghosts. Which it is to be does not depend upon educational theories nor upon the efforts and utterances of Public Schoolmasters. It depends upon the forces which are always reshaping the social and economic structure of England. Those forces may seem to be blind, and their tendency is never clear to contemporaries. But in the last resort they are the expression of the English character and the motive power of English history. They are moving faster now than ever before, and it is on the direction of their movement that our destiny depends. But I confess I cannot see clearly what that direction is.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MACKAYS LIMITED, CHATHAM

TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW

Each, pott 8vo, boards, 2/6 net

THIS series of books, by some of the most distinguished English thinkers, scientists, philosophers, doctors, critics, and artists, was at once recognized as a noteworthy event. Written from various points of view, one book frequently opposing the argument of another, they provide the reader with a survey of numerous aspects of modern thought.

"That very lively and courageous series."—*Spectator*. "A remarkable series."—*Observer*. "This admirable series of provocative and brilliant essays."—*Daily Telegraph*. "We have long desired to express deep admiration for this series. We must pay tribute to the high standard of thought and expression they maintain."—*Field*.

Published by

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.

Broadway House: 68-74 Carter Lane, London, E.C.4

CLASSIFIED INDEX

CLASSIFIED INDEX

"*An entertaining series of vivacious and stimulating studies of modern tendencies.*"—TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT.

VOLUMES READY

Daedalus, or Science and the Future. By J. B. S. HALDANE, Reader in Biochemistry, University of Cambridge. *Eighth impression.*

"The essay is brilliant, sparkling with wit and bristling with challenges."—*British Medical Journal.* "Predicts the most startling changes."—*Morning Post.*

Icarus, or the Future of Science. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *Fifth impression.*

"Utter pessimism."—*Observer.* "Mr. Russell refuses to believe that the progress of Science must be a boon to mankind."—*Morning Post.*

What I Believe. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F.R.S. *Fourth impression.*

"One of the most brilliant and thought-stimulating little books I have read—a better book even than *Icarus.*" —*Nation.* "Simply and brilliantly written."—*Nature.*

Callinicus, a Defence of Chemical Warfare. By J. B. S. HALDANE. *Second impression.*

"Mr. Haldane's brilliant study."—*Times Leading Article.* "A book to be read by every intelligent adult."—*Spectator.*

Tantalus, or the Future of Man. By F. C. S. SCHILLER. *Second impression.*

"They are all (*Daedalus, Icarus,* and *Tantalus*) brilliantly clever, and they supplement one another."—*Dean Inge,* in *Morning Post.* "Immensely valuable and infinitely readable."—*Daily News.*

Cassandra, or the Future of the British Empire. By F. C. S. SCHILLER. *Second impression.*

"We commend it to the complacent of all parties."—*Saturday Review.* "The book is small, but very, very weighty; brilliantly written, it ought to be read by all shades of politicians."—*Yorkshire Post.*

Quo Vadimus? Glimpses of the Future. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.SC. *Second impression.*

"A wonderful vision of the future. A book that will be talked about."—*Daily Graphic.* "Interesting and singularly plausible."—*Daily Telegraph.*

Thrasymachus, the Future of Morals. By C. E. M. JOAD. *Third impression.*

"Written in a style of deliberate brilliance."—*Times Literary Supplement.* "As outspoken and unequivocal a contribution as could well be imagined. A book that will startle."—*Daily Chronicle.*

Lysistrata, or Woman's Future and Future Woman. By ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI. *Third impression.*

"A stimulating book. Volumes would be needed to deal with all the problems raised."—*Sunday Times.* "Full of brilliant commonsense."—*Observer.*

Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge. By MRS. BERTRAND RUSSELL. *Third impression.*

"A passionate vindication of the rights of woman."—*Manchester Guardian.* "Says a number of things that sensible women have been wanting publicly said for a long time."—*Daily Herald.*

Hephaestus, the Soul of the Machine. By E. E. FOURNIER D'ALBE, D.SC.

"A worthy contribution to this interesting series. A delightful and thought-provoking essay."—*Birmingham Post.* "An exceedingly clever defence of machinery."—*Architects' Journal.*

The Conquest of Cancer. By H. W. S. WRIGHT, M.S., F.R.C.S. Introduction by F. G. CROOKSHANK, M.D.

"Eminently suitable for general reading. The problem is lucidly presented. One merit of Mr. Wright's plan is that he tells people what they can best do, *here and now*."—From the *Introduction*.

Prometheus, or Biology and the Advancement of Man. By Professor H. S. JENNINGS. *Second impression.*

"This volume is one of the most remarkable that has yet appeared in this series. Certainly the information it contains will be new to most educated laymen."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "An exceedingly brilliant book."—*New Leader*.

Galatea, or the Future of Darwinism. By W. RUSSELL BRAIN.

"A brilliant exposition of the present position of the evolutionary hypothesis."—*Guardian*. "Should prove invaluable. A stimulating and well-written essay."—*Literary Guide*.

Automaton, or the Future of the Mechanical Man. By H. STAFFORD HATFIELD.

"It is impossible to do serious justice to his volume on the 'Chemical Robot' in a brief review. It calls for a monumental work of opposition."—*Daily Herald*.

Narcissus: an Anatomy of Clothes. By GERALD HEARD. *Second impression.*

"A most suggestive book."—*Nation*. "Irresistible. Reading it is like a switchback journey. Starting from prehistoric times we rocket down the ages."—*Daily News*.

Thamyris, or Is There a Future for Poetry? By R. C. TREVELYAN.

"Learned, sensible, and very well-written."—*Affable Hawk*, in *New Statesman*. "Very suggestive."—*J. C. Squire*, in *Observer*.

Proteus, or the Future of Intelligence. By VERNON LEE.

"Her book is profoundly stimulating and should be read by everyone."—*Outlook.* "A concise, suggestive piece of work."—*Saturday Review.*

Timotheus, the Future of the Theatre. By BONAMY DOBRÉE.

"A witty, mischievous little book, to be read with delight."—*Times Literary Supplement.* "His gay little book makes delightful reading."—*Nation.*

The Dance of Civa, or Life's Unity and Rhythm. By COLLUM.

"It has substance and thought in it. The author is very much alive and responsive to the movements of to-day."—*Spectator.* "A very interesting account of the work of Sir Jagadis Bose."—*Oxford Magazine.*

Wireless Possibilities. By Professor A. M. Low. With 4 diagrams.

"He has many interesting things to say."—*Evening Standard.* "The mantle of Blake has fallen upon the physicists. To them we look for visions, and we find them in this book."—*New Statesman.*

Perseus: of Dragons. By H. F. SCOTT STOKES. With 2 illustrations.

"A diverting little book, chock-full of ideas. Mr. Stokes' dragon-lore is both quaint and various."—*Morning Post.*

Lycurgus, or the Future of Law. By E. S. P. HAYNES.

"An interesting and concisely written book."—*Yorkshire Post.* "A thoughtful book—deserves careful reading."—*Law Times.*

Euterpe, or the Future of Art. By LIONEL R. MCCOLVIN.

"Discusses briefly, but very suggestively, the problem of the future of art in relation to the public."—*Saturday Review.* "This is a much-needed book."—*New Leader.*

Pegasus, or Problems of Transport. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER.

"The foremost military prophet of the day propounds a solution for industrial and unemployment problems. It is a bold essay."—*Daily Telegraph*. "Practical, timely, very interesting and very important."—*Spectator*.

Atlantis, or America and the Future. By Colonel J. F. C. FULLER.

"Candid and caustic."—*Observer*. "Many hard things have been said about America, but few quite so bitter as these."—*Daily Sketch*.

Midas, or the United States and the Future. By C. H. BRETHERTON.

"This wise and witty pamphlet, a provocation to the thought that is creative."—*Morning Post*. "A punch in every paragraph. One could hardly ask for more 'meat'." —*Spectator*.

Nuntius, or Advertising and its Future. By GILBERT RUSSELL.

"Expresses the philosophy of advertising concisely and well."—*Observer*. "It is doubtful if a more straightforward exposition of advertising has been written."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Birth Control and the State. By C. P. BLACKER, M.C., M.A., M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P.

"A very careful summary."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "A temperate survey of the arguments for and against the encouragement of the practice of birth control." —*Lancet*.

Ouroboros, or the Mechanical Extension of Mankind. By GARET GARRETT.

"This brilliant and provoking little book."—*Observer*. "A significant and thoughtful essay, calculated in parts to make our flesh creep."—*Spectator*.

Artifex, or the Future of Craftsmanship. By JOHN GLOAG.

"An able and interesting summary of the history of craftsmanship. Mr. Gloag's real contribution to the future of craftsmanship is his discussion of the uses of machinery."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Plato's American Republic. By J. DOUGLAS WOODRUFF. *Fifth impression*

"Uses the form of the Socratic dialogue with devastating success. A gently malicious wit sparkles in every page." —*Sunday Times*. "Having deliberately set himself an almost impossible task, has succeeded beyond belief."—*Saturday Review*. "Quite the liveliest even of this spirited series."—*Observer*.

Orpheus, or the Music of the Future. By W. J. TURNER. *Second impression.*

"A book on music that we can read not merely once, but twice or thrice. Mr. Turner has given us some of the finest thinking upon Beethoven that I have ever met with."—*Ernest Newman* in *Sunday Times*.

Terpander, or Music and the Future. By E. J. DENT.

"In *Orpheus* Mr. Turner made a brilliant voyage in search of first principles. Mr. Dent's book is a skilful review of the development of music. It is the most succinct and stimulating essay on music I have found."—*Musical News*.—"Remarkably able and stimulating."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Sibylla, or the Revival of Prophecy. By C. A. MACE.

"An entertaining and instructive pamphlet."—*Morning Post*. "Places a nightmare before us very ably and wittily." —*Spectator*.

Lucullus, or the Food of the Future. By OLGA HARTLEY and MRS. C. F. LEYEL.

"This is a witty volume in an entertaining series, and it makes enchanting reading."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Opens with a brilliant picture of modern man, living in a vacuum-cleaned, steam-heated, credit-furnished suburban mansion." This banquet of epigrams."—*Spectator*.

Procrustes, or the Future of English Education. By M. ALDERTON PINK.

"Undoubtedly he makes out a very good case."—*Daily Herald*. "This interesting addition to the series."—*Times Educational Supplement*.

The Future of Futurism. By JOHN RODKER.

"Mr. Rodker is up-to-the-minute, and he has accomplished a considerable feat in writing on such a vague subject ninety-two extremely interesting pages."—*T. S. Eliot*, in *Nation*.

Pomona, or the Future of English. By BASIL DE SÈLINCOURT.

"His later pages must stir the blood of any man who loves his country and her poetry."—*J. C. Squire*, in *Observer*. "His finely-conceived essay."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Balbus, or the Future of Architecture. By CHRISTIAN BARMAN.

"A really brilliant addition to this already distinguished series, and, incidentally, an hour or so of excellent entertainment."—*Spectator*. "Most readable and reasonable. We can recommend it warmly."—*New Statesman*.

Apella, or the Future of the Jews. By A QUARTERLY REVIEWER.

"Cogent, because of brevity and a magnificent prose style, this book wins our quiet praise. It is a fine pamphlet, adding to the value of the series, and should not be missed." —*Spectator*.

Lars Porsena, or the Future of Swearing and Improper Language. By ROBERT GRAVES. *Fifth impression.*

"No more amusingly unexpected contribution has been made to this series. A deliciously ironical affair."—*Bystander*. "His highly entertaining essay is as full as the current standard of printers and police will allow."—*New Statesman*.

Mrs. Fisher, or the Future of Humour. By ROBERT GRAVES. *Second impression.*

"Few volumes in this celebrated series have enjoyed a more deserved success than should be achieved by *Mrs. Fisher*. The wit and daring of *Lars Porsena* soon took it to a fourth impression. *Mrs. Fisher* is even better."—*Daily Express*.

Socrates, or the Emancipation of Mankind. By H. F. CARLILL.

"Devotes a specially lively section to the herd instinct." —*Times*. "Clearly, and with a balance that is almost Aristotelian, he reveals what modern psychology is going to accomplish."—*New Statesman*.

Delphos, or the Future of International Language. By E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

"Equal to anything yet produced in this brilliant series. Miss Pankhurst states very clearly that an international language would be one of the greatest assets of civilization." —*Spectator*.

Gallio, or the Tyranny of Science. By J. W. N. SULLIVAN. *Second impression*.

"So packed with ideas that it is not possible to give any adequate *résumé* of its contents."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "His remarkable monograph, his devastating summary of materialism, this pocket *Novum Organum*." —*Spectator*.

Apollonius, or the Future of Psychical Research. By E. N. BENNETT.

"A sane, temperate and suggestive survey of a field of inquiry which is slowly but surely pushing to the front."— *Times Literary Supplement*.

Aeolus, or the Future of the Flying Machine. By OLIVER STEWART.

"Both his wit and his expertness save him from the nonsensical-fantastic."—*Daily News*. "He is to be congratulated. His book is small, but delightfully funny, and there really are sensible ideas behind the jesting."— *Aeroplane*.

Stentor, or the Press of To-day and To-morrow. By DAVID OCKHAM.

"A valuable and exceedingly interesting commentary on a vital phase of modern development."—*Daily Herald*. "Vigorous and well-written, eminently readable."— *Yorkshire Post*.

Rusticus, or the Future of the Countryside. By MARTIN S. BRIGGS, F.R.I.B.A.

"Few of the fifty volumes, provocative and brilliant as most of them have been, capture our imagination as does this one."—*Daily Telegraph*. "Serves a national end. The book is a pamphlet, though it has the form and charm of a book."—*Spectator*.

Janus, or the Conquest of War. By WILLIAM MCDOUGALL, M.B., F.R.S.

"Among all the booklets of this brilliant series, none, I think, is so weighty and impressive as this. It contains thrice as much matter as the other volumes, and is profoundly serious."—*Dean Inge*, in *Evening Standard*.

Vulcan, or the Future of Labour. By CECIL CHISHOLM.

"Of absorbing interest."—*Daily Herald*. "No one, perhaps, has ever held the balance so nicely between technicalities and flights of fancy, as the author of this excellent book in a brilliant series."—*Spectator*.

Hymen, or the Future of Marriage. By NORMAN HAIRE. *Third impression.*

"Has something serious to say, something that may be of value. Dr. Haire is, fortunately, as lucid as he is bold."—*Saturday Review*. "An electrifying addition to the series."—*Sphere*.

The Next Chapter: the War against the Moon. By ANDRE MAUROIS.

"This delicate and delightful phantasy presented with consummate art."—*Spectator*. "Short but witheringly sarcastic."—*Field*. "Admirably parodies the melancholy and superior tone of a history-book. . ."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Archon, or the Future of Government. By HAMILTON FYFE.

"This is a brave and sincere book."—*Economic Review*. "A brochure that thinking people will discuss."—*Spectator*. "A timely exposure of the hypocrisy of politics."—*Sunday Times*.

Scheherazade, or the Future of the English Novel. By JOHN CARRUTHERS.

"A brilliant essay and, I think, a true one. It deserves the attention of all in any way interested critically in the novel."—*Daily Herald.*

Caledonia, or the Future of the Scots. By G. M. THOMSON, *Second impression.*

"It is relentless and terrible in its exposure of the realities that underlie the myth of the 'canny Scot.'"—*Irish Statesman.* "As a piece of incisive writing and powerful, though restrained, invective, *Caledonia* is specially notable."—*Spectator.*

Albyn, or Scotland and the Future. By C. M. GRIEVE.

"A vigorous answer, explicit and implicit, to *Caledonia,* tracing behind the scenes the development of a real Scottish renascence. Contains stuff for thought."—*Spectator.*

Iconoclastes, or the Future of Shakespeare. By HUBERT GRIFFITH.

"To my disappointment I found myself in complete agreement with nearly all its author's arguments. There is much that is vital and arresting in what he has to say." —*Nigel Playfair,* in *Evening Standard.*

Bacchus, or the Future of Wine. By P. MORTON SHAND.

"Very sound sense."—*Times Literary Supplement.* "A learned and amusingly written book on wine."—*Daily Express.* "An entrancing little volume."—*Brewer and Wine Merchant.*

Hermes, or the Future of Chemistry. By T. W. JONES, B.SC., F.C.S.

"Tells us briefly, yet with brilliant clarity, what Chemistry is doing to-day, and what its achievements are likely to be in the future."—*Morning Post.*

Archimedes, or the Future of Physics. By L. L. WHYTE.

"If the notion [of asymmetrical time] can be successfully applied to physics itself, the universal science will be born. That some great synthesis is on the way seems clear. One of the most suggestive accounts of it may be found in this fascinating volume."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

Atalanta, or the Future of Sport. By G. S. SANDILANDS.

"His provocative and most interesting book."—*Daily Herald.* "Points out some of the pinnacles of unreason climbed by those trying to separate amateur from professional."—*Manchester Guardian.*

Lares et Penates, or the Home of the Future. By H. J. BIRNSTINGL.

"Indicating vividly what may lie ahead if we allow our worship of the American ideal of industrial output for its own sake to proceed undirected." *Country Life.* "Draws an appalling picture."—*Evening Standard.*

Breaking Priscian's Head, or English as She will be Spoke and Wrote. By J. Y. T. GREIG, D.LITT.

"His vivacious book."—*Daily Mail.* "The most vehement attack [on standard English] we have ever read. We are equally amazed and amused."—*Morning Post.* "A rollicking book."—*Spectator.*

Cain, or the Future of Crime. By GEORGE GODWIN.

"Compels the reader to think, whether he will or no."—*Saturday Review.* "A most interesting prophecy. Mr. Godwin makes out a strong case against the stupidity and cruelty of our present dealings with crime."—*Evening Standard.*

Morpheus, or the Future of Sleep. By DAVID FRASER-HARRIS, M.D., D.SC.

"Shews that the doctors do not as yet know much about the subject."—*Queen.* "His arguments, clearly and ably presented, hold our interest. This is a book full of sound thinking and wise instruction."—*Clarion.*

Hibernia, or the Future of Ireland. By BOLTON C. WALLER.

"An earnest and challenging piece of work."—*Irish Times.* "A serious, practical book, full of knowledge."—*Spectator.* "Notable in a notable series."—*Foreign Affairs.*

Hanno, or the Future of Exploration. By J. LESLIE MITCHELL.

"His wonderful little book, in which he confutes the popular notion that the explorer's task is finally fulfilled." —*Morning Post*. "Stimulating, packed with eminently practical suggestions."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Metanthropos, or the Body of the Future. By R. CAMPBELL MACFIE, LL.D.

"An exceptionally stimulating book, the work of a clear and imaginative thinker who can express his thoughts." —*Saturday Review*. "Should certainly be read by a large public."—*Lancet*.

Heraclitus, or the Future of the Films. By ERNEST BETTS.

"An entertaining book, full of sparkling and original ideas, which should stimulate Wardour Street to a more serious consideration of the artistic and moral aspects of the film industry."—*Spectator*.

Eos, or the Wider Aspects of Cosmogony. By Sir J. H. JEANS, LL.D., F.R.S. With 6 plates. *Fifth impression.*

"A fascinating summary of his tremendous conclusions, illustrated by some really beautiful photographs."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "No book in the series surpasses *Eos* in brilliance and profundity, for one of the best brains engaged in research gives us here the fruits of long labour in terms that all may understand."—*Spectator*.

Diogenes, or the Future of Leisure. By C. E. M. JOAD. *Second impression.*

"A brilliant and provocative volume."—Dean Inge, in *Evening Standard*. "The writing is vivid and good-humouredly truculent."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

Fortuna, or Chance and Design. By NORWOOD YOUNG.

"Cheerful and ingenious. His study of the 'laws of chance', as illustrated in the game of roulette, his examination of horse-racing and the Stock Exchange, are not meant for those who wish to acquire sudden fortunes." *T.P.'s Weekly*.

Autolycus, or the Future for Miscreant Youth. By R. G. GORDON, M.D., D.SC.

"His clear and spirited presentation of the problem of the boy and girl offender should rekindle interest in the subject and help towards legislation. Many of us need to get rid of preconceived notions, and his admirable book should help us."—*Times Educational Supplement.*

Eutychus, or the Future of the Pulpit. By WINIFRED HOLTBY.

"Few wittier or wiser books have appeared in this stimulating series than *Eutychus.*"—*Spectator.* "Witty style shrewd insight, delicious fun."—*Guardian.*

Alma Mater, or the Future of Oxford and Cambridge. By JULIAN HALL.

"Conspicuously fair."—*Manchester Guardian.* "Writes about his elders, about youth, and about the two old Universities with frankness, humour, and intelligence."—*Nation.*

Typhoeus, or the Future of Socialism. By ARTHUR SHADWELL.

"Invaluable, a miracle of compression and illumination."—*Yorkshire Post.* "He has almost unequalled knowledge and is largely free from bias."—*Philip Snowden,* in *Daily Herald.*

Romulus, or the Future of the Child. By ROBERT T. LEWIS.

"This interesting and stimulating book should be read, not only by parents, but by all who care anything at all about the future of the race."—*Daily Chronicle.*

Kalki, or the Future of Civilization. By Professor S. RADHAKRISHNAN.

"A most delightful and instructive volume."—*Journal of Philosophical Studies.* "A scintillating, thought-provoking book, carrying us rapidly along in sparkling and forceful paragraphs."—*New Era.*

Shiva, or the Future of India. By R. J. MINNEY. *Second impression.*

"A far stronger impeachment than even Miss Mayo attempted in *Mother India.*"—*Daily Dispatch.* "Does not mince matters in the least."—*Daily Express.*

Vicisti, Galilæe? or Religion in England. By EDWARD B. POWLEY.

"One of the best in the series; a book to be read, thought over, and discussed by all Christians who are not afraid to take the shutters down."—*Guardian.*

Columbia, or the Future of Canada. By GEORGE GODWIN, author of 'Cain'.

"Deserves grave study."—*Evening Standard.* "Indicates aptly that the future of Canada lies with the U.S.A. Paints a vivid and convincing picture of the disadvantages of geographical divorce."—*Time and Tide.*

Achates, or the Future of Canada in the Empire. By W. ERIC HARRIS.

An answer to *Columbia,* maintaining the view that Canada will maintain herself as before in the British Empire.

Eurydice, or the Nature of Opera By DYNELEY HUSSEY, author of "Mozart."

"He is to be congratulated."—*Saturday Review.* "Shows immense skill in accompanying his thesis by a rapid survey of operatic history from which little essential will be missed."—*Everyman.*

Pons Asinorum, or the Future of Nonsense. By GEORGE EDINGER and E. J. C. NEEP.

"A most entertaining essay, rich in quotation from the old masters of clownship's craft."—*Saturday Review.*

Halcyon, or the Future of Monogamy. By VERA BRITTAIN.

"Fully sustains the high standard of the series. We certainly ought to be grateful for an hour's most amusing reading."—*Spectator.* "Of all the brilliant books in the series, I know of few more 'squib-like'."—*Yorkshire Post.*

The World, the Flesh, and the Devil. By J. D. BERNAL.

"Astounding things are discussed in a fascinating manner."—*Daily Herald.* "A brilliant book."—*Spectator.* "The sweep of his imagination succeeds in overcoming the reader's tendency to disbelief. Absorbingly interesting."—*Times Literary Supplement.*

Democritus, or the Future of Laughter. By GERALD GOULD.

"With nearly 100 volumes to its credit, the series frisks on as briskly as in its first youth. *Democritus* is bound to be among the favourites. His humour glances at history, morality, humanity, and the great humorists past and present. Wise and witty writing."—*Observer*.

Sisyphus, or the Limits of Psychology. By M. JAEGER.

"Altogether a very sensible and entertaining book."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Much acumen and knowledge. All students of psychology should read it."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Isis, or the Future of Oxford. By W. J. K. DIPLOCK.

"A very pleasant essay."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "A reactionary hit-back."—*Daily Mail*. "A cleverly written defence of Oxford intellectual life."—*Spectator*.

Deucalion, or the Future of Criticism. By GEOFFREY WEST.

"An attractive essay."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Highly commended to those who wish to get a clear view of the present state of critical writing."—*Spectator*. "An entertaining book."—*New Statesman*.

Cato, or the Future of Censorship. By WILLIAM SEAGLE.

"This brilliant and witty book."—*Times Literary Supplement*. "Packed with the most useful information and with the most interesting deductions and analysis."—*Time and Tide*.

Saxo Grammaticus, or First Aid for the Best Seller. By ERNEST WEEKLEY.

"A very shocking collection of vile phrases from contemporary writers. The beginner will do well to turn to this book for counsel and warning. A vivacious and excellent pamphlet in a good cause."—*Robert Lynd* in *Daily News*.

Chronos, or the Future of the Family. By EDEN PAUL, M.D.

"Deserves to be read by a large number of people. It is a proof of the revolution in the family and sexual relations which is taking place before our eyes."—*Nation*.

Eleutheros, or the Future of the Public Schools. By J. F. ROXBURGH, Headmaster of Stowe School.

"The stimulating quality is not lacking. An excellent book which it would benefit every schoolmaster to read, and, what is perhaps more important, every parent.—*Cyril Norwood* in *Week-end Review.*

Babel, or the Past, Present, and Future of Human Speech. By Sir RICHARD PAGET, BT., Fellow of the Physical Society of London.

"An exceedingly entertaining book, in which he traces the history of speech to its origin. But it is to his speculations as to the future of speech, especially English, that readers will turn with greatest interest."—*Everyman.*

JUST PUBLISHED

It Isn't Done, or the Future of Taboo among the British Islanders. By ARCHIBALD LYALL.

Not since *Lars Porsena* has the To-Day and To-Morrow series received such a witty, distinguished, and original contribution as this study of what *may* be done and what *may not* be done in the British Isles.

Sinon, or the Future of Politics. By EDGAR ALLAN MOWRER.

A profound examination of the nature of political life at the present day with a forecast of probable developments in the future.