

TOPICS OF THE TIME.

Manual Training in Common Schools.*

THE argument against common schools has been put in its strongest form by a distinguished English thinker, as follows: "Conceding for a moment that the Government is bound to educate a man's children, what kind of logic will demonstrate that it is not bound to feed and clothe them?" The argument ignores and refuses to meet the only excuse which has ever been offered for a common-school system,—the political basis. The system is not a largess to the recipient, but a natural measure of self-defense on the part of the government which educates. It is necessary, in a democratic form of government, that the voters should be so far educated as to be reasonably relieved from danger of deception by interested parties; when that is accomplished, the duty of the government ceases. To look at the function of government in the matter, as so many of those interested in public education are apt to look at it, as "the prevention of ignorance," is really but another phase of the feeling that the function of government is "the prevention of poverty."

While the purpose of the system is political, it seems legitimate to attempt to attain as much other good as possible on the way to the goal. If, as a part of the process of making the boy a reasonably good voter, it is possible also to give him the rudiments of a mechanical training, surely time and money spent in this way are very far from being wasted. It is on this ground that the appeal has been made for a certain proportion of manual training in the public schools. It is not intended that the public schools shall be diverted from their proper work into that of graduating expert plumbers, carpenters, or shoemakers: the basis of the system, as above stated, should guard one from any such error. All that is meant is that the training of the hands and eyes should have a place alongside of the training of the mind, body, and heart. There are elementary principles of execution which are common to all trades, or most of them. The boy who has mastered these is prepared, in a measure, for any trade, though he is master of none. It is only asked that boys in the public schools who desire it should have the opportunity, as a part of their ordinary work, of receiving instruction in these elementary principles. They would thus receive education which the State is under obligations to provide for all its voters, and, at the same time, a preparation through which they will be better apprentices and better workmen when they pass out of school.

The argument is offered in reply that the public schools are for all, while this is a preparation designed for a special class. In this form the argument has little weight so long as German, French, music, the higher mathematics, and most of the features of a preparation for college are a recognized part of the educational system of so many States. But the argu-

ment really has a different foundation. It implies that the proposition is a disguised attempt to develop a permanent artisan class, to fit a part of our boys for "that state of life unto which it shall please God to call" them, and to make it pretty certain that they shall stay there. Nothing could be more baseless than such an idea. It is quite sure that this feature in education would incline boys to be *good* mechanics, and not mere bunglers; and that this training, if it should become general, would tend to increase the total working force of the country, even though it did not increase the number of mechanics. But it is far from true that this training would be of benefit only to him who is to be an artisan. Even the clergyman or the editor would be the better as a man and in his profession for a practical knowledge of the proper use of those wonderful tools, the human hands. There is no man, in any profession, who would not be better able to do his usual work, at times, for just this training. It is, above most others, a training whose benefits are not restricted to a special class, but are bestowed upon all.

The argument assumes, also, the odd position that the better artisans are the most likely to remain permanently in the artisan class. There are too many examples to the contrary to make it necessary to do more than state this position. So far as the proposition for manual training touches the "special class" which has been spoken of, it aims only to clear the way of the artisan's children to any position which he may think higher and better for them. But the essence of the proposition has no such restricted aim. It aims to help eradicate that pestilent feeling of contempt for work which is the bane of this generation. Better that the rich man's son should be compelled to work with his hands for a year or two than that he should grow up to feel, and to impress upon others, that work is degrading. Better that the sons of our men of moderate means should learn that there is a science and beauty in manual labor than that they should come to believe that there are easier ways of getting a dollar than by working for it. Better that we should have manual training in our public schools than that all our public-school boys should want to begin life as clerks in brokers' offices, or in any position which is not smirched with manual labor. That feature which has made our country what it is, work and the love of it, is at stake, and the new proposition is a means of saving it.

The only other objection which has been seriously offered caters to one of the worst errors of our modern labor organizations. They aim to restrict the number of apprentices, in order to "make more work" for those already in the trade. What will they say when they see apprentices of a higher grade of intelligence and ability swarming out of our public schools? In answer, it should be said frankly and distinctly that the effect which is implied would be one of the most weighty benefits of the new system. Suppose the lawyers should form an organization for the purpose of

* See "Open Letters," in this number.

abolishing all the law-schools, restricting the number of students in each office, and so "making more work" for the present number of lawyers: would that accomplish their object? They know that the higher the standard of law in a country is, the more confidence the people feel in the lawyers, and that this is the proper way to "make more work" for all of them; and they wisely multiply law-schools and aim to increase their efficiency. Is it wiser for plumbers, for example, to fight against manual training? Or rather should they encourage it, better the grade of their apprentices and their work, and thus gain a public confidence in their capacity which is very far from existing now? Work is "made" by raising the character of the work. Mr. Carroll D. Wright has most acutely pointed out the fact that the introduction of nickel-plating into the manufacture of stoves in this country has "made work" for 30,000 additional operatives, and crowded no one out. It is in this way that thorough manual training is to help the workingman in the future, by making possible branches of work which did not exist before.

A proposition to add fully developed trade-schools to our common-school system is open to objections which do not apply to that of simple manual training. The latter would do no more than show the pupil, by a practical test which is clear to his own apprehension, whether he has an aptitude for such work, and give him an insight into the principles of symmetry and order which underlie it. If there is any valid objection to giving it a place in the State's scheme of common-school education it should be considered at once, for the support of the manual-training proposition is a growing one.

A Southern Man Ahead of his Time.

ON page 435 of the present number of this magazine, the authors of the Lincoln history have referred briefly to the opposition made to disunion in South Carolina by James Louis Petigru in 1861, and on page 432 is given a photograph of his bust.

Something in the character of the independent, far-seeing man, and in the peculiarly generous appreciation of his worth displayed by his fellow-citizens, calls for further attention. Clear-eyed and just, he rarely failed to see and follow the eternal truth that underlies all prejudice, education, and passion. In his private practice, in the courts, in his personal relations to all men, in the nullification troubles in South Carolina, where nothing but his efforts and those of James Hamilton kept the State from civil war, this was always shown. But the time came, when, foremost man of the State as he was, he had no power to stem the flood of passion setting in toward disunion. Not for a moment then did he lose his keen insight nor the firm hand with which he held himself in check. He was not an abolitionist, and he had no feeling against slavery; but he had no hope or faith in revolution. He felt that it was wrong in policy and false in principle. He put no trust in the prevailing faith of the Southern people, that a State would be permitted to secede in peace. He saw that secession would put into the hands of the North a power over the South and slavery that nothing else could give,—a power to gain the aid and sympathy of the whole world, to make war on Southern soil, and to free the slave. If the South

were alarmed at the possibilities of danger in a raid like that of John Brown's, what remedy, he asked, could be gained by rushing into war with the wealthy and populous North—with the civilized world? He saw in secession ambition and wounded vanity; he saw anarchy and civil war; he saw the abolitionist triumphant; he saw the South devastated; he saw division, and sorrow, and ruin; he saw crime. On the other hand, he felt that there was nothing to fear in Lincoln's election. He recognized the fact that the North was outstripping the South in numbers, and wisely counseled the South to yield her political supremacy with good grace. He discerned many reasons for Lincoln's success, but in none read danger. Time, he claimed, would right all wrongs, and avert all disaster. But his arguments were less than useless: secession came; war followed. For the rest of his life he was never again in sympathy with the purposes of his people, though he yielded to their decision, and held common cause in their sorrow. He was a solitary scholar in a world where all others were fighting men. He went his way, and his people went theirs. Whenever their paths crossed he was unflinching in courtesy and kindness; but he never concealed his regret for their action, nor his fear of the ultimate downfall of their hopes.

On the part of the people of South Carolina there was displayed a more generous tolerance of his obnoxious views than would seem possible. Even during the tumult of secession they elected him to their highest salary and most important trust—to codify the State laws. In spite of the satire and ridicule that he hurled at them, they continued to elect him until the work was done. His freedom of speech never destroyed their confidence in him, nor lessened their magnanimity; neither did he restrain it to gain their favor. The case can have few parallels in the history of any country.

The fame of such a man, renowned lawyer and great private citizen, is necessarily fleeting; it is forgotten when the generation in which he lived has passed away. That there might remain some slight token of one who was great in many ways, and, above all, great in his faith in the indissolubility of the Union, it was a fitting incident in the centennial celebration of Charleston, in 1883, that Mayor William A. Courtenay brought about by presenting to the city a bust of James Louis Petigru. It ought to stand to the city as a perpetual reminder of the magnanimity of its people and the faith in the Union which its great citizen held in an hour when apparent self-interest and patriotism and right all cried out against his firm belief. It is a token of the renewed love of his fellow-citizens for our common country; it is a sign that the past is utterly past, and that the same future lies before us all.

Our Daily Bread.

IN commenting upon a paper in which this subject was presented by Professor Atwater at the meeting, last August, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the "New York Times" speaks as follows:

"It is much to be wished that his conclusions might be presented to the people who most need them, and in a form that they could understand and would accept. These people are manual workmen, both skilled

give girls a distaste for the quiet retirement of home, but there is little cause for fear. Not one girl in twenty will voluntarily choose a business life in preference to domestic happiness. Indeed, it is absolutely certain that happy marriages would be promoted by this very independence among women. Not being at leisure to nurse every passing fancy, girls would elect to wait patiently until the light of true love came into their lives.

G. Andrews.

Manual Training in the Toledo Schools.

THE manual-training branch of the Toledo city schools, organized over five years ago, has steadily grown in popularity and usefulness. It was looked upon at its beginning with suspicion and distrust, but its projectors determined to give it a fair trial. The manual-training work began in a humble way in a small room with sixty boys and girls in the classes. These were pupils of the public schools, and did their regular school work in connection with free-hand and mechanical drawing, and carpentry in the manual department. The school began to make friends of its enemies. Those who had indulged in hostile criticism of the enterprise gradually grew silent. The second year a large four-story brick building was erected, and equipped with steam power, benches, tools, lathes, and forges. Ample room was provided for free-hand and mechanical drawing, special prominence being given to architectural and perspective work. A domestic economy department was added, in which girls study the chemistry of foods and their preparation for the table. A sewing class has been organized, in which the cutting and fitting of garments is taught. A class in clay modeling mold the forms and designs used in the arts. The students have increased to about three hundred in all departments, and from the beginning have manifested the greatest interest and enthusiasm for the work. This intense interest in the new work had at first to be so modified as not to interfere with the regular prosecution of the intellectual or class-room work proper. After some experimenting, the two lines of work were harmoniously adjusted to each other. Boys and girls pass from their algebra and history to their drawing, wood-carving, or clay modeling, and from these again to geometry and English literature, with a hearty zest for all. The girls in the domestic economy department con their Vergils or don their cooking suits, and prepare with ease and grace such savory and palatable food as would mollify the most radical opponent of industrial training. In short, there is such a harmonious blending of the useful and the practical with the higher intellectual culture, that the unprejudiced observer needs but to inspect the work to be convinced of the reasonableness and great utility of such training. The advantages of the manual department are open to none except pupils of the public schools. Those who take the manual work do the same amount of mental work in the regular class-room studies as those who have no work in the industrial department.

The objection was raised by many in the beginning that the manual work would impede the pupils' mental progress. I cannot see that it does, and no one here now believes that it does. On the contrary, I am convinced by a comparison of pupils' records in the dif-

ferent departments that if the two lines of work are properly adjusted to each other the manual work stimulates and quickens the intellectual development, and promotes the mental progress of the students. The opposition to manual training manifested in various quarters arises largely from the lamentable ignorance which prevails as to its aims and results. Many seem to think that the sole object of industrial training is to make mechanics and train them to mere manual dexterity. This is an utterly erroneous idea. The manual work is to train the senses, to quicken the perceptive power, and to form the judgment by furnishing the pupil an opportunity to study at the bench, forge, lathe, and engine the nature of matter and the manifestations of force. It is purely educational in its object. It first teaches the pupils to portray in the drawing a variety of beautiful and useful forms, and then to embody these forms in wood, clay, and metals. It teaches how to express thought, not in words alone, but in things. It produces nothing for the market except well-trained minds, seeing eyes, and skillful hands. In the ordinary factory, which produces for the market, the individual is nothing, the article is everything. In the manual-training school the articles made are of no moment, the boys and girls are all-important. As soon as a pupil makes one thing well, he is led on to something higher and better. The pupils make many useful and beautiful things, but these are of no value compared with the knowledge gained, the symmetrical mental development acquired. Some of the advantages, other than those named, apparent from the manual work combined in this way with the public school studies, are: the industrial work holds a far greater proportion of pupils throughout the entire course of study, and thus gives them the benefits of a more complete education; it conduces to their moral welfare, not that it gives them "a passport to heaven," but employs all their time in a pleasant and healthful way, thus preventing idleness and crowding out impure conceptions that might find a harbor in the young mind; it dignifies and exalts labor, and teaches respect for the laboring man; it teaches no special trade and yet lays the foundation for any trade, and gives the youth such knowledge and skill that he becomes a sounder and better judge of men and things in whatever business or profession he may engage. Manual training is a successful and satisfactory branch of study in the Toledo schools, not because it is theoretically a good thing, nor because it is given undue prominence and special advantages, but because it is in harmony with the nature of things, has a noble purpose in view, has been well managed, has good instructors, and has proved itself of great value to the pupils.

H. W. Compton,
Superintendent of Schools, Toledo, Ohio.

Emerson's Message.

MR. BURROUGHS remarks that the main ground of kinship between Emerson and Carlyle is "the heroic sentiment" which both convey to their readers. The comparison suggests a contrast. Every reader of the two feels this essential difference: Carlyle rouses courage, but Emerson inspires the sense of triumph. In Carlyle's pages man seems battling against the universe; in Emerson's company we feel that man is

stalling, regrating, and engrossing"; that is, roughly, the accumulation of stocks of goods by middle-men in expectation of a higher price. The prohibition has been gradually abandoned, not because the motives of middle-men had become purer, sweeter, or more philanthropic, but because the judges, as they came to understand the course of trade more clearly, began to see that the consequences of the success of such a prohibition would be an increased possibility of famine. The ordinary criterion upon which experience teaches us to rely in such cases is not the motive of the individual who claims a privilege, but the consequences to the public which grants it, either through legal or through social channels.

Much of the fallacy and futility which have crept into the discussion of social and economic questions has come from the admission of an element, the motive of the individual, which, however important in criminal law, is quite out of place here. Very many well-meaning arguments for or against Mr. Henry George's proposal to confiscate rent have been based on the grasping avarice of landlords or of Mr. George; whereas the question is mainly one of consequences, whether the public is benefited by individual ownership or by nationalization of land. Modern society has grown into a stronger anxiety for freedom of individual competition through its clearer perception that the consequences are in the highest degree beneficial to the public and to the world. While the leanings of English law were against the middle-man and his "selfish" efforts to accumulate wealth by anticipating the hunger of his fellow-men, the price of wheat was often at nominal and at famine rates in the same country within a single year. Now a complicated system of daily telegraph reports keeps the whole English-speaking portion of humanity informed as to the demand for wheat in every country, and as to the visible supply, whether in Russia, in the elevators of Dakota or Illinois, or in transit by sea; and the first remote indication of famine turns a great current of food in that direction in which the higher price shows that it is most needed. All this enormous and expensive system has been developed by individuals whose motive, while it may very properly be called "selfishness," so far as they themselves are concerned, must be taken as self-interest alone, so far as the public is concerned with it. The public is of the belief that it is far better served in such cases by the self-interest and consequent competition of individuals than by any governmental agencies. The difficulty with men of socialist leanings — for these far outnumber the down-right and out-right Socialists — is that they look only at the "selfishness" of the middle-man, and are ready to welcome any governmental agency which will, to outward seeming at least, reduce the success of selfishness as an economic force.

Even if we should admit that the substitution of governmental for individual forces would in so far abolish selfishness, we might safely appeal to the experience of the race in support of the assertion that the governmental forces would be inferior in efficiency: self-interest, in the various phases of its operation, has decreased the price of dry-goods far more than any governmental agency ever did while it had the opportunity. But it may be worth while to ask attention to the fact that any such change would not abolish selfishness; it would merely transfer it from the individual

to the government agent. The efficient government agent would be as thoroughly selfish in all his motives for activity as the individual middle-man ever was in his; there would be only a thin veneering laid over the underlying motive, and a decrease in efficiency, which the public would be the first to feel and resent.

It is impossible to exclude selfishness as a social and economic motive; and the public would only waste time by taking into consideration that which it cannot exclude. The choice is between adopting the services of selfish government agents or of selfish individuals; and, as competition can have little effect upon the former, while it works with the very greatest force upon the latter, modern civilization has shown the keenest sense of its own self-interest in its disregard of the individual's selfish motives, and its progressive transfer of more and more of its daily work to individual self-interest and competition. The public, in other words, is not interested in the motive of the individual dry-goods dealer, his desire to make profits, but in the consequence — the decrease of price.

A New Branch of an Old Profession.

IN the United States the highest type of mind, especially among men, has not as a rule turned to the teaching profession, because of the inadequacy of its rewards and the uncertainty of advancement. By mere force of habit or custom this tendency away from teaching as a life occupation continues, though the rewards increase in value almost yearly, and promotion is becoming both rapid and sure. The success of the manual-training movement will, it is fair to assume, exert a powerful influence in attracting well trained and broadly cultured men to the service of the school. The ablest graduates of the scientific schools and polytechnic institutes are the men who should respond to the call now being heard all over the country for trained teachers of manual training. Their equipment in drawing, and wood and metal working, when supplemented by a short pedagogic course, is precisely what is required of a principal or instructor in the manual-training school. Furthermore, the salaries attached to these positions are very fair, and will naturally increase as the experience of incumbents makes them more valuable. Mechanics will not do for these positions. Mere tool-men cannot teach. Their sole aim is the finished product, and their method is to urge imitation by the pupil of their own skill. The real teacher of manual training, on the other hand, will desire first of all the development of his pupil, and his method will be to stimulate the student's own activity and power of thought. For him a well-finished product will be but an incident — a necessary incident, it is true — of successful teaching. The well-developed pupil will be the first product for which he will strive.

That this new branch of an old profession is already established admits of no question. Educational thought is all but unanimous in its favor. Public sentiment demands it. Favorable legislative action in New Jersey, and the pending or projected legislation in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and several of the western States, have created a demand for trained teachers of this kind, which it is just now impossible to supply. At least one institution has been established for the purpose of training young men for this

work. It will doubtless be some time before the proper candidates for these positions are forthcoming in sufficient numbers. The lack of rapid adaptability to changed circumstances explains why this expectation is justifiable. Yet the demand will eventually create a supply, and the trained student of nature's forces and materials will find awaiting him a field worthy of his noblest efforts.

For women there is a similar opening. Domestic economy, including instruction in the care, preparation, and constituents of food materials, and sewing, are being offered to girls just as constructive work with tools is prescribed for boys. Careful and systematic teaching is necessary if these branches are to yield the educational results hoped for, and which it is perfectly possible for them to yield. So for women teachers,—and women constitute more than four-fifths of our 320,000 teachers,—there is also an enlarged opportunity. Busy-work, sewing, and cooking will take their place by the side of arithmetic, geography, and history. Already a score or more of cities have schools in which this step has been taken. Everywhere the results are successful. The handling of things stimulates the pupil to careful observation and correct expression. It awakens interest where merely verbal exercises had brought on an intellectual paralysis. It gives power and a consciousness of power. It educates. As one reads the numerous reports on manual training from all parts of the country, New Haven and St. Paul, Albany and Cleveland, New Orleans and St. Louis, and a score more cities and towns, and becomes fully aware of the hold it has gained, he is convinced that for the healthy development of the movement not arguments, but trained teachers, are now necessary.

The Independence of Literature.

THE Rev. Dr. Gladden's "Open Letter" on copyright in this number of *THE CENTURY* makes a needed

explanation of the principle involved in all copyright, as no one can accept the principle of copyright and consistently oppose international copyright. The recent discussion of international copyright has shown the necessity of making clear this principle.

The fact is that the copyright method of supporting and encouraging literary activity is the modern and democratic method as opposed to the ancient feudal method. Either the author must win his living by the simple and easy means of popular sales, or he must, as in the old days, look for his support to some "patron,"—private, ecclesiastical, governmental, or what not. In claiming governmental "protection" by international copyright law American authors have asked not for "patronage" and "protection," as in the old days; on the contrary, they have merely asked for their right to gain their own living unhampered by the unnatural competition of stolen goods. They have asked not for the "protection" of the appraiser, but of the policeman. They wish to be "free" to earn their bread and butter under natural conditions. As Dr. Eggleston said in his speech before the Senate committee, American authors do not ask what several foreign governments give to their authors,—sinecure positions and literary pensions as a means of support; they only ask to be put on the same footing with other workmen. The opposition to international copyright has inevitably ended in denying the principle of all copyright. But when copyright is properly understood it will be found, as we have said above, to be the manly, honest, and democratic method as opposed to the aristocratic and feudal method of supporting the profession of letters.

The independence of literary expression needs to be carefully guarded. "Patronage" is much more out of place in this domain than in that of the plastic arts. Those who have opposed the principle of copyright have been, without knowing it, promoting a tendency which would result in a system reactionary and un-American.

OPEN LETTERS.

The Ethics of Copyright.

THE debate about international copyright has raised the question whether authors, native or foreign, have any rights which the laws are bound to protect. The prompt answer of the advocates of international copyright, when they are challenged to give a reason for their demand, is that the reprinting of an author's books in a foreign country, without asking his consent or offering him remuneration, is an act of piracy; that it is simply helping yourself to another man's property. Mr. Lowell's verse sums up the common argument:

In vain we call old notions fudge,
And bend our conscience to our dealing;
The Ten Commandments will not budge,
And stealing *will* continue stealing.

I confess that to my own mind this has seemed perfectly clear and obvious,—almost axiomatic. But now arise some who dispute all these assumptions. They

deny that the property right expressed in copyright is a natural right; they say that it is only a civil right, the creation of law; that a man has a right to sell his book, but not to monopolize the sale of it; that this right to control the sale is a privilege conferred on him by law; that it may be expedient to extend this privilege to authors, for the sake of encouraging literary production, but that there are no rights in the case except those which are created by the statute. Inasmuch as the statute is in force only within the territory of the State by which it is enacted, no rights are infringed when an author's books, copyrighted at home, are reprinted in a foreign country. The argument for international copyright which rests upon the equities of the case is thus opposed by the assertion that there are no equities in the case; and that while it may be expedient, for public reasons, to extend certain privileges to our own authors, we are under no obligation to extend these privileges even to them; much less to the authors of foreign countries.