

SCHOOL AND SOCIETY

EDITED BY J. McKEEN CATTELL

Volume 45

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1937

Number 1161

CONTENTS

<i>Educational Books of 1936: JOSEPH L. WHEELER and MARTON E. HAWES</i>	417
<i>Educational Events:</i>	
<i>Backward Children in London; Statistics of State School Systems; Authority of State Executive Agencies over Higher Education; Proposed Government Broadcasting Station in Washington; The Junior Academy of Science of Pennsylvania; Field Course in Comparative Education and Cultural Institutions of the Orient; The Liberal Arts Curriculum at Brown University; Gifts to the California Institute of Technology</i>	433
<i>Educational Notes and News</i>	438
<i>Discussion:</i>	
<i>The Quest for Bequests: ARCHIE M. PALMER. The Thomasites in the Philippines; GILBERT PEREZ</i>	443
<i>Special Correspondence:</i>	
<i>Education for Politics—in England and the United States: KARL POLANYI</i>	447
<i>Quotations:</i>	
<i>A New Plan for the Chicago Schools; Politics and the Schools of New York City</i>	450
<i>Reports:</i>	
<i>The New Curriculum of the Law School of the University of Chicago</i>	452
<i>Educational Research and Statistics:</i>	
<i>Length of the Employment Year and Sabbatical Leaves of Absence in Teachers Colleges: H. E. SCHRAMMEL</i>	454

\$5.00 A YEAR

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

15 CENTS A COPY

THE SCIENCE PRESS

LANCASTER, PA.

GARRISON, N. Y.

GRAND CENTRAL TERMINAL, NEW YORK CITY

Entered as second-class matter August 15, 1923, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879

an educational argosy unparalleled in the history of the world.

We are now only a small group of gray-haired men and women far from home with no influence whatsoever—a group not large enough or important enough to be considered by the political representatives of the American government out here.

THE THOMASITES

On July 1, 1901, 600 school teachers sailed from San Francisco on the Transport *Thomas* and arrived in Manila Bay on August 21.

They used to be what they are not
Tis said.
And far away across the sea
They are forgotten . . . all
They are forgotten
Those who in that scarred sea of time
Are flecked with snow or graying fast.
But I—
I know the lives they gave
The lives they give.
Tis not a cycles span but merely years
Those years which dance

Like leaves that float away
And fall
Beneath the Southern Cross
And slowly shrivel up
In seaweed grays and
Purgatorial browns.
They heard the soft call of the East
The hectic call
Of tropic gardens drunched
With scent that kissed away
The breath
And helped forgetfulness
To come.
Those lotus years
Those years of labrous mountain wanderings
Of thirsty deaths and torment winds
Of poisoned streams and fevered brows
With which they paid
For that reward which never came
But which shall come some day
With that posthumous fame
Which always crowns good deeds
In all
Ungrateful worlds.

GILBERT PEREZ

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENCE

EDUCATION FOR POLITICS—IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

THERE is a gulf between the structural life of the two great Anglo-Saxon communities which makes a straightforward parallel between any single aspect of them almost entirely unreal. Indeed, the usefulness of these notes, if any, should lie precisely in the light they may shed on the stark realities lying at the back of these two vastly different societies.

We propose to use both the terms education and politics in their broadest sense. In the term education we wish to include the whole range of human influences that, whether deliberately or not, fashion the minds and bodies of the young, or, for that matter, the adult, with a view to the performance of their permanent tasks in society. By politics, again, we wish to refer not only to the sphere of the state proper but to that of all organized society. Such a liberal definition of politics seems alone adequate in reference to a country like the United States, where the national sovereign state is,

strictly speaking, still non-existent. However, this takes us right into the heart of our subject.

FOUNDING A STATE OR A SOCIETY?

The unique peculiarity of the United States among modern nations is that they were established as a *society*, not as a state. It is probably the only instance in history that such a task should have been deliberately undertaken, or perhaps even contemplated. Whether the freedom of communal worship or the freedom of material betterment was the end primarily sought by the founders of the American commonwealth, they invariably identified the polity with a mode of social existence the rules of which derived their validity not so much from positive legislation as from the nature of things. They regarded society as a rational proposition independent of the existence of the political state. But by thus refusing to recognize territorial sovereignty as the precondition of society, they were implicitly rejecting the idea of politics which refers precisely to the establishment and manipulation of such sovereignty. To prevent the emergence of such sovereignty was the

main aim of the Constitution. Accordingly, politics, in every sense of the term, remained a more or less periphereal and subsidiary sphere in the American social experiment.

As in all other countries of the Western type, state and politics occupy the center of the stage in England. Society is here a predominantly unconscious growth, founded and established by no man, the structure of which is by its very nature removed from direct human interference. The road to change leads mainly through national legislation. State and politics are here the instruments through which members of the community can alone govern, uphold, modify or transform society.

In England, therefore, the citizen is primarily related to politics, whereas in America he is related to society direct. The difference is momentous. *Education for politics* means in England education for the use of power, personal preparation for rule. In America education "for politics," as traditional politics go, would be almost a contradiction in terms. The corresponding process is *education for social existence*. Far from being a preparation for rule, it is a preparedness for adjustment to one's surroundings, consisting of a technique of behavior in reference to the two basic facts of American life: the existence of various groupings in which the individual takes a voluntary part, and a convulsive process of change in both human and natural surroundings.

THE AMERICAN TECHNIQUE

It is under the aspect of change that English and American social environment are most obviously poles apart. Extreme individualism, both mental and material; anarchism in relation to the coercive functions of the state; unlimited competition as the organizing principle of economic life—these basic tenets of American society worked for swift and sweeping change in an empty continent. Except for the old South and New England, where on the whole stability prevailed, the America of to-day is the outcome of one long sustained surge of change that has transmuted the very landscapes of the earth, raising thousands of settlements to dizzy heights and ploughing almost as many under again; blasting life from mountain flanks and rocketing skyscrapers from the plains; disrooting the primeval cover of the ground, forest and

grass, and replacing them by ploughed fields and flying ports—with stunning results both of a creative and a woefully destructive kind. In this *maelstrom* of change social environment underwent at a forced pace every manner of transformation linked with the phenomenon of growth (or, occasionally, decay).

Such, in terms of social reality, was the background of the American approach to the problem of the rôle of the citizen in the community, and, eventually, to the educational needs of the citizen with a view to this rôle of his. For the success of the community manifestly depended upon the achievement of its individual members, and, no less manifestly, the fate of these members depended upon the measure of success or failure attained by the community as a whole. Perhaps the most striking illustration of this mutuality of benefits between citizen and communal group is offered by the rise of real estate values in America, this ever active propelling motor of the greatest shift of population known in modern history. It was under permanent duress that the American learned to realize the thousand ways in which the individual can behave constructively towards the group to which he belongs and can influence creatively that process of change in which he is both a passive and an active partner.

Americans as a people have acquired a unique knowledge of the manifold correlations involved in social change. The effect of individual behavior upon human surroundings, on the group and its functions, especially with a view to their prospective evolution, is a field of experience on which American families will carry on sustained discussions that would seem almost pointless to non-Americans. Often the subject will be the changing function of family life, of marriage and parenthood; the changing relationship of sets of friends in the depression period; the changing form and content of cultural and intellectual pursuits, if not the function of education itself, its aims and methods, both in relation to the earning capacity of the children and to the diminishing functions of the family under changing conditions. And invariably, the point will be: *What to do about it?* which, more often than not, means, how to *behave* about it, *individually*. Behaviorism as a school of psychology is but an abstraction from the methods applied in practice in the United States when

dealing with the reactions between individual and surroundings. A community which habitually does not look to political means to shape their social destinies according to their wishes, must tend, if unconsciously, to evolve some educative methods which will enable the individual to deal with the problem of social change single-handed. The often ridiculed efforts of American educationalists to bring this process under the control of consciousness by developing teachable techniques of investigating into the facts of social change with a view of mastering them are the equivalent to an "education for politics" in a basically non-political type of society. Not for nothing has America become the home of descriptive sociology, the study of human relationships and "integrated" social curricula. Some of it may lack discipline and maturity—taken all in all, it is a priceless start for the development of new organs of self-consciousness in a complex society.

ENGLISH STABILITY AND CLASS RULE

American society was a society of change, because it was born out of a rebellion against feudalism on the background of free land. English society, which continues to embody the principles of feudal social organization more completely than any other society of Western industrial civilization, became a society of stability. The principle underlying its economic organization is that of a secured standard of life on the basis of accepted social inequality. English society is a society of a feudal type not on account of the pageantry which English people enjoy nor of the preponderant rôle of the aristocracy in public life, but because its economics are that of a *producer's society*. The social accessories of economic life in England are invariably fashioned in such a manner as to aim at securing to every producer the maximum stability of conditions of work, earnings, professional honor and traditions. Atomistic individualism, unlimited competition, anarchistic impatience with regulation have scant room in such a system. The feudal idea of "sum cuique" governs distribution. Cohesion in society is grounded on the recognition of their respective monopolies and privileges on the part of the various professional and vocational groups. Apart from an effective public opinion, the supreme guarantor and, to an increasing

degree, also the regulator of these privileges is, to-day, the state. Education for politics in such a basically feudal society is education of a privileged class for the task of leadership, responsibility and rule in the state. This is supplemented by the complementary education of the other classes to be led and ruled. Incidentally, a complete dichotomy of the educational system proper is the result—the famous "two nations," with their two ways of speech, two manners of behavior, two levels of social responsibility, two outlooks on life. In effect, the broad masses of the population in England must be regarded as only comparatively literate. They are not taught to master their mother tongue at school; they lack the capacity of self-expression by written word as well as by way of mouth. Only through the grant of a scholarship to higher education (a chance, which is, recently, more liberally accorded) can the offspring of the common people escape this socially degrading form of aphasia. In such cases, however, the privileged child must leave his people and join the higher social strata for good and all. If his children were, eventually, to consort with their less fortunate cousins, they might pick up an "accent." Distinctions of speech have almost the rigidity of a color bar in England. Segregation of the children of the poor is the inevitable consequence. The English have become so accustomed to this qualified form of caste system that the political unity of the nation, far from being endangered, has been, in the past, rather strengthened by this system. The Labor Party on the whole, like the English working class itself, shares the national outlook and refuses to challenge the dual system of education seriously. English educationalists who are sympathetic to the working class complain of this fact. Incidentally, it accounts for the continued rule of the upper class in England, whatever the complexion of Parliament happens to be.

It is doubtful whether England will be able to hold her own in the international field under this system in the future. The outlook of the upper class in world politics is practical and realist: public schools like Eton, Harrow, Rugby or Winchester; the old universities of Oxford and Cambridge; an admirable tradition of conferences, summer schools and carefully prepared discussions help to keep them up to the mark. But the outlook of the working classes,

on the other hand, is utterly sentimental and "idealist," in the sense of being out of touch with reality. This is a matter of serious consequence for Great Britain's national policy. Formally, policy in England is directed by a democratic parliament which must, in the nature of things, rely on an effective opposition in the fulfilment of its task. But during the Ethiopian crisis the Labor Party, although agreeing in the main with the sanctionist line of the government, failed conspicuously to urge effective motions upon a reluctant cabinet, presumably because this would have involved some measure of support for rearmament on the part of labor. This lack of push and grasp was hardly the result of any essential divergence of interests within the ranks of the party. Their failure to face up to the realities of the situation was simply due to the absence of any political education of an active and positive kind in the ranks of the masses.

More is involved than may be apparent on the surface. The big industrial countries, whether

democratic or not, are proceeding in our time towards a consolidation of their cultural and educational life on a national scale. Some countries, including those with Fascist régime, are achieving this on a dictatorial basis; others, like the United States of America, have attained an unparalleled average level of national culture and education on the basis of political democracy. The United States are to-day, except for the segregated races, overwhelmingly a nation of one speech, one behavior, one standard of manners, one outlook, irrespective of income classes. They can compete in basic educational integration with any type of dictatorial state. England does not only lack educational unity, but she would also be unable to attain such unity for a long time to come, even though she endeavored to achieve it. Her obvious weakness in world affairs in the present period may be, in the last resort, more closely linked to this deep-seated ailing of hers than is commonly apprehended.

KARL POLANYI

VIENNA AND LONDON

QUOTATIONS

A NEW PLAN FOR THE CHICAGO SCHOOLS

SUPERINTENDENT JOHNSON has announced on several occasions that he intended to give special consideration to the brighter pupils in the Chicago schools. He believes they should not be held back because of the inability of the others to keep pace with them. His idea has now taken form in a new plan for the elementary schools.

Mr. Johnson has ordered that a selection of the superior pupils be made after their first half year in school. These children will then complete the work of the first seven grades in six years. They will spend a year in eighth grade and thus will have saved a full year in completing the grade school course. The other children will go through in eight years, as at present. Pupils in the superior group can be transferred to the normal group, and vice versa, if the records warrant the change.

Another innovation has been introduced at the same time. The children in the elementary schools are not to have a new teacher each year. Instead, their entire schooling is to be intrusted

to three teachers. One of them will carry the children through the work of the first three and a half grades; another will carry them up to the eighth grade; and a third teacher will then take them for the final year. This system will apply to all, whether in the superior or the normal group, wherever the size of the school permits this form of organization.

Both experiments, and particularly the first one, will be followed with interest. The saving of a year is important, but it is by no means the only gain which can be hoped for. At present the brighter children, moving at a pace too slow for them, often lose interest in their studies. They find they can keep up without effort and accordingly acquire habits of laziness which are likely to persist through life. If Mr. Johnson's plan succeeds it may result in improving the mental habits of precisely that portion of the population to which the future must look for competence and leadership.

When innovations of this kind have been proposed in the past they have generally met with an opposition which argued that a distinction

OBSERVATIONS ON EDUCATION FOR POLITICS
- IN ENGLAND AND THE USA.

There is a gulf between the structural life of the two great Anglo-Saxon communities which makes a straightforward parallel between any single aspect of these societies almost entirely unreal. We will not attempt such a parallel. Rather, the usefulness of these notes on the relation of education to politics in England and the United States of America, if any usefulness be found in them, should lie precisely in the light they shed on the stark realities lying at the back of the two vastly different societies.

Of the influence that politics, especially party politics, may or may not have on education, we do not wish to treat here. It is on the contrary with the influence of education on politics, or rather, with the process of education for politics, that we are primarily concerned. We should like to make very clear that both the terms education and politics will be used by us in the broadest sense. In the term education e.g. we wish to include the whole range of human influences that, whether deliberately or not, fashion the minds and bodies of the young, or for that matter of the adult, with a view to the performance of their task in society. By politics, again, we mean not only the interplay of the factors attempting to gain influence upon State power, but also the aggregate of the factors tending towards the establishment of such a sovereign territorial power in society ^{which that} as is commonly called the State. Still, not even this liberal definition of the term politics can prove wide enough to cover our subject adequately in reference to a country like the USA in which the political State, in the classic sense, is strictly speaking nonexistent. How, indeed, should education for politics be possible in a society, where politics are, in effect,

ostracized? - However, this question takes us right into the heart of our thesis.

Founding a State or founding a Society

The United States were established as a society, not as a state. It is probably the only instance known in history that such a task should have been deliberately undertaken, or, perhaps even conceived of. All other now existing countries were born as states, mostly as ~~an~~ ^{the} outcome of conquest. By refusing to recognize the necessity of territorial sovereignty and state power as the pre-conditions of society, Americans implicitly rejected the idea of politics which refers precisely to the establishment and manipulation of such sovereignty and power. Where the State is practically forbidden, politics are akin to bootlegging. Accordingly, politics, in every sense of the term, has remained to this day a more or less peripheric and subsidiary sphere in the great American experiment.

As in all other countries of the Western type, ~~the~~ State and politics occupy the centre of the stage in England. Society is here a predominantly unconscious growth, founded and established by no man, the structure of which is removed by its very nature from deliberate human interference. The road to change leads mainly through national legislation. State and politics are the instrument through which members of the community can alone direct, govern, uphold, modify or transform society.

In England, therefore the citizen is primarily related to politics, whereas in America he is related to society direct. The difference is momentous. Education for politics means in England education for the use of power, personal preparation for rule.

In America education "for politics", as traditional politics go, would be almost a contradiction in terms. The corresponding process is education for society. Far from being a preparation for rule, it is a preparedness for adjustment to one's surroundings, consisting of a technique of individual behaviour in view of two basic facts in American social life:- the existence of various groupings of which the individual forms a voluntary part, and an almost continuous process of rapid change, to which both human and natural surroundings are subject.

English and American foreign policy

Foreign politics seem an exception to the rule. No community can entirely escape the consideration of the use of power in relation to other countries, nor the occasional use of power towards them. Still, even in the sphere of foreign policy English and American mentality are different. Great Britain, an island empire, depending not only for her security, but also for her raw materials and markets upon her possessions overseas, regards her participation in world affairs as a matter of course. If anything happens anywhere, the assumption is that English interests are affected; the contrary is the exception. The great variety of possible aspects under which England must be prepared to envisage events, if she is to deal with them according to ^{her} ~~their~~ interests, rules out any but a thoroughly practical and realist approach. The United States, on the other hand, with little possessions overseas, tend to be indifferent to happenings on other continents. They are the "born neutral", and have difficulties in realizing that neutrality is not a state that can be secured by the mere wish to adhere to it. While the English have developed a remarkable capacity for a pragmatic

understanding of foreign conditions and conflicts, which helps them greatly in refraining from taking sides in the latter on general grounds, the American public lacks the technique of swift appreciation of the relevant facts on both sides and is comparatively easily persuaded to believe that there must exist principles of universal validity which, if only properly applied to the facts, should settle the rights and wrongs of the dispute before the court of justice and reason, finally. That illusions of this kind are not conducive to the attainment of the coveted neutrality, even when a more realist approach could have perhaps kept the country out of war, will be readily understood by those intelligent anti-isolationists who have realized the great importance of international education in the USA as technique of maintaining peace. ~~But~~
~~let us return to the domestic issue,~~

Adjustment to social change in the U.S.A.

It is under the aspect of change and stability that English and American social structure ~~are~~ manifestly poles apart. Extreme individualism, both mental and material; anarchism in relation to the coercive functions of the State; unlimited competition as the organizing principle of economic life--these three basic tenets of American society worked for swift and sweeping change in an empty continent. Except for the Old South and New England, where on the whole, stability prevailed, the America of today is the outcome of one long sustained surge of change that has transmuted the very fastnesses of the earth;--raising thousand of settlements to dizzy heights and ploughing almost as many under again; blasting life from mountain flanks and rocketing skyscrapers from the plains; disrooting the primeval cover of the ground, forest and

grass, and replacing it by ploughed fields, paved roads, steel rails and flying ports, with stunning results both of a creative and a woefully destructive kind. In this maelstrom of change social surroundings underwent at a forced pace every manner of transformation that is linked with the phenomenon of growth (or, occasionally, decay).))

Such, in terms of social reality, was the background of the American approach to the problem of the ^{role} of the citizen in the community, and, eventually, to the educational needs of the citizen with a view to this ^{role} of his. For apart from the chance bounty of nature, the success of the community manifestly depended upon the achievement of its individual members, and, no less manifestly, the fate of these members depended upon the measure of success or failure attained by the community as a whole. Perhaps the most striking illustration of this mutuality of benefits between citizen and communal group is offered by the well known instance of the rise of real estate values in America, this ever active propelling motor of the greatest shift of population known ^{modern} in history. It was under the duress of the struggle for life that the American learned to realize the thousand ways in which the individual can ^{behave} ~~be~~ constructively towards the group to which he belongs and can influence creatively that process of change in which he is both a passive and an active partner.

Accordingly, Americans as a people have acquired a unique knowledge of the manifold correlations involved in social change. The effect of individual behaviour upon human surroundings, on the group and its functions, especially with a view to their prospective

development, is a field of experience on which American families will carry on discussions that would be utterly outside the range of non-Americans. Often the subject will be the changing function of family life, of marriage and parentage; the changing relationship of sets of friends in the depression; the changing form and content of cultural and intellectual ~~pursuits~~ ^{if not that of} education itself, its aims and methods, both in relation to the earning capacity of the children and to the remaining functions of the family under changed conditions. And invariably, the point will be raised: What to do about it? Which, more often than not, means, how to behave about it. Behaviourism as a school of psychology is partly an abstraction from the method commonly applied in the USA when analysing the actions and reactions between the individual and his surroundings. A community which habitually does not look to the State to shape their social destiny according to their wishes, must, even if unconsciously, evolve some educative means ~~of other~~ which will enable the individual to solve the problem of social change single handed. The oft misunderstood efforts of American educationalists to bring this process under the control of consciousness by developing teachable techniques and methods of investigating into the facts of social change and of influencing one's social relationships, are ~~in truth~~ but the equivalent to an "education for politics" in a basically non-political society. Not for nothing has America become the home of ~~descriptive sociology~~ ^{and of "misinterpreted" social caricatures} ~~and~~ the study of human relationships.

English stability and class rule.

American society was a society of change, because it was born out of a rebellion against feudalism with a background of free land.

English society which continues to embody the ~~feudal~~ principles of ^{feudal} social organization more completely than any other society of Western industrial civilization, became a society of stability and security. Here, again, the principles underlying the economic organization of society were decisive. In England this ~~principle~~ is that of ^{the} security of ~~the~~ standard of life on the basis of accepted social inequality. English society is a society of a feudal type, neither on account of the occasional medieval pageantry which English people enjoy, nor of the preponderant rôle of the aristocracy in public life, but because its economics are that of a producer's society. The social accessories of economic life in England are fashioned in such a manner as to secure to every member of society, as a producer, the maximum stability of conditions of work, earnings, professional honor and traditions. Atomistic individualism, unlimited competition, anarchistic impatience with regulation have no room in such a system. The feudal idea of "suum cuique" governs the idea of distribution. The unity and coherence of society is ~~based~~ ^{grounded} on the mutual recognition accorded by the various autonomous bodies to their respective monopolies and privileges. Apart from a wide-awake public opinion, the supreme guarantor and, to an increasing degree, also the regulator of these privileges is the State. Education for politics in such a society is the education of a privileged class for the task of leadership, responsibility and rule. This, in a manner, is supplemented by the corresponding education of the other classes to be led and ruled. Incidentally, ^{a complete dichotomy} ~~accomplished dichotomy~~ of the educational system proper is the result - the famous two nations,

with their two ways of speech, two manners of behavior, two levels of social responsibility, two outlooks on life. As to the average level of education, the ^{broad masses} ~~majority~~ of the population must be regarded as only partly literate. They are not taught to master their mother tongue at school; accordingly, they lack the capacity of self-expression, not only in written word, but often also by way of mouth. Only through the grant of a scholarship to higher education (a chance, which is more liberally accorded recently) can the offspring of the common people in England escape this socially degrading form of ^{via} ~~sphax~~. In such a case, however, the privileged child must join a high ^{er} social strata^a for good and all. For if later in life his children were to consort with their less fortunate cousins, they would be in a ~~very real~~ danger of picking up an "accent" and thus losing caste. Distinctions of speech have almost the rigidity of a ^{bar} ~~color~~ in England. Segregation of the children of the poor is the consequence. The English have become so accustomed to ~~the fact of~~ ^U segregation of social classes that the political unity of the nation, far from being endangered, has been, at least in the past, definitely strengthened by this system. The Labour Party as a whole, like the ^{English} ~~British~~ working class itself, share the national outlook and refuse to challenge the dual system of education seriously. English educationalists not infrequently complain of this fact. Incidentally, it explains by itself abundantly the continued rule of the upper class in England, ^w whatever the complexion of Parliament happens to be."

Difficulties ahead

It is doubtful whether England will be able to hold her own in the international field under her present system of education. The outlook of the upper class in world politics is practical and realist:—public schools like Eton, Harrow, Rugby or Winchester; the old universities of Oxford and Cambridge; ~~an~~ admirable tradition of conferences, ~~and~~ debates, summer schools and carefully prepared discussions help to keep the upper classes up to the mark. The outlook of the working classes, on the other hand, is sentimental and "idealist" in the sense of being out of touch with reality. This fact may be of serious consequence for Great Britain's national policy in the near future. ^{eg} ~~Formally~~ ~~Formally~~ this policy is directed by a democratic parliament which must, by the nature of things, rely on an effective opposition in the accomplishment of its task. During the Ethiopian crisis the Labour Party, although agreeing in the main with the sanctionist line of the Government, ~~still~~ failed to urge this policy with sufficient energy upon a reluctant, mainly conservative cabinet, presumably, because this would have involved some measure of support for re-armament. This lack of push and grasp was hardly due to any essential divergence of interests within the ranks of the Party; their failure to face up to the realities of the situation was ultimately due to absence of ^{any} political education of an active and positive kind in the masses. The efforts which the educational organizations of the working classes, especially the Workers Educational Association, are making to supplement this need, seem at present hardly adequate to the task.

More than is apparent on the surface, is involved. The big industrial countries, whether democratic or not, are proceeding in our time towards a unification of their cultural and educational life on a national scale. Some countries, including those with a Fascist régime, are achieving this on a dictatorial basis; others, like the United States of America, have attained an unparalleled unification of the average level of national culture and education on the basis of political democracy. The United States are today, except for the segregated races, overwhelmingly a nation of one speech, one behavior, one standard of manners, one outlook, irrespective of income classes. They can compete in educational unity with any type of dictatorial state.

Still, the United States will not, presumably, be able to forego for long an education for politics in the strict sense. The problem of federal i.e. national government is posed by history. Whatever the answer will prove to be, the task of education^{wj} public opinion both in domestic^s and foreign affairs will be with you in the future. Many² new and complex problems will have to be faced.