6. The supervision and guidance of the school should encourage those pupils, who for many reasons, apparently lack interest in those activities of normal boys and girls to develop those interests through the proper type of participation.

7. The supervision and guidance of the school with reference to these activities should cause the pupils, who for many reasons, have developed unwholesome interests, undesirable social habits, and improper attitudes to become interested in wholesome activities and thus develop proper interests, habits and social attitudes.

8. Participation in extra-curricular activities should supplement and motivate the curricular work of the school.

9. Each activity should have a program of work in terms of desirable outcomes and definite objectives, and each pupil participating should make a contribution to the program.

10. The student organization and control of these activities should be so arranged that all pupils belonging to an activity would be eligible for managerial offices.

(a) The supervision and control on the part of the school should prevent certain pupils from monopolizing these activities.

(b) Students should be encouraged to set up certain eligibility standards for those activities, the work of which necessitates standards.

(c) Membership in the activities should be from the school at large.

11. The school should not require pupils to engage in extra-curricular activities which are designed primarily to secure funds for the school and the community.

12. Success in extra-curricular activities should be given some form of recognition by the school.

WILLIAM R. SMITHEY

EFFECTIVE HISTORY TEACHING

EFFECTIVE is not just a nice-sounding polysyllabic word. It must have a definite meaning. If our teaching is to be effective, we must know what we are to effect. I intend in this talk to assume that each of you has read a book, and therefore I will not give you any book ideas, nor any book terms, nor any cut-and-dried book theories. I will try to talk to you out of my own experience as to what seems to have proved effective in at least certain cases.

What, then, are we trying to do? To acquire such a knowledge of the past as will make us successful citizens of the present. I like to think of history as "a short cut to experience." Were it possible for me to live at all times and in all places I should need no history; I would know by experience. In lieu of this, I must short-cut it some way and solve the problems of other days vicariously.

How then shall I acquire this experience? By memorizing a list of dates, or preparing a chart of dates-events, or proving my ability to fill out one of those standardized tests that are so profitable to those who have standardized tests to sell? It seems to me almost self-evident that two things are necessary and in this order: (1) To know a certain number of facts thoroughly, definitely, and intimately. (2) To be able to reason about these facts. There is a world of literature available on methods of acquiring this first step in knowledge. You do not find a copy of your professional magazine (e.g., The Historical Outlook) which does not give you true and tried devices for selecting, presenting, drilling, and memorizing historical facts. I shall assume that this is familiar to you, and shall confine my talk to the second phase of effective teaching, the use of reason in studying facts.

Let me say first that thinking about facts must follow the acquiring of facts. Whatever may be true in other subjects, it is
indubitably true in history that you do not approach a history unit with certain leading questions in your mind and then try to find the answers to those questions. There is no question until the study of facts has created a question. Some of you may begin a new assignment on China, for instance, with the question “Now, children, as we take up China today, what do we want to know about it?” If the child is either new to your method or is honest he will say “I don’t want to know anything; except how to make a good grade.” If, however, he knows your technique, he will glibly say “We want to know first, how China came to be such a great world power” and when your face shows that is not the right thing for him to want naturally, he will flounder, and with sufficient help and leading questions will finally say “We want to know why China, with all her vast resources and her long civilized history, is not a great world power.” Then you will smile the self-satisfied smile of the teacher who has led young minds to her point of view, and will report on the fresh, original questions asked by the students.

But suppose you proceed naturally, and without any big questions plainly assign certain facts about China to be learned,—and I am not ashamed to have students learn facts, assigned facts, out of a textbook. After two days some boy says “Say, if China has all those resources and if China used gunpowder before we did, why can’t she keep Japan out of Manchuria?” Then your question has arisen, as it should, out of the right thing for him to want naturally, he will flounder, and with sufficient help and leading questions will finally say “We want to know why China, with all her vast resources and her long civilized history, is not a great world power.” Then you will smile the self-satisfied smile of the teacher who has led young minds to her point of view, and will report on the fresh, original questions asked by the students.

The only fair question, the only pedagogical question, is the one that comes after the facts and then seeks more facts. It is logically wrong to begin the American Revolution with a question that implies the inevitability, and the justification, of the colonial position, e. g., “Why were the colonies justified in their Rebellion?” A simple straight-forward study of colonial relations from 1750 will create a certain admiration for the growing British Empire, and if skilfully handled will bring up a healthy honest question, whether it was necessary to break up the empire. You will probably find a good high school class about evenly divided on this. And then will come the real honest-to-goodness reasoning that is the only justification you and I have for our jobs. Try this once and you will be thrilled with the difference between the mental activity of a class trying to decide a real question and the artificial interest in giving a good answer to a canned question.

Furthermore, this is the life we live. No providence sends us into the world to answer a question about Italy and France, but Laval and Grandi come: they are the facts; the question must come afterwards.

Only under the artificial conditions of school life are we sent to a magazine or to a newspaper to find the answer to our big problem. We are caught by a head-line, a hurried reading gives us some facts, we ask ourselves a question, probably to reject it ask ourselves another—until a real question, our personal question, arises. Then we intelligently look for more facts and in spite of ourselves find that we are really studying.

I listened recently to a high school class in government beginning the study of the Cabinet. Under a skilful set of questions the class stated that their interest was intense in deciding whether the Cabinet played a useful part in our system of government. I looked at them, red-blooded adolescent boys and girls of fifteen or sixteen, and I could see signs of interest in everything except the Cabinet. But in spite of faulty approach and a wrong method of assignment, the young lady could teach. Fact after fact came out in regard to the part played by the cabinet members, and soon two children, fortunately forgetting what they were supposed to be doing said almost at
once, "Why, I don't see any good in their all meeting as a cabinet" and "Why, that's a good idea to have them meet together." From then on the class proceeded normally and successfully. Teach your facts first, then, and let the big questions grow out of them.

Isn't it almost a tragedy to take a character as intriguing as Andrew Jackson and tie up all the wide range of impressions and suggestions that might come from a study of his activities with two dictated leading questions on his "autocracy" and the "evidences of sectionalism"? Quite likely these two questions will be suggested by the pupils after the facts have been studied, but why squeeze the juice out before you give them the orange? The value of the whole study lies not in finding the facts to establish a statement but in finding a statement from the facts.

But facts, by themselves, will not cause thought. They must be so handled in a class period that they will call forth original and new points of view. May I give an illustration of three steps necessary in any teaching that goes beyond cramming the memory. The statement is read to a class: "A child was struck by a moving car at Sixth and Broad Streets, Richmond, at 5:30 P. M." The first step is to get the words of the story accurately: it was on Broad Street, not Main; in Richmond, not Roanoke; in the afternoon, not in the morning. (And I think you will bear me out in saying that few students can read accurately. Do your students have trouble with Persia and Prussia, Swedish and Swiss, Gandhi and Grandi?)

The second step is to picture the scene so that it is real—the busiest corner in Richmond, at the most crowded hour, a mass of shoppers, a procession of cars, a hurrying crowd, a child's cry, and a confused murmur. These two steps are necessary, but they are not yet studying; they are merely reading.

Studying begins when some mental process besides mere receptivity takes place. Now what starts turning over in your mind? Is it that children should not be allowed on crowded streets, is it that cars are dangerous in pedestrian sections, is it that part of the traffic should be routed off Broad Street, is it, perhaps, that Richmond is unkindly criticized by some motorists? The only vital point is that there be something started in the mind of the pupil. Personally, I detest having students tell me they have "read over" the assignment. That is just what too many of them do. Their part stops with the first step sometimes, generally with the second; rarely do they pause and ask themselves, "What of it if he did win a battle, or succeed to a throne?" Did it make a difference in the world; would you and I be the same if it had resulted otherwise; would I do the same thing; is this what I've always believed? Does it mean anything in history except a date that the Confederacy had to resort to the draft in 1862? Did your children stop and re-read their daily paper when the Fascist government declared for extreme disarmament?

Can a teacher teach children to think? Most emphatically, yes. You can help them read a paragraph, ask them what it suggests, tell them if they are still unable to think, try them on another, continue until each sentence and each idea will start its own reflex in their minds, gradually bring them to see parallels between past conditions and present, then ask them to take a newspaper incident, and try to judge its significance, before some editor or textbook writer has evaluated it. The only possible use of history is not to judge a past event—it is already past—but to use it in helping you judge the events that are happening in Richmond, in Washington, in Manchuria. For myself, I have no interest in a subject that is fixed, crystallized, finished. I want one in which I can take some
part; so I must approach the World War anew each year, and try to decide if I shall go into the struggle or if I will be neutral in thought as well as in fact.

In some way every historical event must be so vivified and identified that the pupil puts himself into a real situation and faces it as its own actors did. He must see himself in the situation, or he must see the situation as one of his own day. How can he learn to judge it openly and fairly if he already knows the answer and is merely looking for evidence to prove a ready-made thesis? He is in the position of the investigating committee recently appointed by President Hoover and told to bring in a report that "Admiral" Gardiner was guilty of a wilful untruth. The real question is not "How did a certain result come about?" but "What result would you have helped bring about?"

And note that this prepares him to take part in life. He is not going to have some pedagogically inclined friend to ask him each morning what problems he wishes to face in the bank, the shop, or the court. He is to meet facts, challenge them for their problem, and then meet it.

What part shall the teacher take in this training for reasoning, for original thought? Here are the principle functions of the teacher:

To test,
To correct false impressions,
To furnish tools,
To help organize,
To add his contribution,
To encourage thought questions.

Little need be said of the first four. Much as some of us dislike the drudgery of test questions, a certain number of them is necessary. No pupil should be able to say "I didn't know anything, but I contributed something to discussion and got by." There is no substitute for painstaking preparation of the facts of an assignment. And all of us realize the need of constant watchfulness lest words and ideas convey false impressions. Is a "minister" a preacher or a diplomat? Is "free trade" no tariff or no protective tariff? Equally necessary is familiarity with the material needed for next day's preparation. What more discouraging than "Maybe you can find something on this somewhere." And certainly our help is needed in organization. Possibly it is simple to the experienced teacher, but any organization beyond the familiar chronological or topical one of the textbook needs careful, constant, and sympathetic help.

Shall your organization be of the type that says "I don't know what the class will want to discuss today. I hope it will be the position of the troops before the battle of Gettysburg?" And then will you be duly surprised and delighted that the original children decide to discuss the position of the troops before the battle of Gettysburg? Does your contractor on the Federal Building in Richmond hope his men will decide to do a certain piece of work today? Not if he is going to keep his job, nor ought you and I if we are going to keep our jobs. The immediate unit, project, problem, class activity, or whatever you call it, must be thought out by you as a part of your logical objectives for your entire work. But you all know this, for you are successful teachers.

The last two functions call for more comment. One of our professional weaknesses is taking our fashions in pedagogy too seriously. My own path is covered with discarded educational panaceas. One of the latest was the socialized recitation. We are told to stay in the background, keep out of sight and presence, let the pupils manage and conduct their own recitations. Of course this is good in training for social activities, and not more than once a term it is an excellent "stunt." But remember that you must make a definite contribution in fact or explanation to each day's work.
The more widely you read, the more illustrative material you know, the more you have travelled, the more your students will know that Robert E. Lee was a real man of flesh and blood and not an idealized figure of Southern mythology.

And, lastly, you are to encourage thought questions. Of course you will not fancy that they are thinking when you do some thinking out loud before your pupils today, and tomorrow they hand it back in perfect agreement with you. Oh, no, they are quoting — and flattering — you. Most thinking is disagreeing. Have you courage to allow a child to differ with you? Is it so vitally important that the child be right in his thinking? Isn't it more important that he be encouraged to try his wings, even if he is an awkward fledgling? Let him once learn to think for himself, and he will correct his mere factual error, but let him learn to accept what is handed him, and he is safe only so far as his pedagogical nurse follows him. What will you do with the boy who says, “I don't think the South had any good reason for secession”? Shoo him down with horror? I hope not. Tell him, “Well, there were a good many Southern people, especially in Virginia, who thought that way in 1861. Now keep on studying and see if you can convince the other children that you are right, but if they convince you, say so.” Encourage that same boy to ask whether, if the Southern Confederacy had maintained its independence, it would have joined the United States in the World War. There is no past event which cannot in some way be likened to present-day happenings. I have a college senior now who must have had an excellent teacher in her freshman high school history. She can see Roman parallels to practically every present-day event, and having learned to judge Rome in terms of today eight years ago, she still thinks independently.

Don’t you sometimes wish you could know whether you are really succeeding? Latin and mathematics teachers have easy ways of measuring their success or failure. How shall I know? A student who knows more dates than I ever did was one of my poorest students. This is my only test: Can she stand on her own feet? Can she think for herself even if she happens to differ with me? And, a more deadly question, will I permit her to do it? Do any of us ask our students to think, and then dare them to do it? My old professor at the University of Chicago, Dr. A. C. McLaughlin, used to say, “The happiest moment in a real teacher’s life is when he is met in combat by one of his own students—and beaten.”

We might as well accept the fact that if we teach, they will think. And in their hands lies our fate.

“By all ye do, or fail to do
Your silent sullen pupils
Shall weigh your gods and you.”

JAMES ELLIOTT WALMSLEY

THE PHILOSOPHY OF DESPAIR

THERE are numerous evidences that there is a growing feeling of despair among the people of our country. As one travels among country folk, he finds that many farmers have ceased planting certain otherwise productive crops and have neglected to harvest those ready for gathering, because, as they say, “What’s the use?” In agriculture it is now as it was thirty years ago. The farmers’ needs receive less attention and the farmers as a group seem unable to produce a sufficient number of outstanding leaders to reconstruct (if such a thing is possible) the system of agriculture and rural life to meet changed and changing conditions. Abandoned farms, crops without markets, and products sold at less than cost of producing them, not to say anything of other factors, have made many say “I give up. There is no use of doing anything.”