

"If You Can't Beat Your Adversary, Hogan, Disqualify Him"

(By Prof. Kerr Grant)

PROF. KERR GRANT, lecturer in physics at the Adelaide University, in the following article, reasserts and enlarges upon his original criticism of a scheme of universal secondary education. He replies to his critics and says that in spite of the accusation of Mr. C. M. Ward, M.A., he was not jesting.

Mr. Ward, he says, followed the dubious precept of disqualifying his adversary when he couldn't beat him.

Prof. Grant admits that it is possible for a man to be ground between "the stones of the educational mill" and yet achieve greatness. But he adds, "Just as the robust digestive organs of a camel can extract nutriment from dry thorns and woody fibre, so there are intelligences so powerful that they will thrive on the toughest, driest, most unpalatable mental pabulum. On the other hand those of tender powers of assimilation derive as much benefit from such fodder as a baby would from a diet of mixed pickles and corn beef."

Dealing with the remarks of Mr. McIntosh (Minister of Education) he declares that the cause of genuine education will not be advanced by giving an uncritical adherence to sweeping proposals under a system which contains features both useless and effete.

Prof. Grant's article follows:

"If you can't beat your adversary, Hogan," said Mr. Dooley, "disqualify him." Mr. C. M. Ward, classics master at the Adelaide High School, evidently conscious of an unfortunate disability to give an effective answer to the criticisms offered by me, a suggestion that secondary education be made universal, began his rejoinder to my remarks with an unhappy effort to follow this dubious precept.

He accused me of writing my article with "no tongue in my cheek," allying as evidence in support of his possession of an "engaging sense of fun."

I plead "not guilty" to the perpetration of such an uncalculated and unworthy deception as Mr. Ward would impute to me, and I offer to readers of "The Mail" my emphatic assurance that the views put forward by me two weeks ago were given as sincerely though by no means complete—expressions of my views upon the topic submitted to me by the editor for an opinion. Moreover, I assert that Mr. Ward knows this as well as I do. This is clearly shown by the fact that, immediately after making this attempt to discredit the genuineness of my contentions, he proceeds to deal with them quite seriously. Why take this trouble if, as he professes to believe, they were written in jest? Mr. Ward stands self-convicted of a gratuitous and foolish piece of insincerity, which weakens whatever slight force there may be in the rest of his remarks.

Some of these I regard as trivial or irrelevant.

Others are not inconsistent with my own attitude, none leads me to retract a word of what I formerly said. My stated opinion, may I remind readers, was definitely adverse to any unqualified and indefinite proposal to extend our educational system on the lines of our present scheme of secondary education—and let me say here that I had no thought of singling out our State high schools for attack, as Mr. Ward seems to think was my purpose, on the grounds mainly:

(1) That there is no guarantee that the heavy financial burden incurred in such an extension would be compensated by an increase in the industrial or productive efficiency of the community.

(2) That the curriculum and methods of instruction obtaining in the present-day type of secondary school, excepting those designed for technical or vocational instruction, are quite foreign to the natural interests and aptitudes of youth, quite unsuited to the mentality of the average child (I did not say "all children"), and quite useless in the main as a preparation for the future avocation of the boy or girl.

(3) And that whatever benefits accrue to the pupils from spending two or three years at a secondary school—and I will freely concede that quite apart from the question of instruction there are many such benefits—these are largely offset and even outweighed by the really educative influences of responsible participation in the real activities of life.

It is a convenient presumption of a certain type of

academic educationalist that if a child is not at school he is learning nothing. Thousands of harassed parents will bear me out when I say that the natural desire of a healthy child to acquire knowledge about anything and everything under the sun, their spontaneous impulse to participate in all the activities of those around them, in short, their stirring to educate themselves—in the truest sense of the word—is one of the most striking attributes of childhood and a source, at times, of much embarrassment to their parents.

Following the articles in "The Mail"

Mr. Anthony in the Assembly this week called attention to the criticism of the State secondary education system by Prof. Kerr Grant and asked the Hon. M. McIntosh if he would have an impartial enquiry made.

The Minister replied that the article of Prof. Grant was striking because of its inconsistencies. The Government was endeavoring to get the best value for the money expended. The standard of education should be consistent with Australian requirements so that one State should not be placed at a disadvantage with another.

The statement of the Minister is dealt with by Prof. Grant in this article.

In fact, I have an uneasy suspicion that the complacency or indifference of the average parent toward the "education" which his children receive when they enter upon their schooling has its foundation in the sense of relief from the duties of a perpetual instructor thus obtained.

I cannot deal in detail with the whole of Mr. Ward's article, nor is it worth while. He gives at my statement "that education tends to kill initiative and stifles inherent ability." He tacitly agrees, unless I misinterpret him, that the accusation is justified. Let us take pains to point out that "initiative" may as easily "land a man in gaol" as lead him to high ideals. Of course it may, but—I might retort—cannot the same be said of "education"?

Of course, the "initiative" referred to is "initiative" which makes for good results and not for bad.

Is it inconceivable to Mr. Ward that there should be a system of education which, in its spirit and its practice, encourages the one type of "initiative" as much as it discourages the other? If his imagination cannot rise to this mild elevation, I fear I am wasting the time of myself and my readers in replying to him.

Mr. Ward cites the solitary case of Pauper as an illustration of the fact—which I never dreamt of denying—that it is possible for a man to be ground in the stones of the

REC. 26. 11. 29
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL TO HAVE PSYCHOLOGIST

Dr. E. A. Allen Appointed

THE time has gone by when most juveniles were treated on the prescription of Mrs. Squires—a spoonful of brimstone and treacle, administered regularly. For many years now, the North Adelaide Children's Hospital has progressed steadily modern ideas and equipment. The Patients' Department, in particular, is model of efficient planning and service.

To Help Nervous Children

The latest addition to the staff is an Honor Frank Tate, the former Victorian Director of Education, will be president, will be left unfettered in its allocation of the money.

The problems that face the hospital authorities, particularly in the Out Patients' Department, are often those of behaviour and environment. Nervous troubles have their origin in the ills of childhood, and even more serious are the cares they are laying up for adult life.

Dr. Allen will be available as a guide and counsellor in cases like these.

In her private practice Dr. Allen handles many problems of difficult and nervous children who are sent to her by medical practitioners.

She took her degree in philosophy at the London University, where she did research in practical psychology.

DUBIOUS PRECEPT ADOPTED BY MR. WARD, SAYS PROF. KERR GRANT

NO JEST IN ATTACK ON SECONDARY EDUCATION

educational mill and yet subsequently achieve greatness.

Of course it is possible! Just as the robust digestive organs of a camel can extract nutriment from dry thorns and woody fibre, so there are intelligences so powerful that they will thrive on the toughest, driest, most unpalatable of mental pabulum.

On the other hand, those of tender powers of assimilation, and they—alas, form the great majority—derive as much benefit from such fodder as a baby would from a diet of mixed pickles and corn beef. Mr. Ward admits that many great men have owed little or nothing to their education, but professes to see no significance in the fact!

High schools and colleges exist for those who wish to qualify for a professional career . . . as also for those who wish mainly to be educated." In this sentence Mr. Ward touches, I believe, near the root of the evil. It is obvious that the requirements of a professional career demand a specialised and in a sense "technical" type of education, which may well be different from that best suited to those who wish to pursue other walks in life or merely to be "educated."

The University demands by examination certain entrance standards for those entering upon its professional courses. It is undoubtedly unfortunate that these standards and examinations should dominate as they do the whole of the instruction given in the secondary schools. But responsibility for that does not lie, as Mr. Ward would place it, wholly upon the University.

Space would not permit, however, of an adequate statement of the true position here.

The parts of Mr. Ward's article with which I have dealt will serve, I think, to illustrate its general weakness. With my other critics I must deal briefly. There is a "banker" who finds my views on education "ridiculous," and who is, apparently, entirely satisfied that ours is the best of all possible systems.

It is with some amusement that I recall a discussion on the value of secondary education some 19 years ago. I recollect with perfect definiteness the somewhat distressing confidence of the professor of English of that date. One of the leading bankers (can it be the same man?) had voiced to him a bitter complaint that English—as then taught in the school—was utterly useless as a preparation for the duties of a bank officer. "We have to teach them how to write a decent letter," was one item in the indictment. "Sans doute, nous avons change tout cela." Without doubt we have changed all that."

But the main point of my remarks was not an attack upon the present state of affairs, but a criticism of the proposal to extend a similar type of higher education to all and sundry. The great majority of boys and girls will not become doctors, lawyers, bankers, or professors, but will be clerks, typists, artisans, laborers in the field, factory, or household.

REC. 28. 11. 29
HAS FREE REIN IN SPENDING £75,000

Australian Institute's Gift From Carnegie Corp.

MELBOURNE, Wednesday.—Completing Childs arrangements for a gift of £75,000, extending over 10 years, for educational research and investigation in Australia, the Carnegie Corporation of New York has attached no conditions as to methods to be followed.

The Australian Institute, of which Mr. Tate, the former Victorian Director of Education, will be president, will be left unfettered in its allocation of the money.

Vocational guidance will be the first subject of investigation. Mr. Tate has received

their corporation has approved of a grant of £50,000 to be paid in instalments of £5,000 per year for 10 years to finance the Institute.

The trustees have also undertaken to provide £2,500 a year for 10 years to cover the salary of an expert executive officer, and necessary travelling and administrative expenses.

She took her degree in philosophy at the London University, where she did research in practical psychology.

NEWS 28. 11. 29
Examiner's Error

"Parent," North Unley.—Examiners in the public examinations of Adelaide University in their annual reports are prone to make much of slips perpetrated by hapless youngsters.

Yet these men themselves are not above committing errors. A glaring mistake on the part of an examiner was made in question four in the intermediate geography examination yesterday morning.

It read as follows:—"A wireless concert in London starts at 20 h. (8 p.m.). When (local time) would the first news be heard in New York (lat. 42 degrees W.L. Pernambuco (lat. 260 degrees W.L. Port Adel-

laide (lat. 138 degrees 30 E.L.)? What would be the standard (federal) time for Albany, Port Adelaide, and Melbourne?"

Clearly longitude and not latitude of New York, Pernambuco, and Port Adel-

laide should have been indicated in the question. However, candidates have no right to assume that the examinee means something quite different from what he says.

The demoralising effect of questions carelessly framed cannot be stated for by any subsequent leniency on the part of the examiner. Once a university examiner sits the tribute of Port Adel-

laide in 138 degrees 30 E.L.

NEWS 28. 11. 29
Physics Paper

"Candidate," St. Peters.—On Tuesday a paper was put before candidates for the Physics Leaving examination on matter on which little of our work was based.

We were set a book this year called "Hadley's Everyday Physics," and most of the questions were obtained from "Paxton and Davis' Physics."

Could not the examiners use the book instead of going out of their way to call entries from other books?

"Taxpayer," Mount Gambier.—It is right to set a book for candidates for the year and then question them on an entirely different work and still expect results of a high standard.

It is unfair to demand high entries for and then waste the work of a year. Candidates should be given a chance to show their important examinations and examiners should be prevented from "catching them in this way."

[Mr. F. W. Eardley (registrar of Adelaide University) said that the complaints of "Parent," "Candidate," and "Taxpayer" would be brought before the attention of the board of examiners.]