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This bulletin was prepared in the first place as a paper to be read at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education in Nanking, July, 1924. It has been somewhat expanded in order to include a wider survey of the subject.

The subject seems worthy of treatment at this time, when the people of China are laying the foundation of their national system of education. One of the questions of greatest concern is how to make sufficient provision for the large number of children to whom an education is due. Another problem is how to avoid the creation of a vast educational machine, uniform and rigid. In the solution of both these problems private schools may play a considerable part. It is well to know the place that they fill in other educational systems, the difficulties that have been experienced, and how they have been overcome.

The function of Christian schools is just now a matter of some debate. It will be well if the problem can be considered not as an abnormal one but simply as an example of a universal educational problem. This can be done and a satisfactory solution expected only if Christian schools become no longer "foreign schools" but in a true sense "Chinese schools," under Chinese direction, embodying Chinese ideals and definitely meeting the needs of a group of Chinese citizens. They then come within the ordinary category of private schools, with which this study is concerned.

E. W. WALLACE

Shanghai,
March 2, 1925.
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THE PLACE OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN A NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Progress depends upon the interplay of two diverse and seemingly opposed principles. One is the principle of liberty,—liberty of the individual to develop according to his bent, liberty of the group to differ from other groups, liberty of new ideas to come into existence and to spread throughout society. The other principle is that of uniformity and standardization, inherent in man's nature and maintained in order that the individual may conform to the customs and ideals of his group, and that the group as a whole may conserve its individuality and may pass on to the next generation its achievements and its culture.

The history of education shows these two principles in conflict. Education has been, on the whole, a great conservative force in society. Yet there have been fashions in education, as in thought, varying with times and with races. Speaking generally, until quite recently one type of education has been dominant at one period in a nation, though in the past no legal compulsion was put upon parents to send their children to school, or to accept a particular kind of training. They were free to send their children to school or not as they chose; and to select the type of school that they preferred. Variety was not only possible but actual. Pressure exerted in favour of uniformity was social not political.

During the nineteenth century there arose the splendid ideal of education for all, perhaps the greatest contribution of that century to the progress of mankind. The failure of the principle of educational freedom to extend the advantages of education to all children led to a reaction in favor of state-organized and state-controlled schools. With this came the demand for uniformity in curricula and in methods, which reached its most complete expression in France and in Germany.

By the beginning of the twentieth century there had developed an extension of this ideal. Education came to be regarded, in certain countries, as a process to be controlled by the state for its own ends, which were the creation and strengthening of national culture and national power. This led to the development of national types of education, the deliberate creation of the state, designed to counteract the growing spirit of internationalism. It was the remarkable success of Germany in utilizing education as a nationalizing force that led other nations to follow her example.
The result of the Great War, however, has thrown doubt upon the success, even from the standpoint of national culture, of the narrowly nationalistic ideal in education. Those who believe in the universal brotherhood of man have seen that education, which as "humanism" draws men together, can as "nationalism," be made a fatally divisive force when manipulated by politicians. The signs of reaction against that extreme view of "national education" are abundant.

The world has gained immeasurably from the experience of the nineteenth century. It will never give up the conception of the responsibility of the state to insist that provision shall be made for the best possible training of all its citizens. But we are not so certain to-day as we were twenty years ago that it is necessary for the state itself to provide all the schools and colleges that are needed; and the claim of any government to exercise the right of deciding the whole content of all the education given in all the schools of the nation is vigorously challenged by the foremost educators of Europe and America.

In China educational developments, which in the west have been spread over a century or more and which have followed one after the other, are seen struggling together. The determination to provide education for all, and the attempt to make the state responsible for elementary education at least, seem to be opposed by other claims for freedom and variety, necessary in a land so extensive and with such diverse social groups.

The time seems opportune, therefore, for a discussion of the place in a national system of education of private initiative and of private institutions. We shall first consider conditions in a number of countries where modern education has been especially successful, and then proceed to draw some conclusions that may serve to indicate probable developments in the near future, especially as they affect the situation in China.
II. PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN MODERN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

1. FRANCE.

No nation of the west has developed a system of education under such highly centralized governmental control as France. We find that at the present time little place is left for private elementary education, and that its influence is comparatively slight. This fact is explained in part by the logical precision of the French mind, which excels in working out a perfect and homogeneous "system." Historically, it springs from the Napoleonic influence, which aimed at the creation of national greatness by means of organization, both military and political. The result in education has been a mechanical perfection in organization that has been both lauded and condemned by educators from other lands.

Such private elementary schools as there are enjoy remarkable freedom, once the initial difficulties of securing from the authorities permission for their establishment have been overcome. The director of the school is entirely free in his choice of methods, curricula and text books. The state has full right of inspection in reference to morals and hygiene. With regard to instruction, as well as to the books used, the state simply satisfies itself that they are not contrary to good morals, to the laws and to the Constitution. (1)

Private secondary schools, also, have large freedom within the same general limitations. The attendance at these collèges is almost as great as that in the state-provided lycées. (2)

2. GERMANY.

It was in pre-war Germany that a state first definitely utilized the schools for the production of nationalism; consequently no encouragement was given to private education. As in France, while private elementary schools were permitted they were few in number and slight in influence. They were obliged to adhere to the same standards as the public schools with respect to curricula, qualifications of teachers and inspection. (3)

Secondary schools for boys were practically controlled by the government; though it is to be remembered that they were not truly "public" in spirit, like the high schools of America, but were really "class" schools, maintained for the sons of the middle and upper classes. (4) Secondary schools for girls were for the most part privately conducted. This was due to the fact that the education of girls was a recent innovation, and had not yet been accepted as a responsibility of the state.
One feature should be mentioned; religion was taught in all elementary schools. In Germany there are two great religious groups, Lutheran and Roman Catholic; provision for the children of each group was made in separate schools. That is, Lutheran children were taught in Lutheran schools by Lutheran teachers, and Roman Catholics in schools of their own. Even Jewish children had their separate school, where there was in any municipality a sufficient number.

Under the Republic the question of the secularization of the schools is being vigorously discussed. So far no final decision has been reached. Should secularization be adopted in the public schools it is inconceivable that permission would be withheld to establish private schools in which religion may be taught.

3. ENGLAND.

Throughout her history England has been the home of private schools. The English character exalts freedom of the individual, and resents whatever appears to be interference, by individuals or by the state, with liberty of thought or of action. The history of education for more than one hundred years has been a struggle against the extreme forms of individualism in favor of the ideal of universal education, aided and directed by the state. To-day, with negligible exceptions, all elementary schools are under the direction of the national Board of Education. They are, however, of two kinds. "Council schools" are entirely built, equipped and supported out of public funds administered by the county councils. In "voluntary schools," which number more than half of the elementary schools of England, the buildings are provided not by the public authorities but by voluntary private groups, and the schools are largely managed by the representatives of these groups. "Voluntary schools" are fully recognized as integral parts of the national system, and are classified with the "council schools" as "public elementary schools"; they follow in all particulars the regulations of the Board of Education and are visited by its inspectors; they are supported by local school taxes exactly as are the "council schools"; and they share in the grants-in-aid of the Board of Education. The reason for the existence of these "voluntary schools" is the strong desire of large numbers of parents to secure for their children more religious teaching than is possible in "council schools." They are willing to contribute to the cost of such education, over and above what they pay in school taxes, by providing buildings for these "voluntary schools."

Aside from these schools, private elementary schools, in the strict sense, are rare. According to fairly recent statistics, of six million children receiving elementary education only four thousand were in schools that were officially registered
as private. But in a real sense, as we have seen, "voluntary schools" perform the functions of private schools, in that they provide a variation from the training that is given in the schools more directly under the public authorities.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND WALES. (5)

1922-23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Public Elementary Schools:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Certified Efficient Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary education, prior to 1902, was entirely given in private schools, many of which have been in existence for centuries, while others are of more recent foundation. Since 1902 many secondary schools have been established by the local educational authorities, though these are still in the minority. The Board of Education exercises a measure of control over private secondary schools by means of the oversight of their endowments, which is required by law. Private schools that are open to inspection, either by the Board or by the universities, may share in the grants of the Board.

It should be noted that the Board of Education in England, by means of its system of grants-in-aid, based upon the report of its inspectors, is able largely to increase the number of efficient schools conforming to its standards, without putting upon the tax-payers the full responsibility for their support. This is one of the valuable contributions of England to educational practice, and it is worthy of careful study.

4. THE UNITED STATES.

It is a surprise to learn what a considerable share of education in the United States is given in private schools. The following statistics are taken from the most recent Biennial Survey of Education, for the year 1920. (6)

PUPILS IN THE UNITED STATES. 1919-1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Schools</th>
<th>Private Schools</th>
<th>% in Private Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>19,378,927</td>
<td>1,515,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2,201,278</td>
<td>229,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>329,826</td>
<td>295,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,910,031</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,039,705</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-eleventh of the total number of students in the United States is in private schools and colleges. In some states the proportion is much larger, being one-sixth in Massachusetts and Illinois, and one-fifth in Rhode Island.
Private schools are expected to reach the same general standards as those under public control; but they have actually complete freedom, and are not even required to submit to inspection by the state or county educational authorities.

Reisner (7) gives as the reason for so large a number of private schools the desire of wealthy and cultured parents that their children should have a different type of education from that given in the public schools; fear by many that the moral standards of the public schools have been lowered by the increasing number of "alien" children; and the demand of many for schools in which religion may be taught. Those who support these schools, which do not share in any public funds, are willing to pay their share of school taxes and in addition to maintain the private schools to which they send their children.

Recently the state of Oregon passed a law, requiring that all the children in the state should attend the public schools, thus practically eliminating all private schools. This legislation has since been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

Almost half of all higher education in the United States is still given in private colleges and universities. Many of the largest and most famous universities are private foundations, including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, and Leland Stanford. Leaving out professional schools and normal schools, there were in attendance at colleges and universities that are classified as public institutions 195,896 students, and in private institutions 325,878. (8) Public control of higher education is exercised through the charter which each private college and university is obliged to secure from its own state. By the terms of this charter and by legislation the state maintains a measure of control of higher education.

The general American attitude to private education has been admirably summarized by Reisner:

"There is little disposition in the United States to restrict either individuals or organizations in their freedom to maintain private schools. It is pretty generally regarded as the right of the individual parent to choose some special type of institution for his children if he so desires. There is, however, a rapidly maturing conviction that the nation has a right to demand of all private schools that they measure up to the standards of educational efficiency which the public schools maintain. . . . . If it would be inconsistent with the American spirit of individual liberty to refuse private parties and associations the right to maintain their own schools and system of schools, it is no more inconsistent with the demands of national solidarity and efficiency that these schools be compelled to come up to the standards of attendance, teacher preparation, -civic
instruction and the proficiency of pupils in school work which are set up for the public schools.” (9)

5. JAPAN.

One expects to find in Japan little encouragement for private elementary schools. She has followed closely Germany's attempt to utilize the schools as effective agencies for the development under difficult modern conditions of a strong national spirit. Japan was remarkably successful in achieving the purpose that she set before her; though a growing number of her leaders believe that for a time she paid for that success too high a price, in the discouragement of personal initiative and of freedom of thought, and in the creation of a bureaucratic machine. Recent developments, however, have greatly modified the earlier policy, and Japan to-day may be cited as an example of a country in which private education fills a large and influential position.

Schools and colleges are divided into three classes: (1) government schools, supported directly by the Imperial Government, and including only colleges and universities; (2) public schools, mainly of secondary and primary grade, supported by the local prefectural and municipal authorities; and (3) private schools. Private schools are of two classes: those that are "fully conforming" to the regulations required of public schools, and those that are "partially conforming." Only the former may be called "gakko" (学校); this withholding of the name is the only disability placed upon private schools which are "partially conforming" to the government regulations. Students and graduates of private school, including those carried on under Christian or other religious auspices, suffer no legal disabilities.

All schools are obliged to be registered with the government authorities as coming under one of the above four classes. The privileges granted the students in registered schools are:

1. Postponement of conscription until after graduation.
2. The privilege of entering the civil service.
3. Qualification to enter schools of the next highest grade.
4. A 20% reduction in railway fares for teachers and students.

Schools that are recognized as "partially conforming" have freedom to teach religion and to require attendance at religious ceremonies. In private schools that are "fully conforming" the regulation against religious instruction and religious services was formerly very strict. They were not permitted on the school premises. Even with regard to these schools, however, the regulations are now operated with much leniency. Many government authorities have expressed their
conviction of the importance of religion as a moral force and have welcomed schools in which religious training is given. (10)

Less than one percent of the elementary schools in Japan are registered as private schools, and two-thirds of these are in Tokyo among the wealthy classes. A special permit must be secured for each child who wishes to attend a private school. The same standards are enforced as in the public schools. At the conclusion of their course the students are required to take a public examination for entrance into a higher school, which is provided by the State. (11)

Owing to the fact that, because of an insufficient number of schools, three or four times as many students wish to enter schools of secondary grade as can do so, there are very many private secondary schools. For the same reason private colleges and universities play a large part in Japanese education. Waseda University, for example, which is a private institution, has over two hundred professors and seven thousand students. It was founded in 1882, by the great statesman Count Okuma, as a protest against the then narrow outlook and rigid methods of the Imperial University as well as to increase the opportunities for higher education in Japan. The marked success of the private institutions in sending out into Japanese society great numbers of men of exceptionally good training and character, has been a large factor in modifying the attitude of the authorities toward these institutions.

6. CANADA.

We have referred to the manner in which Germany and England have met the demand of parents for religious training of their children. In Canada a special aspect of this problem is worthy of consideration. Two races British and French, live side by side, each speaking its own language and each holding a different form of the Christian religion, Protestant and Roman Catholic. In the province of Quebec, where the great majority of the people are French, the public schools use French as the medium of instruction and teach the Roman Catholic faith. The English-speaking Protestant minority has the right to send its children to "separate schools," where English is the medium of instruction and the religious teaching is in accordance with the Protestant form of Christianity. In other provinces, where the Roman Catholics are in the minority, a similar provision is made for them in "separate schools." These schools are recognized as part of the public system of education; and they are supported by the share of the school taxes that is paid by the parents who desire to send their children to the "separate schools." The same standards are maintained as in other public schools, and government inspection is required. The inspectors are of the race and religion of those for whom the schools are maintained.
This method has been devised in order to respect the rights of two different social groups.

7. INDIA.

Educational policy in India is still determined in the main by the famous "despatch" of 1854, which declared that "the most effectual method of providing for the wants of India in education will be to combine with the agency of the government the aid which may be derived from the exertions and liberality of the educated and wealthy natives of India and of other benevolent persons . . . . It is therefore resolved to adopt in India the system of grants-in-aid which has been carried out in this country (England) with very great success . . . . and the system will be based on an entire absence from interference with the religious instruction conveyed in the schools assisted." (12)

Elementary schools are divided into "public institutions," with over seven million students, and "private institutions," with less than seven hundred thousand students. Public institutions follow the government courses of study, are open for inspection and send pupils up to the public examinations. They are classified as (1) under public management, and (2) under private management, the former being conducted by municipalities, the latter by private committees or other groups. Both types of school receive the government grants under exactly the same conditions, except that religion may be taught in schools under private management but not in those under public management. Strictly private institutions do not follow the government regulations and they receive no grants.

Statistics for the whole country are not available, but those for the Presidency of Madras indicate the general situation. (13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under public management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under private management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that public schools under private management greatly outnumber those under public management.

Private secondary schools and colleges, if they maintain the government standards, receive recognition and share in government grants.

In a land where many races and diverse religious faiths exist side by side, and where religion is considered an essential part
of education, such a policy of recognition and assistance of private schools seems the most practicable one.

8. SCANDINAVIA.

In Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland private education is very influential; this is especially the case with regard to schools of secondary grade. In Norway, for example, 28% of the secondary schools are under private management. In Sweden aid from public educational funds is given to private schools. Cloyd says:

"A striking feature in Norwegian education is the prevalence of private institutions, either with or without state recognition or aid. This condition seems to be due to the genius of the people, who cherish and foster the rights of individual initiation. The compulsory school law does not apply to the state schools only, but permits attendance upon private schools, under proper inspection."

Because of their freedom and flexibility these schools have been important factors in the development and modification of national educational policies.

9. CHINA.

Education in China has from earliest times received the encouragement of the government, and at certain periods publicly supported schools have flourished. In the past, however, as P. W. Kuo has pointed out, the most important part in the development of Chinese education has been played by private individuals, "for education in China has been to a great extent left to private initiative." (15) The necessary standardization was secured efficiently and at comparatively small cost to the central authorities by the great public examinations.

Under the Republic, China has definitely adopted a system of public schools, with the ideal of an elementary education for every boy and girl. Progress in realizing this ideal has been steady; but even yet only a small proportion (barely one-tenth) of those within the age limits of a compulsory school law are actually attending school. Of these, at least one-half are in private institutions, some of which are among the best schools in the country; though the majority fall far below any reasonable standards. There are about half a million students in Protestant and Roman Catholic Christian schools of all grades and of varying standards of efficiency.

No definite policy with regard to private schools has yet been adopted. At least until provision can be made for all children of school age in schools that are publicly provided, it would appear wisdom to encourage private initiative, what-
ever course may be adopted in the future. P. W. Kuo, in discussing methods for financing education, says:

"The second step is to encourage private initiative. This means that private schools should be encouraged, that the old-style schools be reformed or improved through a system of awards and other devices, and that every effort put forth in China by the educators of the West should be given some form of recognition and their work placed under the control of the Chinese government." (16)

What the final attitude may be toward private schools is suggested by a series of resolutions adopted at the Third Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Education, in July, 1924. It is too soon to know what action the Board of Education in Peking will take toward these recommendations; they indicate a possible solution of a universal problem, adapted to conditions in China. (17)

10. SUMMARY.

What we have found in this brief survey may be summarized as follows:

(1) There is no modern nation in which private schools of all grades are not given some place.

(2) In certain nations the government itself undertakes to maintain sufficient elementary schools for all children of school age; private schools are few and exert little influence. This is the case especially in France, Germany and Japan.

(3) In a few nations private elementary schools are encouraged and are part of the system of public instruction, maintaining the same standards, subject to the same regulations, open to the same inspection and receiving the same grants as the publicly provided schools. This is the case in England and in India.

(4) In the majority of countries, while there is freedom for the establishment of private schools, they must be supported entirely aside from public educational funds; and those who support them are obliged to pay their full share of the school tax. This is the condition in the United States and other nations.

(5) In Germany (at least before the establishment of the Republic), in England and in Canada, provision is made for the teaching of religion to children of diverse religious faiths by means of separate schools, which are integral parts of the national system.

(6) In general, private elementary schools are required to maintain adequate standards in such matters as school buildings, curricula and the qualifications of teachers, but much freedom
is permitted to vary from the "public" type, provided these minimum standards are maintained.

(7) Except in France and Germany extensive use is made of private schools to provide sufficient opportunities for the increasing number of young people desiring a secondary (or high school) education. The maintenance of reasonable standards is assured either by inspection, as in England, by leaving examinations, as in Scandinavia, or by entrance examinations to college, as in the United States.

(8) Private colleges and universities are almost universally influential. In Japan and in the United States, for example, they have played a large part in modifying the scope and spirit of higher education.

(9) The present tendency is to teach no religion in publicly maintained schools and colleges, but to permit full freedom of religious teaching to private institutions. Generally speaking, private schools exist because of the desire of parents to have religion included in the training of their children. This desire is growing, and there are many indications of a reaction against an extreme form of "secular education" in the United States and elsewhere, which will lead either to an increase in the importance of private schools, or, as is more probable, to some provision whereby children in public schools may be given the opportunity of receiving religious training.
III. PRINCIPLES THAT DETERMINE THE PLACE OF PRIVATE EDUCATION

We have studied the practice throughout the world in reference to private education. We shall now consider briefly some of the principles upon which this practice is based.

1. We have seen that originally all education was privately supported and controlled. State provision of education, in the west at least, is a modern development. It is, therefore, not unnatural to infer, as is sometimes done, that private schools are a survival of an outworn policy. This inference, however, is far from correct. While it is true that some private institutions owe their present existence to tradition rather than to a clearly thought out policy, by far the greater number have been founded to meet a definite purpose, and are maintained because they do fill a real need in present day education.

It is sometimes objected that the maintenance of private schools tends to develop class distinctions in society and to set up barriers between different social groups; and it is therefore assumed that they are inimical to the interests of democracy. But it is forgotten that the principle of democracy demands that each individual shall have the fullest opportunity possible to develop his own personality; that the individual members of a social group are not alike but have decided individual differences; and that the highest form of unity, toward which democracy strives, is not simple but complex, and embraces in a large unity innumerable variations. The fullest development of the principle of democracy is not seen in that country which to-day is attempting to impose upon all citizens a certain form of political, economic and religious belief, but in such countries as the United States and England, where the freedom of the individual is jealously guarded.

It would be contrary to the spirit of democracy, therefore, to forbid any group of citizens to establish private schools, or to withhold from any individual the right to send his children to such schools. Modern democracies assume that until a child is of age to choose for himself, his parents are responsible to decide the type of education that he should receive; after he reaches the age of choice, that responsibility becomes his own. The state is responsible to see that full provision is made for the best education of all its children, but not necessarily to maintain schools for all; though as a matter of convenience the members of the state are more and more making that provision through so-called public schools.

Much of the misunderstanding here has come through a confusion of the conception of the state as the body politic,
composed of all its members, with that of the state as the organ of government, composed of representatives of all the citizens, and through which their will is achieved. In the former and larger sense, a state system of education would embrace all forms of education that are maintained by any of the members that compose the state, and that represent their various ideals and desires for their children; it would include many types and forms of variation. In the latter and more usual sense, by the term “state system” is meant that form of education which is maintained by the officers chosen by the citizens to carry on the functions of government. As such it sometimes tendstoward a bureaucratic standardization. The citizens imagine that what is provided is a type of education that represents their ideals and interests; whereas it may be more representative of the ideas of the group of officers who for the time being are in charge of education.

The dangers of bureaucracy in education are seen in clearest light in Russia today, but they exist in every nation. It is exactly in those large and well-organized system of state schools that the danger of ignoring or stifling the need for variation is most real. It is here, as modern educators have come to realize, that private education has an important place to fill.

Dr. Paul Monroe has stated the obligation under which the modern state rests to private education.

"The kindergarten, manual training, vocational training, much of scientific training, the education of the blind, the deaf, the educational treatment of the various dependents and delinquents, in fact the addition of almost every new feature to educational practices, has come into the public school system through being tried out and demonstrated in private schools. . . . . The existence of the private school, or rather the non-state school, is the sine qua non of progress. This is merely in accord with the fundamental natural law underlying all evolution and growth, that such evolution comes from the selection of variance, and unless you permit this liberty of variation, there is very little hope of progress." (18)

From another part of the world comes a similar statement, by a Norwegian educator, Rektor D. F. Knudsen:

"I must in one word maintain that the intelligent interests that the higher school stands for are best safeguarded through a system of state, communal, and private schools; each has its advantages and defects; cooperation can best secure that the special advantages of each shall exercise its full effect and that the corresponding defects shall be neutralized. So far as I know, there is no nation that has been willing or able to dispense with private initia-
tive, which is like a free man as compared with one bound hand and feet, like a creature that moves by the side of one fast chained to the ground.” (19)

2. The encouragement of private initiative in education is of value for other reasons. The state, as we have seen, is responsible for seeing that sufficient schools are provided to insure adequate education to all children. The government can either itself secure through taxation the total funds required to build and maintain all the necessary schools and colleges, or it can encourage private initiative to supplement its efforts, and so relieve the general tax-payer of part of the burden of education. This latter method is especially useful in nations that have not yet been able to realize universal education, and where many citizens are not so convinced of the value of education as to be willing to pay large sums in taxes for school purposes. This is the situation in India, in Japan (in secondary and higher education), and in China.

But the development of private initiative means more than the securing of additional funds. The success of any system of education depends upon the moral support given to it by those whom it serves. Mere paternalism on the part of the government tends to stifle individual interest. The granting of freedom to the local community, and to groups in the community, to develop their own ideals in education, is the surest way of building up schools that are truly “national,” because they are the expression of the life and of the interest of the people themselves. In Scandinavia and in England, as we have seen, there are many people who believe so firmly in the value of private schools that they are willing to pay for them over and above the support which they are obliged to give to the public schools through school taxes. In other lands, as in the United States, local and individual interest has been enlisted chiefly in the public schools. Whatever the method, this interest of the people in their schools is the most valuable asset that the national system of education can possess. Where it takes the form of private schools, the government is well advised to see that they are recognized as part of the national system, in some such manner as we have found in our study. In this way they are seen to be supplementary to the public schools, rather than its rivals, a promising field for educational experiment, and a stimulus to the public schools.

3. Reference may well be made here to one aspect of our subject about which there has been less agreement and more controversy than any other. That is, the place of religion in education. We have seen that in most of the nations of the west religious teaching was originally a part of the curriculum. With the rise of the ideal of education for all, however, the inclusion of religious teaching in public schools created
difficulties. As a result it is, in certain countries, deliberately excluded from the course of study.

There are, however, many parents who are not satisfied with such "secular education." They believe that religion is an integral part of the education of the individual, and they desire that their children should not be deprived of it. They have a conviction that the argument that religion is a matter that should be left to the home and the church ignores the rights of children of parents who are careless of religious duties in the home. The psychological and educational aspects of the problem have been clearly stated by an American philosopher, Prof. W. E. Hocking, of Harvard University.

"It is the business of education to see that none of the more general instincts or groups of instincts have an inadequate exposure.

"Mr. Bertrand Russell voices a common objection to immersing the defenceless younger generation in the atmosphere of the faiths, religious and political, that have made our nations. I venture to say that the greatest danger of politically-guided education, particularly in democracies which feel themselves obliged to cancel out against one another the divergent opinions of various parties, is that the best places will be left blank, because it is on the most vital matters that men differ. The pre-war experience of France in secularized education has furnished a striking instance of the principle that in education a vacuum is equivalent to a negation. In one case, as in the other, instinct is robbed of its possibilities of response.

"Children have rights which education is bound to respect. The first of these rights is not that they be left free to choose their own way of life, i.e. to make bricks without either straw or clay. Their first right is that they be offered something positive, the best that the group has so far found. Against errors and interested propaganda the growing will has natural protection: it has no protection against starvation, nor against the substitution of inferior for good food." (20)

At the present time a widespread revival of interest in this problem is passing over the United States. It is probable that some form of religious teaching will, as a result, be included in the requirements of many state school systems, though it will necessarily be of a non-sectarian or undenominational character.

Where, owing to religious differences, the inclusion of religious training in the public schools is not possible, or is objectionable to the majority of the parents, there is the greater reason for the existence of private schools that serve the in-
terests of one group and so can provide religious teaching of a more definite character. So long as these schools maintain the standards of the public schools in other subjects and are open to government inspection, there is good reason why they should be encouraged.

There is a further aspect of this matter. Religious freedom is one of the most cherished of the rights of mankind, for which men have gladly died in the past, and for which they would be willing to make large sacrifices to-day. But the principle of religious freedom, we are coming to see, involves not merely the right of the individual to his personal religious beliefs, but also the right to give to his children that training in religion which he desires for them. If such training cannot, for any reason, be given in the state-supported schools, there is the more reason why permission should be granted to maintain private schools to meet these legitimate desires. It is for this reason, chiefly, that in the United States so many so-called "parochial schools" are found existing side by side with the public schools.

4. There is another reason why private schools appear to be a necessary part of a national system of education. From the time of Pericles in Greece and of Confucius in China, learning and education have been the most powerful forces to bind together individuals and social groups. They have over­passed the boundaries of nations and of races. Europe during the middle ages was broken up into a multitude of warring states. But the student of the new learning passed with little difficulty from one country to another, and found friends wherever he went. It remained for Prussia, in her desire to weld into one nation the numerous small states into which the German people were divided, to discover how to utilize education as a nationalizing force. She invented “education to the state, for the state, by the state,” in order to make, “not men but Germans.” *(21)* In this she was false to the nature of education, and she paid the penalty.

Unfortunately, her great outward success before the Great War impressed other nations, and there are still many people who fail to read the lesson of the War for the educator. The British Labor Premier, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, warned an audience of this danger in a recent address. “We who believe in nationalism... must see to it that nationality is not going to mean exclusiveness.” His words might be paraphrased for our purpose: “We who believe in education must see to it that national education is not going to mean exclusiveness.”

This is but one aspect of a larger issue. Bigness, monopoly in every department of life tend to develop exclusiveness and to permit no competition. Even state-maintained education is apt to be intolerant of private schools, especially when their ideals and methods differ. Yet we have seen that it is
just because they are different that there is educational justi-
ification for them. For a people who wish to progress, who are
dissatisfied with the present state of society, whether in poli-
tics, industry or education, variation in education is the great
hope, the one method for advancement and reform. The
power of ecclesiasticism in education, which has been found
detrimental to progress, is no longer to be feared. But there is
today danger lest the high ideal of “national education” be
prostituted to serve the narrow conceptions and the selfish aims
of the politicians who from time to time control governments.

A modern philosopher, German by race, French by train-
ing, international in his sympathies, has put in startling words
this danger:

“We are living today under the sign of the collapse of
civilization.

“Civilization can only revive when there shall come
into being in a number of individuals a new tone of mind, indepen-
dent of the one prevalent among the crowd and in
opposition to it, a tone of mind which will gradually win
influence over the collective one, and in the end determine
its character.

“A new public opinion must be created privately and
unobtrusively. The existing one is maintained by the
popular press, by propaganda, by organization, and by
financial and other influences which are at its disposal.
This unnatural way of spreading ideas must be opposed by
the natural one, which goes from man to man and relies
solely on the thoughts and the hearer's receptiveness for
new truth. Will the man of today have strength to carry
out what the spirit demands from him and what the age
would like to make impossible?” (22)

We should all endorse these words, even though some of us
might not ourselves put the matter in such a striking form.
That education should not merely provide for the transfer of
the ideals of society as it exists, but should also make it possi-
bile for new ideas to arise and to operate in the modification of
society as it is, would be denied by none. It can scarcely be
denied, also, that one of the functions of private education is
to make possible these new thoughts and new ideals, which the
large public systems do not so readily promote. Especially is
it right to make it easy for private schools to perform this
function in a time like ours, when the old civilizations seem
near to dissolution, and mankind waits and longs for some
better life than it yet has known.

5. We have reached the heart of the problem of modern
educational administration. The past century has seen a slow
but a successful fight to secure the advantages of education
for all children. The battle for national school systems is won, and won, we believe, for ever. There is no further room for debate on that matter.

But there is not yet unanimity as to how the national schools should be maintained and controlled. The advocates of one side would have all schools and colleges provided and maintained by public funds, under the immediate direction of public officials. We have indicated the reasons why this method is probably most suitable for the larger number of schools, but not for all. The advocates on the other side would have the final control of all educational institutions in the hands of the state, but side by side with the publicly provided schools would leave a place for those established and managed by private individuals and groups, under the general oversight of the state.

This control, as we have seen, is exercised through the standards set up by the state educational authorities, by means of public inspection of all schools, and, in many places, by examinations that are required of all graduates of public and private schools alike. By such a method the ends of national education are achieved, while individual initiative, individual ideals, and individual freedom are preserved. The tendency throughout the world appears to be in this direction.
1. As we have seen, education in China has been largely a matter for private schools and private tutors. It is only within the last twenty years that an attempt has been made to build up a system of public education; and while remarkable success has been achieved, in face of the magnitude of this problem, yet China is still far from realizing the ideal of education for all her children. Not more than one-sixth of the children of school age are yet in school. It is natural that in such a situation those who are interested in seeing adequate facilities for the education of all should welcome the aid that is given through private schools.

It is in accord with the democratic nature of Chinese society that so intimate a matter as education of the children of the family should, in the past, have been a concern primarily of the family. It is scarcely to be doubted that in the future many parents will prefer private schools to those conducted by the public authorities. We may expect that in China private schools will continue to perform an important function, through one that is relatively less extensive than in the past.

During these years China is assimilating the knowledge and civilization of the west; she is developing an educational content and method which will incorporate elements from the west into a system that is adapted to her own culture and the needs of the coming generations. Far-seeing educators recognize the value of having in China a number of institutions which embody the educational ideals and methods of western countries. Considered as experimental and demonstration schools they should serve the public system in numerous ways.

Religious liberty has been guaranteed by the constitution of the Chinese Republic. Religion is a part of human experience which education cannot wholly neglect. Because no way has yet been found by which it can have a place in the public schools and colleges, there is the more reason why room should be left for private institutions which can experiment with religious teaching, and demonstrate its place in education.

2. For these reasons there seems every reason why in a comprehensive national programme of education, place should be given to private schools, and why they should be granted the utmost freedom of variation from the public schools, provided that they maintain such standards as seem necessary to guarantee to their students the essentials of a good education.

Dr. P. W. Kuo states the matter from the financial aspect. "In the meantime the matter of financing the new educational system remains as one of China's unsolved
problems. Under such circumstances two immediate steps might be taken. One is to avoid all unnecessary expenditure. The second step is to encourage private initiative. This means that private schools should be encouraged, that the old-style schools be reformed or improved through a system of awards and other devices, and that every effort put forth in China by the educators of the West should be given some form or recognition and their work placed under the control of the Chinese government.” (23)

More recently, the matter has been stated from the standpoint of a western educator, Dr. Paul Monroe, of New York. Dr. Monroe is probably more familiar with educational developments in China than any other westerner, and he holds in a remarkable degree the confidence of thoughtful Chinese educators. In 1921 he spent some months in China, at the request of the group of educators who are now represented by the National Association for the Advancement of Education, making a careful study of the educational situation. Largely as a result of his report the new “6-6-4 system” of organization was adopted. At the conclusion of his visit Dr. Monroe was asked to make a statement on the subject of private education, and especially of the place of schools and colleges under Christian auspices. His conclusion is embodied in these sentences.

“In the development of an educational system it is necessary to keep in mind two principles: first, the need for the establishment of effective standards of accomplishment to which all of the educational work should measure up; second, the need for sufficient flexibility to provide for that variation which is necessary to social experimentation and hence to progress.”

The standards to which he refers are, sufficient attention to Chinese language and its use as the medium of instruction; adequate teaching of Chinese history, geography and literature; satisfactory qualifications required of all teachers; and due representative of nationals on the teaching staffs and administrative bodies of educational institutions.

“From the point of view of the educational interests of the state, even of those of the government itself, it is desirable that the widest possible range of private educational experimentation should be permitted, always provided that the minimal essentials required by the state are observed. Particularly is such freedom desired where the development of the system is in its earlier stages and also where the educational needs are far beyond the ability of the government adequately to meet. Furthermore, such freedom is in consonance with the purpose and spirit of
democracy, and the contrary practice of rigid control quite in violation of both the spirit and purpose." (24)

3. The problem of private education in China is complicated by the presence of Christian schools, established in the first instance by westerners, and maintained for the sake of providing an education in which the Christian religion is an integral part. Such schools can expect to find a permanent place in the Chinese system of education only as they lose their foreign character, and become truly Chinese in spirit and in form, serving the needs of the Christian group in Chinese society and coming within the category of private schools.

This subject is handled in an able manner by Dr. P. W. Kuo. His conclusion is that a place should be made for the Christian schools in a comprehensive plan of national education.

"The present condition in China seems to warrant the adoption of some system of recognition which requires the fulfilment of certain educational standards, but takes no account whatever of the religious teaching . . . .

"The experience of Japan and India, and the educational condition in China, all point with favor to the introduction of a system of recognition and control of missionary education. Such a step would be beneficial in more than one way. It would enable the government to exercise its legitimate control and supervision of the educational work of missionaries as over other private education. Through this control the government can utilize the schools and colleges supported by religious bodies to supplement the national educational work, which for some time to come will be handicapped by the lack of funds. It gives the government also an opportunity to see that missionary education not only really educates but educates in such a way that the graduates will be thoroughly Chinese in spirit, fully in sympathy with the best thought and feeling of their country, and not creatures of a new kind, ill adapted to the environment in which they must by force of circumstance live and work." (25)

Such recognition and regulation of Christian schools would be acceptable to those who are responsible for their maintenance, and whose declared desire it is that they should be "thoroughly good schools, patriotic and national in atmosphere and influence, avoiding all exotic and foreign characteristics, promptly and fully meeting all government requirements, and cooperating with government education in all practicable ways, and at the same time furnishing a healthy variant from the uniform standard." (26)

This quotation from the Report of the China Christian Educational Commission represents the attitude of all forward-looking Christian educationalists. Christian schools and colleges seek no other rights or privileges than those that are
accorded to other private schools. They are ready to meet government requirements of curricula, qualifications of teachers, and membership of boards of control. They expect that the educational authorities will continue to recognize the value of these institutions as variants from the government schools and colleges, and that they will not make such demands upon them as will prevent the Christian institutions from making their distinct contribution to China's educational development.

4. In conclusion we quote again from the statement by Dr. Paul Monroe:

"Somewhat to my surprise I have found during my recent educational investigation that the private educational ventures in China under purely Chinese auspices are very numerous, and more surprised to find that in every community such schools were numbered among the best. In a similar way the mission schools are often of superior type and quality, and many of them do afford suggestions and help. Altogether aside from my interest in the philanthropic endeavor of my country and of the work of Christian missions, and wholly from the standpoint of the development of an effective governmental system to education, I believe that it is desirable to afford the educational efforts of such missions the greatest possible freedom, provided they come up to the minimal essentials of a positive legitimate character, to be required of all schools and enforced in government schools as well as in those of a private character." (27)

Quite recently Dr. Monroe has again been in China, and he has authorized the following statement under his signature.

"PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN CHINA

A STATEMENT BY DR. PAUL MONROE,

Shanghai, January 17, 1925

There is a larger aspect of this question of the place to be accorded to private schools, that is, its bearing on the whole Chinese people. Progress comes by variation and selection. Without this there is no growth. Competition between Christian and other private schools and government schools is healthy for the government schools. If the stimulus of individual endeavor is removed, government education will suffer. At the present time the greatest stimulus to government education in China is mission education from abroad. The time will come when it will be recognized that this has been the fundamental factor that has set government education on its feet. It would be disastrous to government education to remove this stimulus."
Japan has come to recognize this value which comes from variant types of education and has reversed its former attitude toward private education. It now gives a very large margin of freedom to it.

Those who, at the present time, are agitating for the eliminating of Christian schools are unknowingly working for the curtailment and limitation of the very thing they desire; that is, the development of government education. Any repressive, undemocratic, illiberal action curtailing the legitimate function of these schools is apt to return as a boomerang upon government schools by an illiberal partisan government of the future. The most that should be asked is the adoption of a minimum governmental curriculum, the attainment of a government standard of efficiency in carrying out the program and the right of visitation to see that such standards are maintained. Beyond this there should be freedom. Such freedom will redound to the benefit of government schools as well as to private enterprise.

(Signed) Paul Monroe." (28)
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