GUEST SPEAKER - continued from page 5

self-motivation. Of course the people who hold this view of human nature believe that all people are born good and that it is society that makes them willful, evil, intransigent and difficult. The philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau promulgated this view way back in the eighteenth century.

However, my experience with human nature leads me to take almost a completely opposite view. I believe that man is naturally lezy, that if left in his own state he would have no sense of curiosity like all animals, he soon loses his first interest and picks up something else that happens to appeal for the moment. Sometimes I view the student as a hound pup that has not been trained to hunt. It is only the trained, mature hound that knows how to pick up a scent that is is supposed to follow, and to pass by the very interesting scents along the way which it knows have no real bearing on the goal ahead. If man is of the same basic nature, he must learn to work, he must learn to think, he must learn to persevere; he must learn to achieve; he must learn discipline and the job of the school is, in my opinion, just about that. It is an institution set up by society in which the natural man, that is the child, is in an acceptable fashion in the society that is paying for that type of education. This being the case, there are certain things that children must learn, Surely even the terrible teachers that Hall-Dennis sees in our classrooms would hope that these things could be taught in as interesting a manner as possible. But where Hall-Dennis would have us stop when we fail to interest the students, society demands that the child must learn, interested or not.

But let me get back to my main objectives; I. The libel of Ontario teachers:

Hall-Dennis seems to picture the contemporary teachers as either a clod or a knave. By inference it damns us all because nobody in my over forty years in teaching ever has tried to interfere with the teacher's methods if they effected even a tolerable "learning" result. Ipso facto, the unsatisfatory education of today, as the Report sees it, must be blamed on the teachers. While occasionally it attempts to debit the "system" and administration, there is no getting away from the inference that teachers are either stupid or malevolent. By inference and innuendo it portrays the teachers and schools as being what they have never been for atleast forty year. The Report sounds like a spirit that had left this world years ago and had come back to vent its spleen on a school system as it knew it in the early 1900's. The Report, in short, has lost contact with present-day reality. Surely the Committee knows that, no matter what the curriculum, regulations, and hierarchial thinking may be, the schools will reflect the mass opinion of the teachers in them. Why, the Committee hopes to win over Ontario teachers to its pseudomodern point of view by snide inference would require the analysis of a battery of first-string psychiatrists. 2. Denigration of the Present School System

Again, by inference, it presents an erroneous view of education today in order to "sell" its own point of view. One always expects an allegedly new doctrine to justify itself by its merits clearly argued, rather than by damning another point of view. The Committee spends little time in telling us why its doctrine is right. It in effect says, "This is educational salvation; this is what to believe and do; I have spoken." If you ask why its doctrine is right, it in effect replies, "Because we believe what is, is wrong". This gambit is used by the hucksters of Madison Avenue, but would never have been stooped to by the great thinkers of history. I cannot believe that because our present educational system is not perfect, it must follow that what they present is truth absolute. I could have wished that they had argued their point of view from logic, although I realize that this would obviously have been an impossible task. 3. Child Learning

I would hope that no Ontario teacher would - continued

teach without using his last ounce of ingenuity in his presentation of the lesson. Anything less would be unworthy of the profession. But I cannot believe that if every student does not become interested, the teacher must have failed. Nor do I believe that because some do not become interested, the lesson should not have been taught, I do believe that many things should be taught, certainly as interestingly'as possible, because the survival of our society and the student's future welfare in that society so demand. And if I fail to interest him, I think that I must try force, and even fear of consequences. I have never understood why the emotion of love is praiseworthy while the emotion of fear, is blameworthy. Any anthropologist will tell you that without the emotion of fear, mankind would never have survived into the twentieth century. If mankind forgets his sense of fear, it is questionable how long will beshis future in this atomic age.

Let me admit that I hated to learn the multiplication table. My teacher clearly explained why 2 x I = 2, and 2 * 2 =4, etc. We counted the bundles of sticks which I liked doing. But after we had learned the hang of it, I resented memorizing (that terrible word) the rest of the table. I would have been much more interested in counting sticks up to twelve bundles of twelve. And when I at first neglected to memorize the table, things happened that I found greater discomfort than memorization. A good thing too, because when you get to 5769 x 3482, the counting procedure becomes both time consuming and even boring. If you say that memorization is only temporary, rote learning, I submit that I still have "total recall" even though I seldom have had need to exercise it. Interest, yes if at all possible but, if not interest, then learning anyway! I real ize that mature people with only basic education, through interest, can learn a fantastic amount. I do not believe that immature children, without the basic disciplines of learning, will ever learn many things in any real depth through accidental interest. 4. Permissiveness and Democratic Choice

The Report, with its emphasis on student interest and the democratic right of choice, opts for the unstructured curriculum or lack of curriculum and the ungraded school, and calls for the student to be permitted to follow his own choices. He may presumable narrow his interests and follow them as fast as a sympathetic teacher thinks he can go, or even faster. If we had such a system, it seems to me that we would almost need superb, omniscient teacher for each two or three students. Such a situation did prevail under the old aristocratic private tutor system, except that the choice of interests rested with the tutor.

The criticism of such a system of education was that while it tended to produce a fantastically developed youngster in a few narrow areas, it tended to leave the student utterly ignorant of the society into which he must eventually enter and the general educational demands of that society. In any case, such an approach surely is economically impossible in a state-supported system.

Among my ex-students, at least five made penitentiary, two for a small but clumsy breaking and entering, and three for an equally stupid hold-up which involved a very silly murder. Some progressive educators would claim that these tragedies resulted from the compulsive nature of schools and society in general. I do not believe that these events were a result of the structured curriculum they had experienced, or the lack of a more permissive milieu in which they would have been able to pursue their interests. It is true that, with complete freedom of choice, they would probably have studied the techniques of robbery and might have been less amateur in their practice of this art. However I believe that some of the five could have been saved from their antisocial behaviour if we had been less permissive and more authoritation in the exercises of school discipline. They were not stupid boys. One nearly escaped

Continued page 9