

BULLETIN

OF THE

FIRST DISTRICT NORMAL SCHOOL

KIRKSVILLE, MISSOURI

Volume XVIII

Number 4

APRIL, 1918

(Publisht in February, 1919)

Publisht Monthly

Modern Language Series

No. 3.

Enterd as second class mail matter April 29, 1915, at the post office at Kirksville, Missouri,
under the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912.

DIVISION OF GERMAN AND FRENCH

JOHN R. KIRK

President

JACOB WILHELM HEYD, A. B.-Ph. M.,
Professor of German and French

THE FOREN LANGUAGE SITUATION IN MISSOURI

The world is just now emerging from a nightmare of carnage and hate. Autocracy in Germany and many other lands has fallen and is everywhere tottering. Free republics are arising upon the shattered ruins of the central empires and the whole world is about to enter upon a momentous period of reconstruction, which will shake the very foundations of every existing human institution. Never before have whole peoples realized the need of mental and intellectual preparedness as today. France is reconstructing her whole educational system. England for the first time in her history is establishing a democratic, state-supported, universal education, and even the sleeping giant of China is being aroused and is adopting a phonetic letter alphabet, so that her benighted millions may become literate and enlightened. Wherever education is being reconstructed, modern languages are given an unprecedentedly prominent place, especially the languages of the peoples with whom a state of hostility still exists. In Germany, English, French and Russian; in France, English and German; in England, French, German and Russian.

How about our own country? The orgies of hate, thru which we have been passing since our entrance into the war, have practically driven German from the high schools. Where local boards have not done it, authority higher up has arbitrarily stepped in and completed the task. And that in spite of President Wilson's plea that we were at war with German autocracy and not with her people or her language. The United States Commissioner of Education has also warned against too rash action. Yet the "Bolsheviki" are abroad in the world even in the field of education, and we are in danger of "throwing out the child with the bath."

As to universities and colleges, Dr. E. C. Roedder of the University of Wisconsin by means of a questionnaire has ascertained that the study of German in these schools has been reduced by about sixty percent. To determine how far this destructiv force has effected the amount of foren languages taught in the high schools of Missouri the writer examined the lists of High School Teachers, issued yearly by the State Department of Education, for the years 1914-15, 1915-16, 1916-17, 1917-18 and 1918-19.

The high schools were tabulated as to the foren languages taught and the relativ number of schools having one or more of such languages in the curriculum. St. Louis and Kansas City were not included in this tabulation. Since German has been practically banished, the question becomes, has an equivalent substitute been provided? For just as history cannot take the place of science, nor mathematics the place of English, so only a modern language can take the place of a modern language displaced.

The tabulation shows that the approved high schools increased from 328 in 1914-15 to 521 in 1918-19, while the number of high schools having no foren language at all, neither ancient nor modern, increased from 43 in 1914-15

to 177 in 1918-19, or from a little less than one in eight to a little less than one in three.

Of the 149 first class high schools in 1914-15 all had Latin, 111 had German, two French and one Spanish in addition. In 1918-19, of the 267 similar high schools 21 had no foren language, 241 had Latin, 13 had German, 66 French and 32 Spanish, either alone or in combination with other languages.

In 1914-15 there were 53 second class high schools of which one had no foren language, 32 had Latin only, 19 had Latin and German and one German only. Of the 95 high schools of this class in 1918-19 33 had no foren language, 62 had Latin only, 2 had French and one had Spanish in addition.

There were 126 third class high schools in 1914-15. Of these 42 had no foren language, 70 had Latin only, 9 had Latin and German and 5 had German only. Of the 159 high schools of this class in 1918-19 123 had no foren language, 33 had Latin only, while three had German and one French.

Thus it is evident that even in first class high schools the study of Latin has by no means kept pace with the increase of schools of this class. In second and third class high schools the decrease has been marked. The high schools having German increased from one in four in 1914-15 to one in three in 1917-18, with some French and Spanish. Then came the banishment of the German and in 1918-19 less than one in five had any foren modern language at all. Counting in the fact that no new German classes were started this year, and the few schools still having German, had it in the second year only, one sees that the slump has been enormous.

The State Superintendent of Schools did not give the usual tabulations of the numbers of students studying the various subjects in each high school, so no comparison can be made in this respect. This would however show the enormous decrease in the number of students now studying modern languages.

From observation and reports it appears that French and Spanish are being taught by the old translation method, like Greek and Latin. Reading in this method is simply translating from the foren into the nativ tongue, composition is translation of English into the foren language. Originality and ingenuity have no place in that system. Only one way is correct, since all pupils do exactly the same work and in exactly the same way. Some teachers in different parts of the state have complained to the writer that they cannot get their pupils to speak the language studied. But that is the natural outgrowth of the method used. Translation defeats the very object of modern language study, the power to think and give expression to thought in the foren idiom. Only the use of conversation from the first and the banishment of translation as a class exercise will develop this power. And in this power to think in the foren tongue lies the most powerful incentiv to do their best for both teacher and pupil. Let me repeat: Translation as a regular classroom exercise has no place in modern language teaching, and the sooner teachers wake up to this fact the better for them and the language which they are teaching. The one thing above all else which made German so popular in many high schools of the state and especially in non-German communities

was the fact that those teachers were able to use the direct method. They led the pupils to think in the German in conversation, in reading, in composition and in the singing of German songs. If any teachers of modern languages do not find the same response in this respect, it is largely the fault of the translation method, which they are using. The teacher of modern languages should take an inventory and see where the fault lies. The school authorities should see to it that only well prepared teachers who know at least the fundamentals of phonetics are employed and that German is again given a place as an elective in the high school curriculum. Unless these things are done modern language study will keep on losing ground as it has so surely done the past year, which shows fewer schools teaching them, fewer pupils studying them and less efficient methods used in the classroom. Can the schools of Missouri afford to allow the present and future generations of high school pupils to pass on without even giving them the opportunity of gaining a practical, usable knowledge of at least one of these foreign languages, with all that that means to them, the state and the nation in commerce, science and in the arts?

The purpose of this bulletin is to help answer this question by gathering the opinions of men of prominence in this country, outside of teachers of German or persons, whose opinion because of specialization in the line of the German language and literature, might be biased. We are selecting the opinions of men, whose interests lie in other directions, and for whom German can be only a means towards success in their chosen field of endeavor, whether that be letters, science, the industries or commerce.

We are also giving the attitude of England and France as expressed by their most authoritative governmental commissions. They are all opinions which are well worth our serious thought and consideration.

First let a few of our leading thinkers and educators speak. As early as 1917 P. P. Claxton, United States Commissioner of Education after examining the reports from 163 cities, representing a population of 25,000 or more, and their opinions expressed in regard to abolishing the teaching of German from the high schools gave the following "Suggested Policy": "There is general agreement among educators and public men, both in this country and abroad, that there should be no interference with the existing high school and college provision for the teaching of German; that a knowledge of the German language is more important now than it was before the war. The upper grades, especially where organized as junior high schools, may quite properly offer foreign languages, including German, but educators generally look upon the teaching of foreign languages in the lower elementary grades as of very questionable value." Among other similar expressions is a letter from Mr. Claxton to the President of the University of South Dakota a part of which we quote: "In reply to your letter of February 26, I must say that I can not agree with those who would eliminate German from the high schools and colleges of the United States at this time. It is, of course, desirable now, and always is, that nothing should be taught in any language in our schools or elsewhere that would tend to create a spirit of disloyalty to our country

or to the American ideals of freedom and democracy. But the fact that we are now at war with Germany, should not, I believe, affect in any way our policies in regard to the teaching of the German language in our schools."

On this subject in a letter dated April 25, 1918 to the writer, in response to an inquiry, Dr. Henry Pratt Judson, President of the University of Chicago wrote: "There is no doubt that German has been taught in some schools as a means of political propaganda. On the other hand, German is taught in colleges and high schools and in some other schools as the means of acquiring highly desirable knowledge. These two different things should be carefully differentiated. On the whole, in the present circumstances I am inclined to think it inadvisable to continue teaching German in public elementary schools. On the other hand, I should not regard it as advisable to drop the teaching of German from colleges and secondary schools. The only qualification I would make would be that I should see to it that under no circumstances is the study required, either directly or indirectly, and that where it is taught full opportunity should be given to take another modern language, preferably French or Spanish, for those who so desire. The real center of the whole question lies in the teacher. Teachers who are thorough-going Americans, irrespective of their own nationality of origin, will use the language as it should be used, as a means of culture, and not as it should not be used, as a means of converting Americans into non-Americans."

Frank C. Barnes, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. contributed a very practical article to the *Modern Language Journal* Feb. 1918, on the subject "Shall German be dropped from our schools?"

In order to warrant the claim that the article was not written for his bread and butter, he got the testimony of men outside of the teaching profession. He says: "It therefore seemed better to put before you something in the nature of a symposium of opinions of men of prominence who are in other lines of work than our own but who, from experience and connections, are in position to judge of the value of German as a tool in the cultural and scientific and business activities of the present and of the coming generations of students. I began, then, by sending out to fifty-five such men, engaged in business, science, letters, and administration, a letter which contained this paragraph:

"—There is at present in many quarters a tendency on the part of school boards and some other bodies in charge of educational matters to discontinue or at least discourage the study of the German language in our schools because we are at war with Germany. In view of the great value of this language, both from the cultural and pedagogical side and from the commercial or so-called practical standpoint, is this wise or unwise? From the point of view of the educator and of the merchant has not this language now, and will it not continue to have, regardless of the war and its outcome, the same great worth as a subject of study in our high schools and colleges which it has had in the past?

"Nearly all of the addressees answered promptly. In the abstracts of their letters and in the quotations given below I have been careful to make

no change and to omit nothing which could in any degree alter the exact meaning or purport of the writer's original words."

Five of these men were positively opposed to the teaching of German in the universities, six had something to say on both sides and the rest were positive for retaining German in the high schools and universities. I shall quote a few of the latter as given by Mr. Barnes:

1. "President Hibben of Princeton writes: 'I am thoroughly in agreement with you that the war with Germany should not lead us to discontinue or discourage the study of the German language in our schools. That would be a very narrow minded policy and quite unworthy of our American spirit'."

2. "Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz of the General Electric Company says: 'Whatever pedagogical or general educational reason for teaching the German language existed before, naturally exists with the same force to-day. However, by the world war a stronger reason for Americans to learn the German language, has been added in the probability and expectation of America's falling heir to much of the foreign business formerly done by Germany'." He points out that at the present moment the German language offers one of the most available means for communication in the business world with South America, Russia and Japan, and that this is particularly true in the case of Russia."

3. "Dr. Leonard Wickenden, chief chemist of the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Company, writes: 'I have heard with dismay of the proposal to discourage the study of the German language in our schools. It is difficult to see in what way Germany would suffer from such a step, but it is easy to see how greatly America would suffer. To do this thing would be a most obvious method of giving aid and comfort to the enemy. If this country is to hold its own commercially against Germany it must have more and better research chemists, and the research chemist who does not know German is handicapped at every point.' He adds a plea for the teaching of French also."

4. "Dr. W. R. Whitney, chief chemist of the General Electric Company, has these statements in his letter: 'I shall be sorry if any serious steps are taken to stop the teaching of German, at least to those who plan to be scientists or engineers. * * * A large part of our ability to proceed with such work as combating disease with anti-sera, and similar modern advances, is due in part to painstaking German investigators who publish their work. * * * With due respect to other countries the German scientist has published as much as any other and this work should be available to interested Americans. In the John Crerar Library in Chicago, the most representative scientific library in this country, books in German make up nearly 30 per cent of the total number. At the library of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the relation of German books to English is 2 to 1. In the library of our Research Laboratory over three-eighths of the space on the shelves is occupied by German books. And it even now is an every-day experience in our library that many of the best articles and reference books are closed to young engineers by their inability to read German.'"

5. "Professor L. M. Dennis, of Cornell, thinks that it would be a grave mistake to discontinue or limit the instruction in German and that to close to our students of chemistry the sources of information afforded by German publications would have an almost paralyzing effect on the students' success whether in their university studies or in government service or in the chemical industries generally. He asks this question: 'Suppose our war department should obtain possession of a German gas mask that is superior to anything that the Allies have devised, or should learn a German recipe for making an explosive that is more powerful than any that we are producing: * * would the antagonists of the German language think that our troops ought to be deprived of the protection of the masks or of the use of the high explosive because both were of German origin?'

Bishop Theodore Henderson of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Detroit as quoted by the Literary Digest from the Detroit Free Press, after a bitter attack on pro-Germanism in this country said among other things:

"My mother was born in Germany and she was born in the town where the Kaiser received his early education. I have other ancestors who occupied high positions in the German Government. There is a lot of German blood in my body.

"But every drop of blood in me is dedicated to the holy purpose of wiping Kaiserism off the face of this earth.

"I am a pacifist with the accent on the last syllable—*fist*. I DO NOT BELIEVE IN STAMPING OUT THE GERMAN LANGUAGE IN THIS COUNTRY. I BELIEVE IN STAMPING OUT PRO-GERMANISM, BUT LET US TAKE THE GERMAN LANGUAGE AND USE IT TO SPREAD PATRIOTISM AMONG THOSE WHO SPEAK IT. —(Literary Digest, April 27, 1918.)

From Leading Newspapers

After speaking at length as to the importance of the study of English the St. Louis Globe Democrat wrote recently: "Still there are other languages notably Spanish, French, Portuguese, Russian and German, with which the young American should have an opportunity to become familiar, in order that we may engage on equal terms with our rivals in foreign trade, to say nothing of other obvious advantages. Our high schools and colleges should retain optional courses in German, unattractive as they may be emotionally and recast as they must be, since the revelations of the war. But as a matter of common business sense, as well as a national precaution, we cannot afford, as a whole nation, to remain ignorant of German."

Some time ago the "Boston Transcript" published an article on this subject from which we will give a few quotations: It says:

"The use of various foreign languages as a business proposition is exhaustively and interestingly studied in a report by a committee authorized by parliament and appointed by the British prime minister 'to inquire into the position of modern languages in the education system of Great Britain.' Practically all the points of this report apply to conditions in America as well as to those in Great Britain, and it is significant that not only does this British committee not recommend a discontinuance of the study of German, but

urges that it be extended. It is not, of course, a question whether we like the German language or not, but whether we need a practical knowledge of it. What is the situation in this regard? The United States, as well as England, is going to have a great deal of business to settle up with Germany and the Germans after the war is over. Some of this is left-over pre-war business. Still more will have relation to a thousand complications growing out of mutual seizures and confiscations, all of which will have to be laboriously disentangled. In the meantime the Germans will be after our home market and after our new business with South America and Asia. In all these complicated relations involving much correspondence, we shall be dependent on German clerks except in the degree that our people have acquired German. The Germans' knowledge of English, greatly superior to our knowledge of German, will give them their old business advantage over us."

"As this British report points out, questions of trade relations are not the only ones toward the solution of which a knowledge of German will help. German is acknowledged by this report as 'perhaps the first language from the point of view of information.' It is certainly a storehouse of special information, necessary not merely in science, but to large business enterprises, to which a knowledge of the German language was the only key. Will this be true in a less degree after the war than now? Scarcely since the scientific experiences of the war, with the inventions and developments in many lines, will have to be made available for peaceful use. The war has remade aeronautics, for example, and also a good deal of chemistry. And the Germans have been in the forefront of these developments. The benefit of their experience and researches would accrue to themselves alone unless we were prepared to avail ourselves of the information recorded in the German language." (Monatshefte.)

"It will be useless—even silly—to boycott the German language" writes COMMERCE AND FINANCE. "COMMERCE AND FINANCE is right," remarks the MILWAUKEE JOURNAL. "America must not fall into mistakes of the sort Prussia has made. We must not boycott the German language or any language. But we must see that the German language and all other foreign languages are reduced to their legitimate place in American life. * * * Every high school should offer at least one Germanic language and one Romance language. In most cases these will be German and French. Every college should offer at least seven or eight of the more widely spread languages. But in no case should any one definite language be required. In high schools it might be well to make the study of a foreign tongue fully optional. In colleges, study of a foreign tongue should be required, but the choice should rest within certain limits, with the student."—(From Monatshefte.)

In an article in "The New Republic" of April 20, 1918 on "Prussia and Our Schools" Charles H. Judd writes: "The elementary schools of the United States borrowed their plan of organization and the general definition of their course of study from Prussia." Then he describes this school for the common people, the "Volksschule," the educational conditions in America which led to their adoption and then continues: "The course of study of the

Volksschule is what might be expected in such a school. There is no foreign language. Why should the common people know any other language than their own? There are no advanced subjects; for example, there are no higher mathematics, only rudimentary arithmetic. There is plenty of history and a regular training in religion."

"Never was more perfect institutional machinery set up for systematic control and limitation of the range of ideas of a nation."

Then he takes up the school of the aristocracy, the "Gymnasium," contrasts the narrow training of the teacher of the Volksschule with the thoro and broad training of the teacher of the Gymnasium. He points out how the Volksschule receives the children at six years of age, keeps them for eight years and turns them out at fourteen finished products, with none except the most ordinary prospects before them. The Gymnasium on the other hand receives the boys at six, gives them a three-year primary course and then a nine-year course, which connects with the university and opens the way to every field. Then he continues: "The course of the Gymnasium is of the type suited to the needs of aristocracy. The boy has plenty of foreign language. He begins Latin after the fourth year. English and French come after the sixth. He studies advanced subjects early."

"It is one of the ironies of history that American educational leaders in the middle of the last century were so intent upon getting something for the common people that they borrowed one of the most potent devices of autocracy for the suppression of the common people. The limiting influence of the Volksschule has hampered the normal development of our education. Our elementary school has been bound by the tradition that its instruction is strictly rudimentary."

After illustrating this point with arithmetic he continues: "Or take the foreign languages. Young children learn these readily. All over Europe the boys and girls who are going to study Latin or French begin it early. But not in America, because the Volksschule is the place where American boys and girls spend eight long years and there is no foreign language study in the Volksschule."

"Our elementary school has committed a great sin against democracy in restricting the opportunity of generations of American children."

Attitude of the Chief European Beligerants

ATTITUDE OF GERMANY

The attitude of Germany is well summarized by a statement in the Mannheim Gazette as quoted by the Monatshefte from the annual report of Mr. Claxton, U. S. Commissioner of Education. It runs as follows: "The modern languages occupy a prominent position in our Realschulen and Oberrealschulen. No narrow minds will demand their curtailment because of the unpleasant experiences with the French and the English. On the contrary, the knowledge of these languages is absolutely necessary to us, especially that of English. Ignorance of a foreign language is not an element of strength, but of weakness. Besides Germany has no intention of isolating herself from the rest of the world when the war is over. She does not want to wage war after

the war. She strives more than ever to penetrate into the world. * * *The modern languages ought to be given more, not less, time than heretofore."

ATTITUDE OF FRANCE

The situation in France can be ascertained from the Official Report from Inspector-General Potel of the French Government, reprinted from Vol. I, No. 1, of *School Life* (U. S. Bureau of Education) in the *Monatshefte* Sept. 1918.

I.

In the beginning of the war a feeling of hostility against instruction in German manifested itself in France. Discussions were opened in the newspapers, and the attendance at the German classes of the first cycle became poor. The University, which perceived the danger, did not fail to make it known. In the month of September, 1916, an interministerial commission met at the Ministry of War to study the modifications to be made in the examinations for admission to the important military schools as regards foreign languages. In the course of one of its meetings the said commission was incidentally informed by the inspectors-general of secondary education, who were present, of the danger which German instruction in France ran. The interministerial commission made a series of propositions to which the Ministry of War was good enough to give its approval. In a letter which it addressed on November 26 to the minister of public instruction, it communicated to him the modifications made in the competitive examinations for admission to the Polytechnic School and the School of Saint-Cyr. The essential provision of the Ministerial order was as follows:

(1) From the first the commission has allowed candidates to choose as an obligatory language either German, English, or Russian. The minister added: "The University must counteract, in so far as it lies within its power, the tendency to which the inspectors-general, members of the commission, have called attention, which manifests itself among the pupils to abandon the study of German." On his side, the minister of public instruction invited the heads of institutions to exert their influence with the families to have their children inscribed for the German course.

Public opinion, once enlightened, became normal again. In the course of my visits of inspection in the years 1916 and 1917 I noticed that the attendance at the German classes of the sixth and fifth had markedly increased the number of pupils studying German varies from one-quarter to a third of the total number of scholars. It is in the public schools that the abandonment of German is most marked, doubtless because the pupils of these establishments are recruited from the small town or rural districts where the higher needs of the country are not perceived with the same clearness as in the important intellectual centers.

In the universities the German language and German literature are still studied. As regards the commercial schools, M. Jouanny, member, secre-

tary of the Chamber of Commerce of Paris, made me the following statement: "We have maintained the instruction of German in our five schools."

II.

One may therefore reply with all assurance that the courses and classes of German in the schools of France will still be attended. But the studies, from the fact of the war, have undergone profound changes which the programs did not need to prescribe, because they occurred, so to speak, spontaneously. Already the Ministerial instructions of 1902 specified that "apart from the language itself, the foreign country and the people who live in it should furnish more particularly material for instruction."

To-day less than ever should there be ignorance of Germany. One must first study her on the spot, follow her economic evolution and the development of her social institutions, the movement of her associations, the instruction given in her universities. One must watch over all the manifestations of her activity, and, in order to be exact, our information must be based on a knowledge of the German language. If we are ignorant of German, we do not know Germany, or, again, what is more serious still, we shall only know and see of her what she wishes to show us. She will appear generous, humanitarian, and pacifist, and will conceal, under the veneer of an innocent good nature, her moral hideousness, which, when she reveals herself, revolts the human conscience.

When peace is signed the Germans must be watched at home, but they must also be watched here with us. What makes the strength of Germany is above all the manner in which she has known how to establish herself in all countries. Have France, England, and America been as attentive to the expansion of Germany and the intrigues of her agents? It has required the Teutonic misdeeds in America, the propaganda in Ireland, Italy, Russia, and France even to open our eyes. Do not let us hope to raise a wall which will protect from attempts at invasion on the part of Germany. She will have abroad her associations, churches, lodges, choral societies, patronal or workingmen's syndicates, who will all prepare for the next war. It would be culpable not to speak the language of all these artisans of a powerful country like Germany, for one must understand what they say, read what they write, and endeavor to learn what they think.

THE ATTITUDE OF ENGLAND

The attitude can best be seen in the report of a committee appointed by the English government. We give in part an article reprinted by the *Monatshefte* from No. 7 of "School Life," published by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. For lack of space the entire article cannot be here given, but we shall select such parts as have direct bearing on our subject. The article says:

"That ignorance of language is a serious obstacle to the development of foreign trade, and especially that ignorance of enemy peoples and their languages has hampered Great Britain's war efforts, are important conclusions

reached by a committee of distinguished men appointed in August, 1916, by Mr. Asquith, then prime minister of Great Britain, to inquire into the position of modern languages in the educational system of the nation.

The report of the committee, recently made public, is exhaustive and well-considered. It gives first place to French in the history of modern civilization, though the literature of England may have exceeded that of France, and Germany may have excelled in the actual bulk and volume of scientific work during recent years. For Englishmen, German is rated in practical value as second only to French, and on the strictly commercial side German is probably superior.

The chairman of the committee was Stanley Leathers, civil service commissioner and one of the editors of Cambridge Modern History. Among the other members were Sir Maurice de Bunsen, British Ambassador at Vienna when war was declared; Dr. H. A. L. Fisher, who was a member of the Government committee on German outrages and who resigned his place on the modern language committee to become president of the board of education; Dr. Walter Leaf, the banker and a translator of Homer; and Sir James Yoxall who at one time was the royal commissioner on secondary education.

The report discusses such topics as the history of the study of modern languages in Great Britain; the neglect of modern studies; the value of modern studies; the relative importance of the several languages; the means of instruction; the supply and training of teachers for schools; the method of instruction; and ends with a summary of conclusions and recommendations. It is a safe prediction that this report will be esteemed as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the place in present-day education of modern language study. It deserves the careful study of the educators of this country as they approach problems of educational reconstruction and readjustment. The following excerpts from the report are of special interest:

The evidence collected by us seemed conclusive as to the need of foreign languages in business, especially under the new conditions which may be expected to prevail after the war. Keen emulation will then be encountered; lost ground must be recovered; new openings must be found; in countries where we felt secure we shall find our footing precarious. So large is the part of our industrial product marketed abroad, so great is our capital invested in foreign countries, so universal was our carrying trade, so extensive are our financial transactions and influence and power of our credit, that any impediment to our success will react not only on those firms directly interested in foreign markets, but also on the prosperity of the whole country. Our foreign trade does not comprise the whole of our activities, but the whole of our activities depend upon it. In a great part of our foreign trade a knowledge of languages, a knowledge of foreign countries and of foreign peoples, will be directly and abundantly remunerative.

* * * * *

Ignorance of the mental attitude and aspirations of the German people may not have been the cause of the war; it certainly prevented due preparation and hampered our efforts after the war had begun; it still darkens our

counsels. Similar ignorance of France, greater ignorance of Italy, abysmal ignorance of Russia have impeded the effective prosecution of the war, and will impede friendly and co-operative action after the war is over.

* * * * *

For the acquisition of sound knowledge of any foreign country a speaking knowledge of the language is the first necessity. Hundreds of thousands of British citizens traveled in France before the war; but only a minimal percentage got any knowledge of the French people, because the others could not converse with the inhabitants in their own language.

* * * * *

The importance of any language may be judged by the significance of its people in the development of modern civilization, by the intrinsic value of its literature, by its contribution to the valid learning of our times, and by its practical use in commercial and other national intercourse.

* * * * *

Before the war German was, perhaps, the first language from the point of view of information. Its preeminence was attained somewhat rapidly—in the course of the nineteenth century, and especially in the last 40 years. In philosophy and in those sciences and quasi-sciences in which new knowledge is constantly acquired and general conceptions undergo frequent modifications, no student who wished to keep abreast of the times could afford to ignore German publications. This position was strengthened by the industry and competence of German translators. Important works of learning and literature produced in languages not generally known, such as Dutch and Russian, were often accessible only in German translations. The German supremacy was skilfully fostered by the admirably organized German book trade and extended not only to the natural sciences, but to the whole field of philology and antiquities and, to a large part of history.

From the practical point of view German was second in value to French alone, and on the strictly commercial side probably equal, or even superior, to it owing to the wide extension of German activity and the general use of German in the business of Russia and the Balkan Peninsula.

* * * * *

After the war the importance of German must correspond with the importance of Germany. If Germany after the war is still enterprising, industrious, highly organized, formidable no less in trade than in arms, we can not afford to neglect her or ignore her for a moment; we can not leave any of her activities unstudied. The knowledge of Germany by specialists will not suffice; it must be widespread throughout the people. A democracy can not afford to be ignorant.

We may indicate one point in particular which is likely to be of importance at the end of the war. It will in any case be impossible to oust the use of German in commerce, even for our own purpose at home, apart from any question of competition in neutral countries. The mere settlement of pre-

war accounts with Germany will be a long and difficult matter. If we are not ourselves able to supply men who have sufficient knowledge of German to conduct the necessary correspondence, strong incentives will be offered to revert to the old practice of employing qualified German clerks for the purpose.

This is only one of many considerations which lead us to the conclusion that it is of essential importance to the Nation that the study of the German language should be not only maintained, but extended."

