The signatories to the protest, amongst whom are to be found men like Mr. Max Muller, Mr. Frederic Harrison, and Mr. Freeman, besides some eighty members of the Senate and the Board of Control, are 401 in number. Not all of them have signed the protest to the present system, but everyone of them has some fault to find. Hardly will the late Education Commission vie in importance with this protest. Such persons each as Dr. Dale, Bishop Brown of New Zealand, Mr. A. Ambro de Vries, Miss. G. M. Young, Dr. Cameron Maclees, Miss. E. Lyne Linton, Mr. Henry Layard, Miss. Thackeray Ritchie, Dr. J. A. Freude, Rev. H. R. Hewes, Mr. J. G. Holyoke, and Mr. Edwi Arnold have signed the protest. We do not care to give names, nor less important ones, but the simple reason is that a full description would take up too much space.

All these persons, with others, find fault on various grounds with the present system of examination. The majority of them complain of the arrangement of rewards. Children attending public schools, under the direction of the Education Department, by Managers and schoolmasters, as suitable instruments for earning Government money; "young boys of the middle and richer classes are often trained for scholarships, with little regard for the future as two-year-olds are trained for the common examination. Young men of real capacity at the Universities are led to believe that the main purpose of education is to enable them to win such great money, to create such an excitement as takes place in an examination as has no meaning for them." Further, that "great" examinations are responsible for a large part of the over-strain placed now on young bodies and young minds; that a worship of uniformly excellent results is a worship of externals; that the present system tends to exalt him who appears to know above him who knows. In the opinion of the protestant British educational system is a "body without a soul," and its necessary result will be the encouragement of students who "are only interested in the money-prize"—who only believe in "fellow knowledge because she means a sum of money, the public triumph of a successful class, or the gaining of a place."

Most strong denunciations are levelled against the present competitive system. Mr. Max Muller, formerly a hero of rhetoric, has joined the army which is one of the march against the present system. He is a criterion of knowledge. From what I have seen at Oxford and elsewhere, he writes, "all real joy in study seems to me to have been destroyed by the examinations as now conducted. Young men imagine that all the difficulties of the examination are being removed by enabling them to pass the examinations. The required number of pages is put up under compulsion, therefore ungrudgingly, and after the examination is over what has been got up is got rid of again, like a heavy and useless burden." Again Mr. E. A. Freeman, whilst acknowledging the hopelessness of the English world ever reaching such a stage as the abolition of examinations would mean, is free to confess that "every examination is in itself an evil; by its mere existence, and bad as it is, it brings about other evils."
for the attainment of knowledge, but for the object of passing the examination, perhaps of compassing its 'pecuniary value.'” Mr. Frederic Harrison, who certainly cannot be charged with regarding utilitarianism, condemns also the present system. “Examination,” he writes, “like so many other things, is useful as long as it is spontaneous, occasional, and simple. Its mischief begins when it grows to be organized into a trade, and the be-all and end-all of its own sphere. The less the student be ‘prepared,’ in the technical sense, the better. The myriad examinations which now encompass human life have called out an army of trained examiners who have reduced the business to a complicated art as difficult and special as chess. Like chess-playing the art of examiner and examinee has been wondrously developed by practice.” It is with regard to this latter development—the development of the examinee—that education has really most to do. We are not free from it here—from this craze of judging power by answering capacity. More and more are we drifting into the quagmire from which the signatories of this protest in the Nineteenth Century are seeking to extricate English education. Our University authorities require particular knowledge, or rather they require that an examinee shall be so trained by his teacher that he will be able to answer the questions asked, and this means the granting of professional degrees to students who are able to answer certain questions. The pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is not sufficiently encouraged. The knowledge which receives recognition is that which gradually makes a doctor or a lawyer out of a given subject. The University is degenerating into a pill and brief factory—degenerating, too, just at a time when other centres of learning are striving to regain the right path. This article in the Nineteenth Century ought to be sufficient to show leading spirits of the University that education does not show its fruits solely or even mainly in a power to answer questions. If they will not be influenced by the men who have signed the protest to which we have referred they will hardly be persuaded until the mischief has reached such dimensions that it will have ceased to be controllable.