

REVIEWS

history ends. The bibliography shows French authorities as the chief sources—are our English history schools so painfully defective? Maps and time charts increase the value and add to the usefulness of a work that no student can afford to ignore and no pious or intelligent (but why “or”?) Catholic neglect.

JOSEPH CLAYTON.

THE TEACHING OF HISTORY. By R. Worts. (Heinemann; 7/6.)

We have all been amused by *1066 and All That*, but perhaps have scarcely realized that the state of things occasioning the satire is not so funny. For many years the importation of adult, University methods of teaching crystallised in the Certificate Examinations has petrified a living subject and made it poison for the young. “Unless the present system is challenged and considerably challenged it will increase its grip on the schools and secure an unbreakable hold on both teachers and pupils.” The Headmaster of the City of Leeds School presents this challenge by a thorough discussion of the whole problem based on more than 20 years experience and on an acute study of the difficult psychological issues (e.g., time sense) involved in the teaching of history to young minds. Catholic teachers should be especially interested because they are (or often can be) free from enslavement of academic tyranny. They need not fear that this is a thesis written with the brutal unawareness of the mere reformer; it is sympathetically alive to all the difficulties of the liberal-minded schoolmaster.

“My considered judgment is that the Certificate Examinations as at present conducted denude History of any educative value . . . except that of memory training and clear restatement of memorized knowledge.” And writing of the condition of boys at this stage, boys who “begin to talk (after severe training) in parrot fashion and write unintelligently of ‘policies’ and ‘movements,’” Mr. Worts adds truly that “the average school student of this age is perhaps the most artificial mind ever known to a cultured society.” This is “the dreary fate of adolescence.” History might be the most illuminating and liberalizing of all school disciplines; it might be the most fertile ground for the *constructive* imagination; but only if it is taught *primarily as an art* and not simply as a science. The material of history must be made *real*, and if the imagination cannot do this that material fails to exist. History must be a *story*. A little reflection will show the futility of applying the “scientific” method to juvenile minds and the absurdity of trying to make young boys understand the “causes and effects” of great historical periods—a method, incidentally, which is “the chief weapon in the armoury of teachers whose first duty is not to engender love of their subject but to get

as many of their students as possible through the examination."

Mr. Worts insists that boys should be encouraged to read widely and develop a grand perspective and not dissect a special period; that therefore they should have a large library and that lending should not be "restricted on the grounds that the books may be torn, battered or lost," or even stolen. "Generosity in this matter will reap its own rich reward; expense should be the last item to be considered." Free periods for reading should be increased. Text books should be much simplified, profusely illustrated and changed often. One dull book should not be allowed to stale successive generations. Full use to be made of the film, a powerful stimulant to the memory and to the faculty of expression, and enabling the mind to see "life in the Past moving as real life must move through Time."

The thing of ultimate importance is, of course, the teachers' attitude. A real class should consist of interrogation and discussion, not of a compressed text book, or dictated notes or "tests." With regard to subject matter Mr. Worts suggests among other things an outline of world history as a simple but exciting preliminary and background. He also urges that boys should be given some account not of the Industrial Revolution but of the actual industrial world in which we live. In this way they will begin to acquire the means of forming an intelligent judgment about the immensely difficult conditions of the world in which their lives are to be spent.

One point of disagreement. The author holds that religious history both before and after the Reformation should be omitted; though he considers that the *political* aspect of the Church during the Middle Ages is an essential study. He is reacting against the tradition represented by the impossible questions set in the Certificate Examinations about the involved controversies of the Reformation period. It is a good reaction, because such questions are clearly beyond a boy's capacity, and they are deadly because they leave him with a false idea of religion. But to leave his mind with the notion of the Church as only a political institution would be even more deadly and totally false. The question of truth or falsehood is in fact very relevant to the whole problem of this book and it is not discussed by the author. For history is a science as well as an art, and the historian while acting as an artist in making his material live, must see to it, so far as he can, that that material represents *the truth*. Otherwise he becomes simply a novelist. Thus in this matter of the Church the thing to do is not to exchange one false aspect for another, but to teach its history in an imaginative and positive way basing oneself on the most accurate accounts obtainable. We should urge more Church history not less, and since it is the

REVIEWS

most vital Society in both the ancient and modern world its story can be made as thrilling, more thrilling, than that of any political institution or military exploit. We would emphasize, however, that this criticism is not a defence of religious history as at present taught. In fact, Mr. Worts' protest is valuable: it may awaken religious teachers. And in any case the objection does not detract from the actuality and importance of this book. It should be in the reference section of every staff library and in the possession of every school-teacher of history.

AELFRIC MANSON, O.P.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE NATURE OF HISTORY. By H. G. Wood.
(Cambridge University Press; 6/-.)

Nineteenth century Liberalism was, in its religious aspects, a perverted form of Christianity. Christianity became in fact synonymous with Progress and Humanitarianism. Mr. Wood is a contemporary representative of this Liberal school.

Indeed, had Mr. Wood omitted "Christianity" and confined the title to "The Nature of History" his book would have met with far wider approval. The first chapter, *Christianity and the Nature of History*, is a discussion on the nature of History itself: an analysis of the statement that the importance of an event "must be either in its significance as a link in a chain of still more significant happenings or in its embodying uniquely some intrinsic values." Mr. Wood rightly supports the second alternative and consequently the reasonableness of the embodiment and foundation of Christianity in concrete events in Palestine.

Grant the historical significance of Christianity and then the question of Jesus considered as a Leader becomes of extreme importance. It is quite true that social forces prepare the way for great men, but to emphasize this truth in order to discount the decisive influence of the individual factor in history, as Kautsky does, is erroneous. Kautsky holds that social trends, not leaders, are responsible for new organizations. By an analysis and refutation of Kautsky's theory of Christ, Mr. Wood proves the creative character of great men in History and the error of the Materialistic Interpretation of Christianity.

Christ was not only a Leader but the Son of God and He came when He did because the fullness of time had come. Mr. Wood illustrates the fact of "the guiding hand of God in History" by an excellent description of the Roman world into which Christ was born. The ancient world was in definite need of a religion, and an investigation of Augustan literature reveals that the intelligentsia and particularly the Stoics were formulating theories necessary for a better world. Christianity fulfilled the need of the Roman world but, paradoxically, was instrumental in creating a tension