

to the individual. Growth and progress are determined by what the rest of the class has done. This is being practiced partially now, although as long as there is a set of standards that needs to be met by the class as a whole and as long as there is standardization in grading there will be a certain amount of comparative work done. The real fallacy of this lies in the fact that Susie is graded by what Susie does in comparison with what Johnny does and not by what Susie has done before. Personal growth must be measured individually, and I feel certain that this is the trend of tomorrow.

This brings about then a slight discussion about the "then and now" teaching methods. The "now" methods having just been mentioned in the last paragraph are referred to as "progressive" methods. The "conventional" methods of yesteryear are being gradually outmoded because they fail to meet the needs of children in the changing world. A greater variety of things are needed in the school program to assist a child in adjusting to the changing scene. Some drastic changes were inevitable because certain fundamentals have to be taught but in less time than was previously used. Much time in the previous methods was spent in irksome drill, time-killing repetitions and deadening detail. And it was mainly a matter of rote. Workshop methods or laboratory experiences were unknown. The teacher of the textbook gave the pupil the worded material which he committed to memory and tried not to forget until the exams. He was given very little opportunity to find out the "how" or "why" or "what will happen if I do this or don't do that?" techniques.

Memorizing, or rote, played such a big role in the school day of the second and third generations back. All of you who fought your way through the "McGuffey Readers" know very well what I mean. It was indeed a pleasure for me to see one of these McGuffey 5th Readers while writing this history. The content of these "Eclectic Series" is no less than astonishing. To find Shakespeare's "Shylock or the Pound of Flesh" included in fifth grade readers was a little surprising, to say the least. Perhaps no more surprising though than some of the melodrama stories it contained. Hardly a lesson failed to have some portion or the whole thing in its entirety marked for memorizing. I'm sure that one of the main differences noted in today's teaching is the lack of assigned memory work. Good? or Bad? Almost without hesitancy I would say your answer would "date" you. (Unless of course, your ideas are extremely reactionary or revolutionary.)

We simply can't skip over the 3 R's. How many times do we hear "When I went to school we learned the 3R's! with the follow-up of course, that "Too much foolishness is taught nowadays". Well, I am not going to dwell on the misinterpreted "foolishness". Reading, 'Riting, and 'Rithmetic is my topic now and thereby hangs a tale! The reading, and 'riting I won't challenge, but the 'rithmetic I can't help but smile about. I wish I could tell you how many people mentioned these 3 R's in my interviews and I always crossed them up sooner or later. Almost everyone of them reminded me of Shakespeare when he said, "What's in a name? A rose, by any other name would smell as