

ADAM SMITH, EDUCATOR

ADAM SMITH'S FAME rests largely on his achievements as an economist. *The Wealth of Nations*, published in 1776, won for him a place in the history of economic thought so outstanding and enduring that he has often been referred to as the Father of Political Economy. But Smith was much more than "a mere economist." For one thing he was a moral philosopher, and it was in that capacity that he first came into prominence. He was also a keen student of literature, having very high credentials for being linked with what he himself quaintly referred to as "that unprosperous race of men commonly called men of letters."¹ Furthermore, Smith was an educator. He was not only a highly successful teacher but an expounder of some very interesting and provocative notions concerning the purposes and methods of education. The present essay will deal with this last aspect of his career.

Most of Smith's formal work as an educator was carried on at the University of Glasgow, but immediately before assuming his post at his old alma mater he had engaged in a somewhat formal educational programme in Edinburgh. Upon leaving Glasgow, moreover, he continued a type of educational work when he journeyed to the Continent as the tutor of the young Duke of Buccleuch. All told, Smith's teaching career was not long, for from 1766, when he returned from the Continent, until his death in 1790 he was not involved in academic activity. For the first part of this period he was engaged in intensive work, mostly at the home of his mother in Kirkcaldy, on *The Wealth of Nations*, and for the latter part of the period (from 1778 on) he served as Commissioner of Customs in Edinburgh.

Smith's own formal education began with his attendance at the grammar school in Kirkcaldy. Then, in the latter part of 1737, at the age of fourteen, he entered Glasgow University where he remained until the spring of 1740. Later in the same year he went to Balliol College, Oxford, and continued his studies there until 1746. Returning to Scotland he spent two years at Kirkcaldy, and in the fall of 1748 he began a series of lectures in Edinburgh. Smith's teaching career had now commenced. He was twenty-five years of age.

Smith's lectures in Edinburgh, a city in which public lectures were highly popular, were probably sponsored by the local Philosophical Club, and with the special encouragement of Henry Home (later Lord Kames).² He gave three courses of lectures in all, of which two were apparently on Literature and Literary Criticism. These lectures were never published, and shortly before his death in 1890 the famous economist asked that they be destroyed. Until a few years ago there was little information concerning the detailed content of the lectures, but then a most fortunate literary discovery was made. Professor John M. Lothian came upon what turned out to be a virtually complete set of notes taken by a student in part of Smith's Moral Philosophy course given at the University of Glasgow in 1762-1763.³ On the basis of evidence at his disposal, Professor Lothian believes that these particular lectures are clearly an elaboration of those that Smith gave on rhetoric and belles lettres in Edinburgh.

In 1751 Smith joined the faculty at the University of Glasgow. He was appointed to the chair of Logic, a position that included the teaching of rhetoric and belles lettres, and he also acted as a substitute, during his illness, for the professor of Moral Philosophy. In the following year he received a permanent appointment, which he continued to fill for twelve years, to the chair of Moral Philosophy. This subject was much broader than the modern reader might imagine, and included natural philosophy, ethics, jurisprudence, and political economy. Moreover, Smith also gave lectures on belles lettres, taste, and the history of philosophy, and he injected into his discussions a great deal of literary criticism.⁴

To any college or university president of today Adam Smith would appear as an ideal faculty member. He had all the essential qualifications: he took his class work seriously; he devoted a great deal of time to research and writing; he participated very actively in administrative work. At the University of Glasgow, he not only served in all three of the major academic capacities, but he served in all of them with outstanding success. At Glasgow the great economist built up an enviable reputation as a teacher, a reputation that extended far beyond the university campus. Many students were attracted to his classes, a number, including two Russians, coming to Glasgow from as far away as the Continent. His lectures on Moral Philosophy aroused a great deal of interest and enthusiasm, as is evident from a statement made by John Millar, who was a student and then a colleague of Smith's, and who was also himself a distinguished teacher. "Those branches of science which he taught," said Millar, "became fashionable at this place, and his opinions were

the chief topics of discussions in clubs and literary societies. Even the small peculiarities of his pronunciation or manner of speaking became frequently the objects of imitation.⁵² Further evidence is seen in the following statement (from the records of the university) concerning Smith, made by the Senate of the institution in 1764 shortly after he resigned his professorship: "His happy talent in illustrating abstracted subjects, and faithful assiduity in communicating useful knowledge, distinguished him as a professor, and at once afforded the greatest pleasure and the most important instruction to the youth under his care."⁵³

Further evidence relating to Smith's effectiveness as a teacher and to his general influence in Glasgow is contained in an observation made by Thomas Reid, who succeeded him in the chair of Moral Philosophy. Writing to a friend in 1764 when he entered upon his new duties, Reid pointed to the pronounced spirit of inquiry that existed among the young people of the city. This, says Rae, the economist's chief biographer, in a statement with which one must agree, is "the best testimony that could be rendered of the effect of Smith's teaching."⁵⁴ Many years later another great economist declared that, with the exception of Francis Hutcheson, "Adam Smith was, perhaps, the first and greatest of the teachers who have taught a modern subject in a modern way." These are the words of John Maynard Keynes,⁵⁵ and it is of interest to note that Smith, as a young student at Glasgow, was privileged to study under Hutcheson. Moreover, in his letter accepting the appointment as Lord Rector of the University in 1787 he referred to his old professor as "the never-to-be-forgotten Dr. Hutcheson."⁵⁶

What was there about Smith's manner of teaching that made him so popular and so successful? Professor Millar can give us revealing testimony on the matter. For one thing Smith did not read his lectures, a process that can be painfully dull and uninspiring. Instead, Millar declares, "he trusted almost entirely to extemporary elocution." To aid him in his lectures, however, he had written material; but this was kept very much in the background.⁵⁷ Smith departed from his general rule when he taught individual students, such as Lord Buchan. Then he apparently found it more convenient to read his lectures, pausing along the way for comments and illustrations.⁵⁸ Smith was not a silver-tongued orator. "His manner, though not graceful," observes Millar, "was plain and unaffected." But he possessed one of the most desirable attributes of a teacher: he had enthusiasm for what he taught. As Millar declares, "he seemed to be always interested in the subject" and, as a consequence, "he never failed to interest his hearers." The latter part of this state-

ment may be somewhat exaggerated: sometimes, apparently, he had to alter the content or style of his lectures to overcome listlessness.¹²

In using the extemporaneous method of presenting his ideas and material, Smith was able to avoid one of the dangers involved in this particular technique of teaching. His lectures were not unduly discursive and rambling. If one may apply the picturesque metaphor of still another economist, Stephen Leacock, he did not jump on his steed and ride off in all directions. In each lecture Smith ordinarily advanced a number of clear-cut propositions, often of a paradoxical nature. These he considered one by one, attempting to prove and illustrate them. Frequently, however, it took him some time to get under way with his lectures. As Millar states, "he often appeared, at first, not to be sufficiently possessed of the subject, and spoke with some hesitation." But as he progressed with the lecture things changed: "The matter seemed to crowd upon him, his manner became warm and animated, and his expression easy and fluent." It should be added that though Smith dealt with his "points" systematically, he was quite willing to digress. In fact he seemed to enjoy digressing, particularly into the area of literary criticism. But his digressions were within limits.

On controversial issues Smith used a "pro-and-con" type of approach, arguing with great vigour in simulated defence of positions contrary to his own, so that those who studied under him did not hear only one side of an issue. By the generous use of illustrations he developed his subject in a way that was designed to attract the attention of his students and afford them both enjoyment and instruction as they followed the analysis. In his analysis he shifted from the simple to the complex, and back to the simple again. As Millar points out, Smith attempted to encourage his students to follow "the same object, through all the diversity of shades and aspects in which it was presented, and afterwards in tracing it backwards to that original proposition or general truth from which this beautiful train of speculation had proceeded."

Smith was an excellent lecturer. But the lecture method (as contrasted with the discussion method) has in more recent years been subject to considerable criticism. It is possible, if one may refer to the old definition of the method, that material may move from the note-book of the professor to the note-book of the student without going through the head of either. This is possible under the lecture method but by no means inevitable, and it certainly was not the case with Adam Smith and his students.

If the lecture method has fallen to some extent into disrepute (although, where classes are large, it is often the only feasible method), it can still have

much to commend it, especially if the lecturer is available to his students for consultation and discussion, as Smith was. This general point, it is interesting to note, was argued by one of America's outstanding educators, Woodrow Wilson. In his essay "An Old Master"—the master being Smith—Wilson admits that a "paralysis of dullness" too often characterized the old-fashioned lecturer, but he expresses his belief that there is still a place for lecturing. Furthermore, he goes so far as to say that "it would seem to be a good policy to endure much indifferent lecturing—watchful trustees might reduce it to a minimum—for the sake of leaving places open for the men who have in them the inestimable force of chastened eloquence."¹⁸

Smith met his "public" class, which, according to Rae, never went beyond eighty or ninety students, from 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. ("Eight o'clocks," now often the bane of students and professors alike, would have been a mild relief to Smith and his charges). At 11 o'clock he met this group again to test it on the lecture he had given earlier in the morning. About a third of the students habitually came to this second session, at which attendance was voluntary. Smith also had a "private" class of much smaller size which he taught twice a week at 12 o'clock. He was readily available to his students for discussion; indeed, he invited the better ones to his home for that purpose.¹⁴ A few students also boarded with Smith and he occasionally lectured to them (and to a few others—Lord Buchan, for example) and supervised their studies. He advised students in choosing their life work and in getting equipped for it, and he took a keen interest in the health of some of his students.¹⁵

Smith, it is clear, was a very human and a very considerate teacher as well as an intellectually competent one. He met his obligations to his students in an exemplary fashion. The same cannot be said of his contemporaries at Oxford, of whom he was quite critical. "In the university of Oxford," he declares in *The Wealth of Nations* (p. 718), "the greater part of the public professors have, for these many years, given up altogether even the pretence of teaching." This neglect, according to Smith, was due to the nature of the authority under which the professors served and to the basis on which they were paid—their salaries came out of endowments and were not related to the number of students they had, a policy Smith favoured. It might be added that Oxford was intellectually at a low ebb not only during the six years that Smith was there but for most of the eighteenth century, and that Cambridge was also at a low ebb for part of the century.

During his teaching career Smith was an active writer. In the original *Edinburgh Review*, covering the year 1755, he had a review in the first issue

of Samuel Johnson's recently published *Dictionary of the English Language* and in the second a discussion of the current state of European literature. Of greater consequence, however, was the publication in 1759 of his *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, the book that first brought the author into widespread prominence. In 1761 his essay "On the Formation of Languages" appeared. During the Glasgow period Smith also wrote his essay "On the History of Astronomy" and certain significant parts of *The Wealth of Nations*—which he used in connection with his lectures on Moral Philosophy. His famous classic, however, was not to be published until twelve years after he gave up his teaching post.

Two other early pieces of Smith's writing may be mentioned. While he was giving his lectures in Edinburgh he *probably* edited and collected, and wrote a brief preface for, the poems of his friend William Hamilton of Bangour.¹⁶ Moreover, at the time of his installation as a faculty member at the University of Glasgow in January, 1751, Smith gave an address entitled "*De Origine Idearum*," a portion of which was later embodied in his essay "The History of the Ancient Logics and Metaphysics."¹⁷

In present-day academic parlance Smith was without question a productive scholar. But with his interest in writing—and in thinking, for he spent a great deal of time in quiet meditation—he did not overlook his students. He was not oblivious to the obligations he owed them.

An excellent illustration of his sense of obligation to those who attended his lectures, and also of his highly developed feeling of rectitude, is found in a dramatic and amusing account that has been given of his last class at Glasgow.¹⁸ Since he was unable to finish his course of lectures, Smith insisted, although they were to have a substitute teacher, on refunding to his students the fees they had paid. On the final day he came to his class with little paper packages, each containing the money due to an individual member of the group. The first student Smith called up to get his package refused to take it, at the same time declaring *his* great indebtedness to Smith. A general cry of approval went up in the room. But the great teacher was determined. "You must not refuse me this satisfaction," he asserted. "Nay, by heavens, gentlemen, you shall not." Thereupon Smith seized the student who refused the refund by his coat, thrust the money package into his pocket, and pushed him away. The other students, realizing the hopelessness of their cause, also accepted the refunds.

Smith was not only a writer but a researcher. During his Glasgow days his work was chiefly of a non-statistical, non-quantitative type but it was nevertheless research. Though he leaned heavily on the deductive method,

including a "species of philosophical investigation" described by Dugald Stewart as *Theoretical or Conjectural History*.¹⁹ Smith did more than philosophize in his armchair. As is abundantly clear in *The Wealth of Nations*, he made very extensive use of original sources. His statistical investigations, however, seem to have been made largely after he left Glasgow.

As with his writing, Smith did not permit the closely allied activity of research to interfere with his teaching. As a researcher he did not look upon his students as nuisances. Moreover, as in all cases where teaching and research are harmoniously wedded (and today, it might be added, this happy connubial condition is not as extensive as it should be), Smith's studies and investigations added lustre to his lectures. It is probable, too, that his class work stimulated his own thinking and gave additional direction to his research work: cross fertilization could be expected to occur then just as it can be expected now.

In addition to his writing and teaching, Smith was very active in administrative work while at Glasgow.²⁰ Rae declares that, during his years on the faculty, Smith seems to have been more deeply involved than any other professor in the business affairs of the institution. Professor Alexander Gray even goes so far as to say that during the time Smith was at Glasgow he in fact ran the university.²¹ From 1758 until his resignation early in 1764 he served as college Treasurer; from 1760 to 1762 he was Dean of the University Faculty; and in 1762 he became its Vice-Rector. In addition he served on numerous committees. Because of the peculiar structure of the institution—there were really two separate corporate bodies, the University and the College each with its own government—the administrative work that confronted Smith was both complex and difficult. In this aspect of his work, as in the other two, he acquitted himself with great success.

Smith's years at Glasgow, as teacher, as researcher-writer, and as administrator, were busy and fruitful. They were also very happy. As he himself declared in 1787, when he was appointed Lord Rector of the University, the thirteen years he spent there he remembered "as by far the most useful and therefore as by far the happiest and most honourable period of my life."²²

Adam Smith was not only an educator but an educational reformer as well. In a particularly notable chapter in *The Wealth of Nations* (Chapter 1 of Book V) he advances a variety of suggestions to which over the years enthusiastic tributes have been paid. J. B. Say looked upon his "highly ingenious disquisition on public education" as a "magnificent digression"—"replete as it is with erudition and the soundest philosophy, at the same time that

it abounds with valuable instruction."²³ A century later J. M. Keynes, expressing similar sentiments, spoke of "the magnificent first chapter of the Fifth Book" of Smith's classic.²⁴

Among the ideas advanced were very strong opinions on school and university endowments and the accompanying policy of teacher remuneration.²⁵ In the field of teaching he believed that there should be a very close connection between effort and reward, a goal which was absent when teachers' salaries came out of endowments or subsidies rather than directly from student fees. In other words, in the matter of faculty pay Smith favoured the principle: From each according to his ability, to each according to the number of students he instructs. To put the point in a still different fashion, and this time in the words of Professor C. F. Arrowood, the provision of education, according to Smith, "is a sort of merchandising: the teacher should offer his goods in an open market, and their quality and the demand for them would regulate the support of his work."²⁶ It should be added that Smith was thinking here primarily of education for the well-to-do classes. He supported a somewhat different arrangement for the education of the masses.

Smith stresses the need for diligence on the part of teachers and asserts that the attainment of that desirable quality is interfered with when faculty remuneration comes from endowments—which "have necessarily diminished more or less the necessity of application in the teachers"—and not, at least to some degree, directly from student fees.

When education is conducted on the basis of private enterprise, with teachers paid largely or wholly out of the fees of their students, the performance of the teachers, Smith argues, is of a superior nature. "Those parts of education," he declares, "for the teaching of which there are no public institutions, are generally the best taught." Fencing or dancing schools (Smith was greatly interested in dancing) are a case in point. Somewhat the same notion is contained in Smith's remarks about the education of women. There are no public educational institutions for them—hence there is "nothing useless, absurd, or fantastical in the common course of their education." What they are taught is solely determined by what their parents or guardians consider "necessary and useful." (There were no frills in the education of the members of the gentler sex!)

From the preceding remarks it might be assumed that Smith was completely opposed to public education. This, however, was not the case, as we shall note shortly.

The payment of teachers according to the number of their students

would probably, as Smith reasons, encourage diligence on the part of the instructional staff, or at least on the part of *some* members of the staff. But this method of reward has very obvious dangers, at least as applied to modern institutions of higher learning. In colleges and universities today there are other means that can be used in disciplining or getting rid of neglectful faculty members than having their salaries wither away. Moreover, having faculty salaries based wholly or largely on student fees would mean in general either very low salaries or very high fees. Although Smith's ideas of teacher remuneration are wholly impracticable today, it is well to stress the general object that he had in mind, namely excellence in teaching, including up-to-dateness in approach.

In his "magnificent" discussion of education Smith does not criticize Oxford and other endowed educational institutions only on the basis of professional neglect. He believed that they do *not* give adequate attention to the sciences, a criticism that we could hardly make of colleges and universities today. As for the subjects they take up, he declares that "it may, perhaps, be said" that they "are not very well taught," though he points out that such subjects would ordinarily not be taught elsewhere. He states that most universities have not been very forward in introducing the improvements that have been made in philosophy, and he goes on to say that "several of those learned societies have chosen to remain, for a long time, the sanctuaries in which exploded systems and obsolete prejudices found shelter and protection, after they had been hunted out of every other corner of the world."

A different issue in Smith's remarkable chapter, and one that still arises in many institutions of higher learning, is that of forcing students to study under certain professors, without the right, unless permission is granted, of changing sections or classes "in case of neglect, inability, or bad usage." Such compulsion not only tends strongly to destroy "all emulation among the different tutors of the same college," he maintains "but to diminish very much in all of them the necessity of diligence and of attention to their respective pupils."

If a teacher neglects his students, and if he is "a man of sense," says Smith, it must be unpleasant for him to realize that, in his lectures, "he is either speaking or reading nonsense, or what is very little better than nonsense." When his lectures are of this kind, most of his students may stay away, or perhaps attend the lectures but "with plain enough marks of neglect, contempt, and derision." The teacher, as a consequence (and assuming that he has to give a definite number of lectures), may attempt to give decent presenta-

tions. There are several other expedients, however, Smith adds, which may be resorted to and "which will effectively blunt the edge of all those incitements to diligence." For one thing, the teacher, instead of explaining to his students the subject he is supposed to be dealing with, "may read some book upon it." If the book is in another language he may interpret it for them. Or, Smith continues delightfully, the teacher could use an even less troublesome method: he could have the students interpret the book, "and by now and then making an occasional remark upon it, he may flatter himself that he is giving a lecture."

Smith was opposed to compulsory class attendance except for very young students. If a teacher does his duty, coercion can scarcely ever be necessary for persons who are older than twelve or thirteen. "No discipline," he declares, "is ever requisite to force attendance upon lectures which are really worth the attending, as is well known wherever any such lectures are given." Smith, it will be seen, supported the principle of "unlimited cuts." He was of the opinion that good teachers had nothing to fear from its application. This would generally be true also, he felt, of teachers who were not very good but who took their work seriously.

Smith believed that students should have the right to choose not only their professors but their universities. Persons who receive "scholarships, exhibitions, bursaries, etc." should be able to use them at institutions of their choice. This right "might perhaps contribute to excite some emulation among different colleges."

It is of special interest to note that Smith, who travelled on the Continent for three years with the young Duke of Buccleuch (stepson of Charles Townshend, the statesman who did so much to provoke the American colonists to rebellion), was opposed to sending young men on continental tours in lieu of a university education. He recognized some of the benefits that a continental sojourn confers on the young traveller, but asserts that "he commonly returns home more conceited, more unprincipled, more dissipated, and more incapable of any serious application either to study or to business, than he could well have become in so short a time, had he lived at home." Smith blames the universities, and the discredit into which they had fallen, for the repute gained by this "very absurd" practice. For the father whose son is absent in Europe there is some consolation, however. He "delivers himself, at least for some time, from so disagreeable an object as that of a son unemployed, neglected, and going to ruin before his eyes."

Though he said much in support of private enterprise in education, Smith

nevertheless recognized a place for public intervention. This intervention was for the special benefit, not of "people of some rank and fortune" but of "the common people." By setting up in each parish or district, somewhat after the fashion of the policy followed in Scotland, "a little school," in which the master would be paid in part out of public funds (not wholly, or even principally, Smith again emphasizes, because "he would soon learn to neglect his business"), children could be taught "to read, write, and account," and without long effort. The results would be especially good if in these schools the books used in learning to read were a little more instructive (the criticism of textbooks is by no means a new phenomenon!) and if, instead of getting a smattering of Latin, which they sometimes received, they were given some training in elementary geometry and mechanics. This training, says Smith, would be advantageous in practically all trades. To encourage the students in their work, "small premiums, and little badges of distinction" could be given for superior performance. Moreover, the government could ensure that most persons would acquire the basic educational training by requiring that they be exposed to an examination or a period of probation as a condition of freely participating in any corporation or engaging in any trade.

Smith thought that the provision of public education (in "homoeopathic doses," said Marx!²⁷) for the children of the common people would help to counteract the unfavourable results of the division of labour. At the beginning of his famous volume he had stressed the great importance of the division of labour as a factor in the economic development of a nation, but in his chapter on education he alludes to the unfavourable effects that are likely to follow from its use.²⁸ His words are almost as severe as those used by Ruskin some decades later. The worker who concentrates his efforts on the performance of a few simple operations "generally becomes as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become." He acquires dexterity in the trade in which he specializes but, says Smith, it appears to be "at the expense of his intellectual, social, and martial virtues." This condition relates not to a few persons but, in an advanced society, to the bulk of the people (i.e. "the labouring poor"); that is, unless the government takes corrective action. It is here that education has its part to play. It will help to develop the intellectual, social, and martial virtues and thus strengthen the body politic.

But such public education confers another benefit upon society: the people are less likely to question the authority of the government and participate in public disturbances, a point that was later emphasized by Macaulay (who made a number of references to Smith's discussion of education) in his

speech in the House of Commons in defence of public education.²⁹ "The more they are instructed, the less liable they are to the delusions of enthusiasm and superstition, which, among ignorant nations, frequently occasion the most dreadful disorders." In free countries it is of the utmost importance that the people should not be disposed to judge the conduct of the government "rashly or capriciously."

Smith follows his discussion of education for young people with a treatment of education for people of all ages. Running to almost thirty pages, his presentation takes him into a long analysis of religious instruction, including a detailed account of religious history. *The Wealth of Nations*, in Smith's hands, covers a vast intellectual terrain, and only one or two points in his discussion can be noted here.³⁰

Of special interest are the policy recommendations he makes for correcting the "unsocial or disagreeably vigorous" aspects of the austere moral systems found among the numerous little religious sects in society. The first policy relates to the study of science and philosophy. By imposing certain entry requirements—"some sort of probation," Smith states—to entry into the professions and elected offices of trust or profit, such a study might be rendered "almost universal among all people of middling or more than middling rank or fortune." In dealing with this point Smith declares, epigrammatically, that "Science is the great antidote to the poison of enthusiasm and superstition." He feels that if "all the superior ranks of people" were protected against this poison (and such protection could be supplied by teachers operating through private enterprise and not as state employees) those in the inferior groups would not be much exposed to the danger.

Smith's second policy relates to public diversions. If private individuals (acting in their own self-interest, and without entering the areas of "scandal or indecency") were given the freedom "to amuse and divert the people by painting, poetry, music, dancing," and by providing "all sorts of dramatic representations and exhibitions" for them, most persons would be readily freed of "that melancholy gloomy humour which is almost always the nurse of popular superstition and enthusiasm."

Some of Smith's ideas on education might seem to brand him as a supporter of upper-class privilege, and his repeated use of the term "inferior ranks of people" and also his employment of such expressions as "the common people" and "people of some rank and fortune" would appear to justify such a conclusion. This general charge, as a matter of fact, has been levelled against him.³¹ But, at least in partial extenuation of his attitude, it should be noted

that Smith had great sympathy for the underdog, and that there is ample evidence in *The Wealth of Nations* to support this contention. Furthermore, the great economist should be judged on the basis of the political, social, and educational principles of his own day, not of ours.

Judging Smith on this basis there are grounds for believing that in some matters he was ahead of his time. For example, while he emphasized the utilitarian aspects of education, he also believed that education was necessary for intellectual growth and hence for the development of the whole man. "A man without the proper use of the intellectual faculties of a man," he said, "is, if possible, more contemptible than even a coward, and seems to be mutilated and deformed in a still more essential part of the character of human nature." Hence, he argues, even if the state derived no advantage from the education of the common people, which, as we noted before, it does, it would still be desirable to provide such education. This notion of education and the development of the whole man has led one professor of education to link Smith's name with those of Comenius, Kant, Pestalozzi, and Huxley.²²

Smith's theories of education are magnificent because of his provocative ideas. But they also are magnificent because of the way in which he presents them. Modern readers will probably find parts of his discussion unduly digressive and perhaps monotonous, but on the whole this part of *The Wealth of Nations* is one of the best written segments of the whole book. His discussion contains numerous historical allusions, which suggest the breadth of the author's knowledge. At times his style is sharp, as when he refers to "sham" lectures and to "wise men, or those who fancied themselves such," and when he criticizes Oxford and "those learned societies" where "exploded systems and obsolete prejudices" have found refuge. On occasion he uses striking terms, such as "the great society"—an expression he uses, ahead of his time, on at least three occasions. In places his style is epigrammatical and one more of his epigrams may be added: "Fear is in almost all cases a wretched instrument of government, and ought in particular never to be employed against any order of men who have the smallest pretensions to independency."

All in all, Smith's chapter is a most fascinating one. While some of the ideas expressed in it are from a present-day standpoint most impracticable or out-of-date, others are of great current significance and of genuine suggestive value. At a time of immense expansion in our educational programmes and institutions, the chapter can be read with considerable delight and profit.²³

NOTES

1. *The Wealth of Nations*, ed. Edwin Cannan (New York, 1937), p. 131.
2. See W. R. Scott, *Adam Smith as Student and Professor* (Glasgow, 1937), pp. 49-50; and John Rae, *Life of Adam Smith* (London, 1895), pp. 30-31.
3. *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, Edited with an Introduction and Notes by John M. Lothian (London, 1963).
4. Rae, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-56.
5. Millar's account of Smith's lectures, to which reference will be made with some frequency, was made public by Dugald Stewart. See *The Collected Works of Dugald Stewart*, ed. William Hamilton (Edinburgh, 1858), X, 11-13. Much of Millar's account can also be found in Rae, *op. cit.*, pp. 54-57.
6. Stewart, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
7. *Op. cit.*, p. 59. It should be added that some persons in Glasgow had certain qualms about Smith because of his religious unorthodoxy. *Ibid.*, p. 60.
8. *Economic History*, IV (February, 1938), 36.
9. A description of Hutcheson as a teacher is contained in William Leechman's Preface to Hutcheson's book, *A System of Moral Philosophy* (Glasgow, 1755), I.
10. Scott states that Smith planned his individual lectures apart from this material and largely independent of it. *Op. cit.*, p. 70.
11. Rae, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
13. *An Old Master and Other Political Essays* (New York, 1893), pp. 3-4.
14. Rae, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-53.
15. Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70. Scott's account of Smith's classes differs somewhat from Rae's.
16. There is some slight question as to whether Smith performed this task, but the present writer would give him the benefit of the doubt, going along with Rae and with N. S. Bushnell, author of a comparatively recent study of Hamilton (Aberdeen, 1957).
17. See Glenn R. Morrow, in *Adam Smith, 1776-1926* (Chicago, 1928), p. 158.
18. See Rae, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-170.
19. *Op. cit.*, p. 34. The method of Conjectural History as described by Stewart is much broader than the term itself, and the above paragraph, might suggest.
20. A detailed discussion of Smith's administrative work will be found in Rae, *op. cit.*, chap. VI, and Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-78, chap. VII.
21. *Adam Smith* (London, Historical Association Publication, General Series: G 10, 1948), p. 5.
22. Rae, *op. cit.*, p. 411.
23. *A Treatise on Political Economy* (Philadelphia, 1847), p. xlv.
24. *Economic History*, IV (February, 1938), 36. Keynes states that Article II of this particular chapter "contains passages which ought to be pre-fixed to the Statutes of every University and College."
25. It is an interesting fact that when the one hundredth anniversary of the

publication of *The Wealth of Nations* was observed by the Political Economy Club of London in 1876 (with Gladstone in the chair), the issue that was perhaps the most extensively discussed by the various speakers was that of university endowments. The Proceedings of this meeting were published in London by Longmans, Green, Reader & Dyer in 1876.

26. *The Theory of Education in the Political Philosophy of Adam Smith*, privately printed (Texas, 1945), p. 15.
27. *Capital*, Everyman's Library (London, 1932), I, 384.
28. There has been some discussion recently as to whether Smith held two views on the effects of the division of labour or only one. See E. G. West's article in *Economica*, New Series, XXXI (February, 1964), 23-32; and Nathan Rosenberg's analysis in Vol. XXXII (May, 1965) of the same journal, 127-139.
29. *The Complete Writings of Lord Macaulay* (Boston and New York, 1900), XVIII, 128-154. Macaulay stresses the importance of public education as a means of ensuring greater security to persons and property.
30. A more detailed treatment of this part of Smith's discussion, by Charles F. Arrowood, will be found in *The Harvard Educational Review*, XIV (January, 1944), 71-73.
31. On this general point see D. Craig, *Scottish Literature and Scottish People, 1680-1830* (London, 1961), pp. 68-70. See also *The Story of Education* by Carroll Atkinson and Eugene T. Maleska (Philadelphia, 1962), p. 163.
32. John M. Adamson, *English Education, 1789-1902* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 5, 114, 148, 317. On Smith as a pioneer educational critic, see Edward C. Mack, *Public Schools and British Opinion, 1780-1860* (New York, 1939), pp. 66, 133.
33. Other early economists also expressed opinions on educational matters, including the question of state support. A discussion of their views and Smith's is contained in E. G. West's article, "Private Versus Public Education: A Classical Economic Dispute," in *The Journal of Political Economy*, LXXII (October, 1964); in William L. Miller's article, "The Economics of Education in English Classical Economics," in *The Southern Economic Journal*, XXXII (January, 1966); and in Brian Simon's book, *Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870* (London, 1960).