

GRAMARCY PARK SCHOOL AND TOOL-HOUSE ASSOCIATION
AS A MODEL INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

BY ARCHIBALD CUTHBERTSON, NEW YORK.

[Written for THE CANADA EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY.]

THE Gramarcy Park School and Tool-House Association, situated on 8 and 10 Gramarcy Park, or 104 East 20th Street, New York City, was started chiefly by Mr. G. Von Laube, a gentleman of superior intellectual abilities, and advanced principles regarding education. The great aim of this school is to fill a long-felt want between the Kindergarten and Polytechnic Colleges. The work of the school is twofold, viz.: to make young people much more useful in after-life, and also to give them their education more by understanding the structure, or actual manufacture of many objects, animate and inanimate, than by mere theories of any kind. The concrete, the objective, the actual existing or living thing should be studied during much of a child's earlier life, and not the abstract of dry literature, as used largely in a child's education previously.

Much may be said in favour of the old system of teaching, and much will be gained from the new; but seeing what has been the kind of men produced by the old system we certainly cannot censure it, but agree with the thinkers who hold that the old kind of instruction was good enough as far as it went, but what we must now do is add the new practical to the old theoretical.

As this is a new departure it has been opposed for various reasons, and one is because the memory and imagination are not going to be properly cultivated by this kind of education. The settlement of such a question we may leave to ethical philosophers.

Our personal experience on this subject is that the leading power in a child's mental faculties is predisposition, and if a child has an intellectual tendency for mechanical work and inventing, the suggestions of the imagination will be decidedly of such a kind; if the mental bias is for mathematics, memory and imagination will follow the paths which lead in that direction. So on we might go through a long catalogue of experiences. We have known farmers, successful ones too, who, although they had years of experience, could not use a saw properly, but were perfect in a knowledge of agriculture, and that was all they tried to do. We have known others who, although on farms all their lives, yet were conspicuous failures as farmers, but were good mechanics, and knew, in this respect only, what they had "picked up." Robert Burns, although bred to the business, was a conspicuous failure as a farmer, but a success as a poet—to the latter calling, however, he had apparently been born. There need be little dispute about how a child should be taught. Nature herself has settled that question, because the world is full of objects and these have taught the child first. But now we have reached the stage where discussion may begin, viz.: Does a child need to be able to *make* a thing, or understand the structure of a living body before its knowledge of that thing or organism can be called *satisfactory*? Certainly, for callings or trades, this is necessary, as the following examples may show. An artist had painted a beautiful sea-