

of human learning; talks much about studying things rather than words. It pushes forward the kindergarten and commends the method of Froebel, which relies wholly on the self-activity of the child. In the interest of childish needs and wants it recommends plays and games and occupations at building or construction. It adopts as its motto the adage of Comenius: "Learn to do by doing." It goes so far as to decry the mechanical methods of school discipline in the interest of arousing the intellect

to original efforts. It sacrifices everything to make class exercises interesting to the pupil, and the school a place of delightful self-activity and entertainment.

The intellect grows by mastering for itself the thoughts of others and by investigating causes and principles. But the will grows through self-sacrifice for the sake of wider and wider interests. It is possible, therefore, to have two lines of educational reform antagonistic, each to the other.—*The Public School Journal*.

THE PLACE OF ART EDUCATION IN GENERAL EDUCATION.

BY JOHN S. CLARK.

(Continued from last issue.)

Now, standing as we do to-day in the possession of this art legacy from the men of the past, can we rationally minimize it, and, as many of the educational leaders demand, consider the child merely as a particularly high differentiation of physical energies, the passive subject of nature, molded and played upon at nature's mercy? I tell you, Nay. We must see and own and practically act upon a truer conception of the mind of man, and upon such a larger vision of the place of man in creation's scale as was so strongly brought out by Dr. John Fiske at Harvard two weeks ago, in his Phi Beta Kappa address. Dr. Fiske then gave utterance to words that are to be forever memorable in the great discussion upon which thinking men are now entering with reference to man and his destiny in the light of evolution, and he has kindly sent me his exact words for use on this occasion. In speaking of psychological man and contrasting him with all that preceded him, Dr. Fiske said:

The physical variations by which man is distinguished from apes are not great. His physical relationship with the ape is closer than that between cat and dog, which belong to different families of the same order; it is like that between cat and leopard or between dog and fox, different genera in the same family. But the moment we consider the minds of man and ape, the gap between the two is immeasurable. Mr. Mitart has truly said that, with regard to their total value in nature, the difference between man and ape transcends the difference between ape and blade of grass. I should be disposed to go further and say that while for zoological man you cannot erect a distinct family from that of the chimpanzee and orang, on the other hand, for psychological man you must erect a distinct kingdom; nay, you must even dichotomize the universe, putting man on one side and all things else on the other.

It is this stupendous sense of the soul's reality—that is, its individuality and its self-activity—that we need to emphasize in these days of talk about the soul as merely a derivation from sense-activities.

Let me ask all those who believe there is nothing in the mind but the product of the senses, Whence came