

should be a fruitful means of rounding out character in a wholesome, healthy fashion, and providing beforehand resources of true refreshment and lofty inspiration. Such resources of appreciative power are needed both by the artist and by his public; by the man of leisure and by the humblest workman. Indeed the balance of need lies with the one whose life is to be almost full of commonplace toil, if the improving industrial conditions which give him increasing hours of leisure are to actually make his leisure spiritually profitable to him.

We have hitherto spoken of art in its largest inclusive meaning, comprising all literature, music, painting, sculpture, and architecture. What is true of art, as a whole, in its bearings upon the life of the race and the education of the individual, is true of the particular lines of art which are usually referred to when we speak of art in education. Art in this sense is understood as applying to modeling, drawing, and coloring with their special functions in decoration, illustration, and sculpture, painting, machinery, and building construction and architecture.

Now there are two great obstacles in the way of the establishing of true art education in our public schools:

First. The mistaken and belittling notions about art and art education, which prevail to so great an extent among professed leaders of educational work, as well as on the part of the public.

Second. The unfamiliarity of the rank and file of teachers with the subject-matter and methods of true art instruction.

Now as to the first obstacle, many educators, when they speak of art, mean merely graphic expression, mere diagramming of imitating as a means of stating information. When they speak of art instruction they mean

merely encouraging children to make maps, diagrams, and sketches or models in connection with their lessons in arithmetic, geography, physics, and natural history. These apostles of "free" art practically take the ground that the average child can drop into art, as Mr. Wegg dropped into poetry, "in a friendly sort of way," and that, if he is just given clay, a pencil or brush and a piece of paper and urged to draw or model whatever he happens to see, just as he happens to see it, the result is *art*. This is just like giving the untrained and illiterate child paper and pen, telling him to write whatever he thinks about whatever he pleases, in whatever way occurs to him, and calling the result literature. Now everybody would recognize the absurdity and futility of this latter procedure. We all know that the child cannot by himself evolve good literary taste and good literary style out of his own crude, desultory thoughts, plus a sheet of paper. There is no such short cut to literature. He must indeed write and write and keep on writing, but above all he must read and be taught what to read; his mind must be fed from the fruitful store of good literature which already exists, the legacy of accumulated ages of human culture.

Now it cannot possibly be our best plan to-day to ignore all the progress of the past, and make each child laboriously work out all over again the whole history of civilization, Dark Ages included, when he ought to be let into his birthright as "heir of all the ages." A broader and clearer appreciation on the part of educational leaders as to what art itself means as a factor in developing the creative power of the child, and what it stands for in social life to-day, is the first requisite for the success of art education as a part of public education. As evidence of how this great subject