

Beauty in Design and Pictures: Idealism and Aesthetic Education

Author(s): Mary Ann Stankiewicz

Source: *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (Winter, 1987), pp. 63-76

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3332831>

Accessed: 29/03/2010 16:18

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=illinois>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Illinois Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Aesthetic Education*.

Beauty in Design and Pictures: Idealism and Aesthetic Education

MARY ANN STANKIEWICZ

Germany was virtually the dominant cultural influence on nineteenth-century America. Romanticism in art, Transcendentalism in philosophy, the renaissance in literature, Biblical higher criticism, modes of scientific research, Kindergartens, graduate seminars, and professional scholarly organizations, these all had roots in Germany.¹ Thus it should come as no surprise that German philosophy influenced art education as well as other areas of thought and action in America. Histories of art education explain that Hegelian philosophy reached art education via the work of William Torrey Harris, United States Commissioner of Education from 1889 through 1906.² One problem with this generalization is that by the time Harris became commissioner of education, Hegelian Idealism had become so widely diffused in American culture that its identity had almost disintegrated. Therefore, the problem for the historian of art education becomes one of documenting specific links between Hegelian Idealism, William Torrey Harris, and art-educational literature or practice.³

It is important to remember that Idealism was just one of many threads in the fabric of art education at the turn of the century. Child study, form and object study, research on color and other aspects of perception, Japanese art, and the arts and crafts movement have been recognized as contributing to classroom practices. Like Idealism, Romanticism had seeped into American culture; it, too, contributed to the texture of art education.⁴ Technological changes in printing industries, economic pressures from publishing and art supply businesses, and a variety of other cultural, social, economic, and political factors shaped the field as well. Nonetheless, from about 1895 on, American art educators spoke and wrote about their field using Idealist concepts and assumptions.

Mary Ann Stankiewicz is an associate professor in the Department of Art, University of Maine. She has published in *Visual Arts Research*, *Studies in Art Education*, and this journal and is coeditor of *Women Art Educators*. She has also worked with The Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Even though Idealism had become commonplace and common sense by the late nineteenth century, we can document how specific aspects of Hegelian aesthetics reached art education by examining William Torrey Harris's influence on Henry Turner Bailey, Massachusetts Supervisor of Industrial Drawing from 1887 to 1903, then second editor of *School Arts* until 1917. Bailey met Harris on the train returning from the National Education Association meeting in San Francisco in July 1888.⁵ During the long hours between San Francisco, Yellowstone, and St. Paul, Bailey listened to Harris. The older man's discussions of art, religion, and philosophy filled a void in the younger man's education. Bailey quickly accepted Harris as a mentor, describing Harris as his intellectual godfather.⁶ Within a week of his return to Massachusetts, Bailey used part of his state paycheck to purchase Hegel's *Philosophy of History* and a volume of Emerson's poems, both recommended by Harris. On April 1, 1889, a few months before Harris moved to Washington, Bailey spent a day with Harris at the old Alcott house in Concord, and two days later, at a quarter past five in the morning, he began reading Hegel's *Aesthetics*. The two men remained friends for many years; Bailey dedicated one of his books to Harris and also credited Harris and Ruskin with teaching him to see the picturesque.⁷ Bailey's pretensions to a coherent philosophy of art education must be credited to his relationship with Harris.

Bailey, therefore, provides a clear link between Hegelian Idealism, the work of William Torrey Harris, and art education. However, Bailey distorted some of what he received from Harris. He quoted Hegel in surprising contexts, appealing to his authority rather than to philosophical logic. Bailey's usage of Hegelian Idealism provides an example of one route for the influence of Idealism on art education as well as an example of how this philosophy became popularized in turn-of-the-century art education.

Hegel and Harris on Aesthetics

Hegel's *Aesthetics* was first published as part of his collected works in 1835; the first English translation appeared in 1879. In 1905, Bosanquet translated the introduction to the lectures on aesthetics into English, superseding a partial translation done in 1886. William Torrey Harris belonged to the group of St. Louis Hegelians who read Hegel in German and made their own translations. Although poor language skills may have prevented many American Hegelians from understanding subtleties of German philosophy, the St. Louis Hegelians did comprehend the essentials of Hegelian Idealism, including the dialectic of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.⁸

According to Hegel, one defines one's self through a process of identification with the other in widening social and institutional relationships. In this philosophical process, a human being comes to know his/her spiritual

self through knowledge of that which is other, e.g., by knowledge and experience of nature (the material opposite of the spiritual being) or of the community (the opposite of the individual).⁹ A human being learns as the self is reflected back from the opposing object. Synthesis is found in a union of spirit and nature or of individual and community.

Monroe Beardsley's summary of several key points in Hegel's *Aesthetics* is drawn on by the following discussion. First, Hegel based his aesthetics on the assumption that reality was Spirit or Mind, "a systematic whole whose self-unfolding, through its activity of thought, gives rise to the structure, and the history, of all that is."¹⁰ Second, Hegel asserted that this self-active Spirit required an activity in which the Idea, a synthesis of meaning and shape, could show itself in a sensuous form. Thus, the gulf between spirit and matter was erased by a synthesis of Idea and sensuous form, and art was a necessary activity of the Spirit. Although art was not serious, moral, or useful and might even appear superfluous to some, it was necessary to "the indulgence and relaxation of the spirit."¹¹ Third, according to Hegelian aesthetics the basic and essential function of art was to reveal truth in the material, sensuous form of art. Beauty arose from this reconciliation of matter and content, of sensuous form and embodied Idea. A fourth consideration held that the beauty of art was of higher quality than beauty found in nature because the spirit of the human artist gave the work a stronger imprint of the Idea than that found in nature. Fifth, art, religion, and philosophy provided three ways to understand the Absolute Idea. Hegel explained that apprehension of the spirit in art was an immediate, sensuous knowing, while religion was pictorial thinking and philosophy the free thinking of the Absolute Spirit.¹²

Finally, matter and spirit could assume one of three relationships, each of which generated a historical style of art: (1) Symbolic art, in which the idea was overwhelmed by the medium; (2) Classical art, in which idea and medium were in balance; and (3) Romantic art, in which the idea dominated to complete the spiritualization of art. Hegel devoted much of his aesthetics to a historical survey of these styles, identifying each with particular cultures. Symbolic art, for example, was found in ancient Egypt; Greek sculpture marked the height of Classical art, and Romantic art grew with Christianity. For Hegel, Romantic Christian art was the high point of the history of art, a history which he believed complete and closed. In Hegel's analysis, each style of art also had its paradigmatic art form. Architecture, the most material art form, was a paradigm of Symbolic art, just as sculpture was of classical art. Painting, music, and poetry, the characteristic Romantic art forms, completed a hierarchy which moved toward the least material art, that in which words were the medium.

One other aspect of Hegel's aesthetics will be germane to our discussion. According to Hegel, natural beauty was a beauty of abstract form, an ex-

ternal beauty rather than one arising from a manifestation of the Spirit.¹³ Regularity and symmetry, conformity to law, and harmony were three characteristics of this beauty of abstract form. Regularity unified an object through repetition of one shape; symmetry brought together similar forms but repeated them with variations in size, shape, position, color, etc., so that unity arose from like relationships between unlike forms. Conformity to law was a higher form of unity than mere regularity; it suggested qualitative more than quantitative relationships among forms. Instead of explaining the unity of an abstract form by counting repetitions of like shapes, one could use a principle, such as the Golden Mean, to explain the unity of a natural form. The highest level of unity in natural forms was that of harmony, "a relation of qualitative differences" which created a congruent unity from opposing forms.¹⁴ Hegel again discussed regularity and symmetry, conformity to law, and harmony in his analysis of the external form of the work of art. The work of art existed as an external object as well as a sensuous embodiment of ideal content. As an external object the work of art had beauty of abstract form, but such beauty was material, not spiritual. Thus, more regularity and symmetry should be found in architecture than in less material art forms, although even music and painting derived some unity from repetition. In spite of his concern with conformity to law as one means to unifying the physical form of a work of art, Hegel did not believe that art was rule governed. Theories that formulate prescriptions for making art might be able to specify the form but not the content of a work.¹⁵

William Torrey Harris used Hegelian philosophy to examine politics and to solve practical problems of school teaching and management; but, as he wrote, his "chief application of philosophy was to literature and art."¹⁶ Although he did not travel abroad to see original works of art until later in his career, Harris was interested in art and music during his years in St. Louis.¹⁷ He was a founding member of the St. Louis Art Society in 1866 and was the society's first speaker. He was familiar with Walter Smith's writings on art education, and he visited art galleries when he could. Some of his lectures on aesthetics, including those given at the Concord Summer School of Philosophy, analyzed reproductions of paintings from a Hegelian point of view. Harris has been credited with much of the responsibility for the inclusion of art, music, science, and manual training in the American school curriculum.¹⁸

Harris's writings on art and aesthetic education, published between 1876 and 1900, show evidence of his careful reading of Hegel. Although the earlier writings seem in many respects paraphrases from Hegel, the later writings, published during and after 1889, show that Harris had assimilated Hegelian aesthetics and was applying it to educational problems. Harris used the dialectic in structuring his arguments. He based his

work on the reality of Spirit and Mind and believed that "art and literature lead all other branches of human learning in their capacity to manifest and illustrate the desires and aspirations, the thoughts and deeds of mankind."¹⁹ Although Harris agreed with Hegel that the beauty of art excelled that of nature, his definition of art as a material object which showed the self-activity of a living soul left room for acceptance of nature as a type of art, a favorite American conception.²⁰

There were several points in Hegelian aesthetics that Harris elaborated, sometimes with certain differences from the original. While Harris agreed with Hegel that art, religion, and philosophy were three ways to comprehend the Absolute Idea and the three highest products of the soul, he placed them in a somewhat different hierarchical relationship. Hegel had described philosophy as the synthesis of art and religion in its knowledge of the Absolute.²¹ According to Harris, "Religion is higher than art. Morality and holiness are higher than beauty."²² Each was a means to reach the Absolute. Art offered sensuous perception of the Absolute as Beauty while religion conceived the Absolute as revealed by its traditions and mode of worship. Harris made religion in the large sense, that is, belief in God not limited to church membership, the overarching path to the Absolute. He wrote: "Art is the piety of the Senses, Religion the piety of the Heart, and Philosophy the piety of the Intellect."²³ Although Harris was devout, he did believe in the separation of church and state, in separating the inculcation of religious doctrines from schooling. However, he also believed that moral training had a place in the school, where it could lay a foundation for education in religious doctrines.²⁴ As we shall discuss below, Harris's recommendations for aesthetic education were bound to his belief in the need for moral education.

Harris used Hegel's analysis of the three historical styles in art in several articles and lectures. This analysis provided Harris with a structure from which he could argue for the close connection of art and religion and gave him grounds for asserting the preeminence of Greek art. According to Harris, the Greek religion was superior to other pagan doctrines because it was based on a conception of ideal beauty. The Greeks imagined their gods in human form, thus uniting spirit and sensuous form. The beauty of their art offered a fitting standard for all art because it arose from the tension between soul and matter but showed the triumph of the spirit.²⁵

Harris utilized Hegel's principles of abstract beauty of form in at least three papers. However, he separated regularity and symmetry into two elements and deleted conformity to law while retaining harmony as the third sensuous element in art. Harris defined regularity as a form of rhythm. Rhythm in turn symbolized the first fact of reason, that the self recognized itself and other objects. Both the child and the savage took delight in "the identity in form between the rhythm of his soul activity and the sense-

perception by which he perceives regularity.”²⁶ In other words, a child’s pleasure in repeatedly imitating a sound or action derived from a psychological recognition of similar processes in both spirit and matter. A synthesis of self and object was created through repeated manipulation of an object. The mimetic pleasures of repetition gave rise to early consciousness of the self. Harris asserted that the cycles of nature matched the rhythms of the soul’s self-activity. The perception of such identifications made metaphor possible and gave rise to sun myths and other protoliterary conceptions of divinity. In Harris’s aesthetics, then, regularity, symmetry, and harmony played a much larger role than in Hegel’s. No longer limited to characteristics of the external form of a natural object or work of art, these elements were a link between art and nature which expressed and symbolized aspects of the human spirit. Harris did maintain a hierarchical relationship among the three, asserting that more highly developed cultures preferred symmetry to repetition and that the most cultivated taste sought harmony. Harmony presented the highest type of unity in which details were subordinated to the expression of a conscious purpose.²⁷ The beauty of Greek art arose from the harmony of inner and outer, of will and body, of idea and expression characteristic of its sensuous embodiment of spirit in human form.

A Hegelian View of Aesthetic Education

While most of Harris’s writings on art and aesthetics prior to 1889 focused on relations between art and religion, his writings published after that date applied Hegelian aesthetics to education. We might speculate that his discussions with young Henry Turner Bailey encouraged Harris to apply his understanding of Hegelian Idealism to problems of art education. In any case, Harris believed that the best education established “a system that secures the greatest self-activity of the pupil while it builds up in his character perfect obedience to law, divine and human, and a sacred regard for truth.”²⁸ Perhaps in order to counter the materialism he saw in recommendations for manual training, Harris recommended aesthetic education as the true industrial education. Typically, he built his argument through the dialectic.

Given the distinction between matter and mind, Harris posited five subject areas with significance for mental development and social adjustment.²⁹ Mathematics, which was related to the world of mind revealed in nature, was the first; grammar, which pertained to the world of mind revealed in language, was the second. Harris explained that from these two studies three others arose: biology, history, and the arts. Biology studied organic nature in contrast to study carried on in the inorganic sciences, such as physics, to which higher mathematics led. History and the related

domain of biography demonstrated how the individual will consolidated into social units. Literature, visual art, and music provided the aesthetic element in education and allowed the exercise of the creative imagination. Thus, the opposition of Nature and Man led to studies of inorganic and organic nature and of the three domains of the human mind, i.e., the intellect, the will, and the creative imagination.³⁰ Since the realm of Man was more complex and more directly related to Spirit than the realm of Nature, it was more appropriate as a domain of schooling. Literature and the arts headed the hierarchy of studies because they led "all other branches of human learning in their capacity to manifest and illustrate the desires and aspirations, the thoughts and deeds of mankind."³¹ Through art man tried to create the appearance of spiritual energy where there was no actual soul. Although literature had long been accepted as a school subject, Harris argued that architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and poetry constituted the full hierarchy of arts to be studied. Harris also asserted that art was as serious as history and even more truthful because artists were second only to religious prophets as seers and teachers.³²

In 1889, in an address before the NEA, Harris defined aesthetic education as:

The cultivation of taste, the acquirement of knowledge on the subject of the origin of the idea of beauty (both its historic origins and the philosophical account of its source in human nature), the practice of producing the outlines of the beautiful by the arts of drawing, painting and modeling, the criticism of works of art with a view to discover readily the causes of failure or of success in aesthetic effects.³³

While manual training and general education prepared workers for industry, only aesthetic education, as Harris envisioned it, provided the correct base for industrial success and economic profit. "Wealth demands the aesthetic," but poverty is satisfied with the useful.³⁴ Aesthetic education could teach one to prefer noble, unselfish ideals; thus it offered an ethical goal. Art expressed values of freedom and moral action; its pleasures were spiritual, not merely sensuous.

Harris's writings on aesthetic education included some suggestions for practice. For example, skills of drawing should be taught along with ideals of tasteful, decorative form. Such ideals were epitomized by Greek art which should thus provide a focus in art education. Regularity, symmetry, and harmony showed organic unity and were sensuous elements in art, but as discussed above, they also expressed and symbolized certain qualities of the human spirit. Composition, the structure of the work which includes these elements, was thus the first area to study in art. Schools should collect good reproductions of the greatest masterpieces. About twice a month, the teacher should show the reproductions to students, explaining

the theme of the work and pointing out the artistic means through which the artist expressed the theme.³⁵ Through this process, the students would learn how to analyze pictures, but more importantly, cultivate taste and knowledge of human nature as revealed in art. Both physical and spiritual faculties could be educated through the study of art.

From Harris to Bailey

Bailey owned reprints of several key papers by Harris on aesthetic education, and underlined passages show that he had read them.³⁶ Prior to meeting Harris, Bailey's reading had included the Bible, Ruskin, and popular novels and magazines. Bailey gave Harris credit for encouraging him to read philosophy and great literature: Emerson, Carlyle, Goethe, Kant, Shakespeare, Dante, Augustine, Marcus Aurelius, Aristotle, and Plato.³⁷ In his discussions with Harris, Bailey found support for certain approaches to art education which were then considered bad practice by authorities in the field: undirected drawing by children, nature study, illustrative drawing, and the use of color. By inviting Harris to be the guest speaker at the third annual meeting of the Massachusetts Normal Art School Alumni Association in December 1890, Bailey made certain that Harris's thoughts on the need to develop taste as well as manual skills would be heard by his colleagues. As the State Agent for the Promotion of Industrial Drawing, Bailey was in a position to apply Harris's and his own interpretations of Hegelian Idealism to curriculum development and recommendations for classroom practice. Later, as editor of *School Arts* and a popular lecturer and author, Bailey would communicate his understanding of Idealism to art educators across the country.

The Hegelian dialectic is based on an assumption that the actual world is moving toward the ideal. The thesis is an ideal posited by philosophers, such as Hegel or Harris. Reality, the antithesis, is naturally contradictory to the ideal. The process of synthesis occurs as intellectuals, such as Harris or Bailey, disseminate the ideal so that reality can become a better match with it. I feel uncomfortable describing Bailey as an intellectual, for he clearly was not; rather, he was a popularizer, a booster of art education as the 1920s would have understood that term. Rather than contributing to the idealization of art education, Bailey contributed to the popularization of Idealist beliefs as part of the taken-for-granted assumptions of art education.

One reason for Bailey's attitude was his lack of systematic education in philosophy. After graduating at the head of his class of five from Scituate High School, Bailey attended Massachusetts Normal Art School, graduating in June 1887, after two years' experience as drawing supervisor in the Lowell day schools. Bailey had no training in logic or argument. However,

he enjoyed writing and often supported his points by quotations from his extensive readings. After Harris had introduced Bailey to Emerson, Bailey frequently quoted the Transcendentalist. Quotations from Ruskin and Harris are often found in close proximity to quotations from Emerson, suggesting that Bailey was using all three in support of a generalized romanticism.³⁸ Analysis of Bailey's writings shows that he developed a personal orientation toward art education which drew on Hegelian Idealism via Harris. Bailey described art education in terms of the ideal classroom, the ideal teacher and school.³⁹ He emphasized spiritual goals for art education over material ends, although as a graduate of Walter Smith's school he could also argue for art education as a means to economic prosperity.

There is an interesting pattern in most of Bailey's direct quotations from Hegel. In 1899, Bailey quoted Hegel on the classical form of art as "'the free and adequate embodiment of the Idea in the shape that is peculiarly appropriate to the Idea itself.'" ⁴⁰ The context was a recommendation that all school papers be made beautiful. Bailey declared that Hegel provided a comprehensive and discriminating standard by which all works of art, from spelling papers to classical friezes, might be judged. In his report to the state for 1900-1901, Bailey again quoted Hegel in a discussion of teaching mechanical drawing. Hegel's *Philosophy of Fine Art* was used to support a recommendation that the idea determine the form in applied art.⁴¹ As this section continued, Bailey treated "idea" as equivalent to function so that he was really using Hegel in support of a concept we would term "form follows function." One final example can be found in Bailey's short book on booklet making, where he referred to Hegel in support of a recommendation to embody a personal idea in visual form in designing the booklet.⁴² The pattern that emerges from these examples makes it clear that Bailey was using references to Hegel to give intellectual authority to practical rules and recommendations for manual activities. The general principles of Hegelian Idealism stressed the role of mind and idea; thus, Bailey was using his appeal to authority to argue for the importance of mind in manual training.

While Bailey had been impressed by Harris's philosophy from his first encounter, he did not immediately apply it to art-educational practices. Instead, he read and assimilated ideas until he perceived Harris's work as the solution to a continuing problem, that of teaching drawing as a means of refining taste. In his report for 1894-95, Bailey stated that he had been concerned about this problem as far back as 1888, when he had developed a curriculum outline for a course in design.⁴³ This outline had been a move toward "culture study" because Bailey linked historic ornament and a little art history with the goals of appreciating beauty as well as creating original designs. By the time of his 1894-95 report, Bailey was able to congratulate himself that design, model, and object drawing were recognized

means of culture. The next problem was to transform mechanical and geometric drawing and construction into culture studies as well. Bailey had quoted Ruskin as his authority in treating design as a culture study, now he turned to Hegel and to Harris for support in transforming all aspects of art instruction into studies that would broaden, enlighten, and refine the pupil's mind.

In order that art be taught as culture study, students needed to see exemplars of the principles of beauty, i.e., examples of repetition, symmetry, and harmony in reproductions of works by the great masters. Therefore, Bailey promoted schoolroom decoration and picture study. In addition, the students needed to recognize that drawing was simply one form of expression which could record or manifest structural beauty. Although the physical appearance of a beautiful object altered with changes in time, lighting, and location, the spiritual elements of beauty remained eternal, universal, and changeless. Thus industrial drawing was becoming aesthetic education. As Bailey wrote in the following year's report:

The aim of instruction in drawing is culture through the senses by which we apprehend the forms of things. The ends to be secured are a sensitiveness to beauty, an intelligent appreciation of beautiful things, the power to make things beautiful and to reveal beauty to others.⁴⁴

In support of his push for aesthetic education, Bailey quoted Harris's definition of aesthetic education in both his 1895-96 and 1896-97 reports. Harris became Bailey's authority for a philosophical view of education as a means to introduce students to a spiritual reality and a larger life.

In certain cases, Bailey seems to have reversed Hegel and to have diluted Harris's aesthetic education. For example, when advocating aesthetic education, Bailey made nature study a necessity so that students could experience the beauty of the spirit manifested in nature as well as in art. Bailey often seemed to ignore Hegel's principle that the beauty of art must be higher than natural beauty. There may be a genetic explanation for this as well as a simple lack of comprehension. Bailey's first aesthetic experience occurred while he was sitting in the midst of spring blossoms listening to an oriole sing. Many of his responses to pictures were associative or sentimental, suggesting that he found it easier to respond aesthetically to nature than to art.

Bailey, like Harris, usually placed religion above art as a means to approach the spirit. He quoted Harris on art as a means to "piety of the senses."⁴⁵ He wrote about art as an ethical factor in community life second only to religion, and about the need to live one's aesthetic religion.⁴⁶ However, in at least one context, Bailey did rank religion as equivalent to art and philosophy as paths to the spirit. One of Bailey's most popular lectures had begun as a talk given to normal school students in the late 1890s.

The City of Refuge had first been published in 1901; as *The Magic Realm of the Arts* it was published in 1928; as a lecture, it also was given the title "The Higher Citizenship." Bailey began with the Idealist premise that the arts extend and enrich our physical world into an eternal spiritual one. Using the metaphor of a twelve-gated spiritual city drawn from the Apocalypse, he described what he termed a "celestial health resort."⁴⁷ On the north, the three gates were religion, philosophy, and literature; on the south, nature study, history, and fiction; on the east, poetry, music, and drama; and on the west, architecture, sculpture, and painting. By 1928, the north and south entrances had changed somewhat.⁴⁸ The northern gates were biography, philosophy, and belles lettres, while the southern gates were fiction, religion, and nature study. These three were, according to Bailey, the easiest access to the spiritual realm. The city of refuge served two main functions: not only did citizenship in it guarantee moral excellence, but it provided a worthwhile use of increasingly available leisure time. The transition from Hegelian aesthetics to Bailey's heavenly health resort seems comical but provides a clear illustration of how popularized Idealism had become.

Conclusion

Although Bailey was a member of the National Education Association Committee of Ten appointed on July 8, 1898, his presence cannot fully account for the "remarkably Hegelian" tone which Foster Wygant has noted in the first half of the report.⁴⁹ While I have documented the path by which Hegelianism reached Bailey, I have also examined certain lacunae in his understanding of philosophical Idealism. The Final Report of the Committee of Ten, delivered at the 1902 NEA conference in Minneapolis, is further testimony to the fact that Idealism was a major contributor to the ideology of art education. Langdon Thompson, chair of the committee, was familiar with the Hegelian dialectic prior to his appointment to the committee.⁵⁰ Entries in Bailey's personal and professional diaries indicate that Josephine C. Locke, who left the committee before it had completed its task, was talking about aesthetics and German Idealism at teachers' conferences in 1888 and 1891. A certain Idealist bias can also be found in John S. Clark's philosophy of art education.⁵¹ Although Clark wrote a dissenting opinion and did not sign the final report, he was a member of the committee throughout its labors. Thus, we have evidence that Hegelian Idealism was influencing art education through various channels.

Bailey was not an innovator nor an intellectual leader in art education. Rather, his beliefs and attitudes can be taken as typical of those shared by many of his contemporaries, a reason perhaps for his popular appeal as a speaker and writer. Therefore, in examining Hegelian aesthetics as a base

for Bailey's work in art education, we are examining one role for aesthetic theory in art education. Marilyn Stewart has made a distinction between using concepts from a discipline, like aesthetics, to inform the teaching of art and using the discipline as subject matter.⁵² The second approach characterizes current discipline-based programs.⁵³ While using the discipline of aesthetics as content for art education may be a new development in the field, aesthetic concepts have been informing art teaching for many years. The story of Hegel, Harris, and Bailey illustrates one process by which philosophical theory has become a source for ideology in art education. Documenting and explaining how certain assumptions become taken for granted is a challenging task for the historian. When the historian is also a practitioner of art education, there is a strong temptation to make the lessons of history into overt morals. If aesthetic theory is to inform the teaching of art, as it clearly does, then art educators need to understand the domain of aesthetics as well as the logic of systematic philosophy.

NOTES

1. See the introduction to William H. Goetzmann, ed., *The American Hegelians: An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973). In various articles Abrahamson and Smith have examined more contemporary German influences on art education: Roy E. Abrahamson, "Henry Schaeffer-Simmern: His Life and Works," *Art Education* 33, no. 8 (1980): 12-16; Roy E. Abrahamson, "The Teaching Approach of Henry Schaeffer-Simmern," *Studies in Art Education* 22, no. 1 (1980): 42-50; and Peter Smith, "Germanic Foundations: A Look at What We Are Standing On," *Studies in Art Education* 23, no. 3 (1982): 23-30.
2. For references to Idealism in art education at the turn of the century, see Fred M. Logan, *Growth of Art in American Schools* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), pp. 91-94; Stephen Mark Dobbs, "The Paradox of Art Education in the Public Schools: A Brief History of Influences" (ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED 049 196, 1971); and Foster Wygant, *Art in American Schools in the Nineteenth Century* (Cincinnati: Interwood Press, 1983).
3. Dobbs, "The Paradox of Art Education," p. 9, has cautioned historians of art education about the difficulties of tracing philosophical influences into classroom practices.
4. Mary Ann Stankiewicz, "'The Eye is a Nobler Organ': Ruskin and American Art Education," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 18, no. 2 (1984): 51-64.
5. Eugene, Oregon, University of Oregon Library, Special Collections, Henry Turner Bailey Papers, Diaries; Henry Turner Bailey, Editorial: "N.E.A., San Francisco," *School Arts Book* 10 (June 1911): 989-93; Henry Turner Bailey, *Yankee Notions* (Cambridge, Mass.: Washburn and Thomas, 1929), all have descriptions of Bailey's early meetings with Harris. The author's research on the Bailey Papers at the University of Oregon was funded through a National Endowment for the Humanities Travel to Collections Grant.
6. Bailey, Editorial: "N.E.A."
7. Henry Turner Bailey, *Twelve Great Paintings: Personal Interpretations* (New York: Prang Co., 1913), was dedicated to Harris, "Lover of Beauty; Lover of Truth; Philosopher, Teacher; My Friend." As a student at Massachusetts Normal Art School, Bailey was unable to recognize the picturesque; see Henry Turner Bailey, *Photography and Fine Art* (Worcester, Mass.: Davis Press, 1918), p. 51.

8. Goetzmann, *American Hegelians*, p. 14.
9. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*, trans. T. M. Knox, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. x.
10. Monroe C. Beardsley, *Aesthetics from Classical Greece to the Present: A Short History* (University of Alabama Press, 1975), p. 235.
11. Hegel, *Aesthetics*, p. 3.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 134. Knox, translator of this edition of Hegel's *Aesthetics*, points out in a footnote that Hegel was not original in discussing these characteristics of abstract form. Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty* (chapter 3) and Kant's *Critique of Judgment* also discuss regularity and symmetry, conformity to law, and harmony.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
16. "Harris's Intellectual Odyssey," a selection from William Torrey Harris's Preface to *Hegel's Logic* (1890), reprinted in Goetzmann, *American Hegelians*, p. 74.
17. Kurt F. Leidecker, *Yankee Teacher: The Life of William Torrey Harris* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1946), pp. 299ff.
18. Neil Gerard McCluskey, S. J., *Public Schools and Moral Education: The Influence of Horace Mann, William Torrey Harris, and John Dewey* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 101.
19. William Torrey Harris, "The Study of Art and Literature in Schools" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1900), p. 688. Like many of Harris's writings on aesthetic education, this paper appeared as a chapter in one of his Reports as United States Commissioner of Education, in this case, in the 1898-99 report, and was also reprinted.
20. William Torrey Harris, "Beauty in Art vs. Beauty in Nature" (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1899), pp. 1-2.
21. Hegel, *Aesthetics*, p. 104.
22. Harris, "Beauty in Art," p. 6. This was one of Harris's articles owned and read by Bailey who underlined the second sentence in this quotation.
23. William Torrey Harris, "The Relation of Religion to Art," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 10 (1876): 207.
24. McCluskey, *Public Schools and Moral Education*, pp. 264-65. McCluskey also points out that John Dewey, like Harris, saw an intimate relation between religion and art. Perhaps this trait derived from their common roots in Hegelianism.
25. William Torrey Harris, *Art Education the True Industrial Education* (Syracuse, N.Y.: C. W. Bardeen, 1889), pp. 7-9.
26. William Torrey Harris, "Religion in Art," *Chautauquan* 6 (1886): 191.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
28. William Torrey Harris, "The Psychology of Manual Training," reprinted from *Education* (May 1889): 5.
29. William Torrey Harris, "The Aesthetic Element in Education," reprint of an address read before the National Council of Education at Milwaukee, July 1897, pp. 3ff.
30. Harris, "The Psychology of Manual Training," p. 17.
31. Harris, "The Study of Art and Literature," p. 688.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 692.
33. Harris, *Art Education the True Industrial Education*, p. 1.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
35. Harris, "The Study of Art and Literature," pp. 690-91.
36. These reprints are in Box 5 of the Bailey Papers. They include: "The Psychology of Manual Training" (1889), "Beauty in Art vs. Beauty in Nature" (1899), "The Aesthetic Element in Education" (1897), and "The Study of Art and Literature in Schools" (1900). Several of these were originally speeches which Harris later had published as part of his annual reports as Commissioner of Education.
37. Bailey, *Yankee Notions*.

38. See, for example, Bailey's annual reports to the Massachusetts Board of Education (Boston: Wright and Potter), published in January 1896, p. 355, and in January 1898, pp. 338-39. Dating these reports can be confusing. The report for the school year 1894-95 was published in January 1896.
39. Henry Turner Bailey, *Art Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1914). For other references which reveal Bailey's Idealism, see "Elementary Public Art Instruction—Its Scope, Aims and Methods," *Art Education* 6, no. 1 (1899): 9; "The Fine Arts as an Ethical Factor in Community Life," *Journal of Social Science*, no. 41 (1903): 128-29; *The Arts and Crafts in the Public Schools: An Address before the American Institute of Instruction at New Haven, Connecticut, July, 1906* (Worcester, Mass.: Davis Press, 1907), pp. 15-16.
40. Severance Burrage and Henry Turner Bailey, *School Sanitation and Decoration* (Boston: Heath and Company, 1899), p. 171. Bailey does not indicate the source of this quotation from Hegel.
41. Henry Turner Bailey, "Annual Report," in *Massachusetts Board of Education Annual Report* (Boston: Wright and Potter, January 1902), p. 317. Bailey footnotes the quotation to Hegel's *Philosophy of Fine Art*, chap. 5, sec. 2, but does not indicate which edition or translation.
42. Henry Turner Bailey, *Booklet Making: An Art-Craft Problem* (New York: Prang Company, 1912).
43. Bailey, "Annual Report" (January 1896), p. 358.
44. Bailey, "Annual Report" (January 1897), pp. 383-87.
45. Bailey, "Elementary Public Art Instruction."
46. Bailey, "The Fine Arts as an Ethical Factor," p. 131; Bailey, *Art Education*, p. 32.
47. Henry Turner Bailey, *The City of Refuge* (Worcester, Mass.: Davis Press, 1901), p. 8.
48. Henry Turner Bailey, *The Magic Realm of the Arts, Suggesting Incidentally the Importance of Fads* (Worcester, Mass.: Davis Press, 1928).
49. Wygant, *Art in American Schools*, p. 107.
50. On page 118, Wygant reproduces Thompson's analysis of art from his 1897 *Manual of Drawing to Prepare Students for the Regent's Examination in Drawing*. This outline is structured in dialectical form, raising the question of how, where, and when Thompson became conversant with German philosophy.
51. See, for example, Clark's debate with Col. Francis Wayland Parker at the 1895 NEA conference: John S. Clark, "The Place of Art Education in General Education," *Proceedings of the National Educational Association, 1895, Denver* (St. Paul: National Educational Association, 1895). Although Clark was a follower of John Fiske's version of Spencerian evolutionary theory, Clark and Parker both held that spirit was prior to matter.
52. Marilyn Stewart, "Can Aesthetics Be Taught?" (Paper presented at the National Art Education Association annual conference, New Orleans, April 1986).
53. W. Dwaine Greer, "Discipline-Based Art Education: Approaching Art as a Subject of Study," *Studies in Art Education* 25, no. 4 (1984): 212-18.