NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Charles Dudley Gaitskell: His Philosophy of Art Education

Krystyna Marya Zaremba-Czereyska

A Thesis

in

The Department

of

Art Education and Art Therapy

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts (Art Education) at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

March 1989

ISBN 0-315-51384-5

ABSTRACT

Charles Dudley Gaitskell:
His Philosophy of Art Education

Krystyna Marya Zaremba-Czereyska

This study examines Dr. C.D. Gaitskell's (b.1908) philosophy of art education as reflected in his writings, publications and interviews. A serious involvement in art education began during his studies for a Masters degree in Education (1940) at the University of British Columbia. Gaitskell dedicated himself to this field upon his appointment to the position of Director of Art for the Department of Education, Ontario in 1945. Completion of a Doctorate in Education (1948) at the University of Toronto, focussing on the state of art education in Ontario further reflected his commitment to the discipline of art education.

This thesis retraces Gaitskell's theories on the teaching of art beginning with his early writings during his post with the Department of Education. A survey of his ideas on art education reflected in his major publication Children and Their Art (1958), other writings, and in articles and booklets produced during his period of retirement, is also revealed. With the exception of educators such as Arthur Lismer, Anne Savage and Fritz Brantner, the field of art education was still relatively unexplored in Canada during the first half of the 20th century. Consequently, during his university education and afterwards, Gaitskell was exposed to the

concepts of British and American education and art education which had become popular and were slowly gaining acceptance in Canada. Specifically, the ideas of Sir Herbert Read, Marian Richardson and John Dewey proved influential to Gaitskell's approach to art education. This study investigates the impact of these sources on his philosophy. Further influences from psychology, including the psychological concepts of G. Stanley Hall, John Dewey and the Gestaltist school are also traced. Moreover, there were aesthetic influences from the Bloomsbury Group which affected Gaitskell's ideas. These factors, as determined by this study, are believed to have largely shaped Gaitskell's philosophy of art education which was a synthesis of concepts from these various sources.

Dr. Gaitskell during the early 1950s

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation and thanks to her advisor, Dr. Robert Parker for his help and guidance towards the completion of this study. This debt is also extended to the members of the Faculty committee: to Professors Stan Horner and Leah Sherman for their suggestions and support.

The writer also wishes to express her deep-felt gratitude to Dr. Angela Grigor whose insights and criticisms have proved invaluable. Many thanks to Ray Blackwell for his support and kindness in providing assistance on many background details pertaining to Dr. Gaitskell's career in the Department of Education. Thanks are also due to Diana Cromarty for her many helpful comments and assistance with the typing of this study.

Finally, a special note of appreciation to my mother, Lynda Price-Czereyska, a fellow Art Educator, and to my husband, Kenneth MacLeod, whose support, patience and encouragement were immeasurable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Charles Dudley Gaitskell: His Career in Art Education

Charles Dudley Gaitskell: His Career in Art Education

In 1914 C.D. Gaitskell sailed with his parents from England to Vancouver. After returning from World War I, Gaitskell's father moved his family to Thetis, an island off the Vancouver coast. It was there that Gaitskell gradually developed an interest in painting as a means of keeping himself occupied in this lonely region. In later years, Gaitskell's father, recognizing his son's artistic talents, sent him to study Design at the Otis Art Institute in Los Angeles from which he received a certificate in 1931.

After doing various labouring jobs, Gaitskell continued his education at the Victoria Normal School (Note 1) where he first decided to try teaching art. He was assigned art classes in an adjacent "Model School" and quickly became aware of some problems confronting art education in Canada at that time. Gaitskell found a lack of understanding of what he saw as the nature and purpose of art and art teaching personal expression and growth within the educational system. In his view art did not merely involve recording reality but was an important vehicle for expressing feelings and ideas. He believed by exploring these areas through image-making, the child would mature intellectually, emotionally and socially. It was this stand which Gaitskell would promote in his future writings and in his post as Director of Art in Ontario.

Shortly after graduating he was offered a teaching post in a one-room rural schoolhouse in Peace River British Columbia. This was soon followed by a principalship in this region where Gaitskell served as Supervisor of Art for the Peace River area and wasted no time initiating correspondence courses in art for the outlying rural schools in an attempt to promote art education. He looked forward to the prospect of establishing the territory's art program as he well realized "No art had been taught up North. Here was a remarkable opportunity to start something good in education" (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 9). After observing what Gaitskell felt were some rigid and insular attitudes towards art and art methodology in teacher's college, an opportunity to introduce some new ideas into the teaching of art was welcomed. Moreover, Gaitskell felt the children of this relatively isolated region were "unspoilt", (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 10) that is, unprejudiced by gimmicks and quick and easy methods of representation to which many city children were exposed. He sensed these children had not yet developed any stereotyped notions about art and thus were more capable of producing creative imagery free from the art clichés which he saw prevalent in too many city schools. Gaitskell carried out this work with characteristic drive and attention, meticulously keeping records of his results.

Meanwhile, Gaitskell made use of these records as foundation research for his Masters thesis in Education. (This was preceeded by a B.A. in English and French which Gaitskell completed in 1938.) An Experiment in Art Instruction in the Peace River Educational Area was the result. He received his Degree in 1940.

In spite of the heavy responsibilities of his job and university work at the time, Gaitskell continued drawing and painting in an effort to strengthen his studio background. A competent painter, his work found its way into a number of provincial exhibitions and was given an "Honorable Mention" at the British Columbia Artist's Exhibition at the Vancouver Art Gallery. Gaitskell, however, was not a professional artist but an educator who was interested in art and leaned in the direction of philosophical and administrative matters (Tait, 1957, p. 177).

In addition to his academic and studio pursuits, Gaitskell began writing a number of articles on art education in a determined effort to improve the quality of school art programs in British Columbia. Included among these were some sharp criticisms of the provincial government's inattentiveness to art education within their school system. Not long after their publication Gaitskell was promptly summoned to the Ministry of Education to explain his censorious views on the matter and was, to his surprise, presented with a summer position to instruct art to teachers-in-service in Victoria.

Undoubtedly, this post represented a splendid opportunity for Gaitskell to further the cause for art education and demonstrate its necessity in the development of well adjusted individuals. By reaching out directly to teachers, he was able to encourage a more modern approach to teaching art that placed the development of the child first, and not the art product and the acquisition of skills and techniques that were typical of traditional art programs. In an environment that gave children the freedom to explore their own ideas and life experiences, Gaitskell believed that a more genuine and sincere form of visual expression would emerge. He was firmly convinced that this approach would have more relevance for the education of children since it encouraged active participation in projects that required them to think and solve problems.

Gaitskell was highly critical of the traditional art program with its sterile methods based on the use of copy books, emphasizing representation and perfection of techniques. Yet for the most part in Ontario between 1900 to 1937, this form of art education was still dominant (Note 2) (Tait, 1957, p. 118). The austere and practical atmosphere this traditional approach stimulated was primarily the result of professional artists who knew little about elementary education and even less of a child's reaction to art (Tait, 1957, p. 119). Consequently, they imposed a program upon school children that was more closely attuned to the needs of the adult artist. Gaitskell had no patience with this concept of art education and strongly favoured child-centered methods for teaching

art, largely conditioned by the teaching of Franz Cizek (1865-1946). By the end of his university studies in British Columbia in 1939, Gaitskell had become quite familiar with Cizek's ideas and endorsed his view that the art teacher should assume a more passive role so that the child's imagination could have greater reign. While Gaitskell was in agreement with Cizek's theories, he was more fully in accordance with the pedagogical views of another supporter of the child-centered approach to art education, Marian Richardson (1892-1946). Indeed, this British art teacher was to prove quite influential in shaping his approach to art education.

Gaitskell also strongly supported the educational concepts advocated by the Progressive Education Movement and its leader John Dewey (1859-1952), whose theories on democracy and education Gaitskell felt had great applications for the teaching of art. He was of the opinion that both the ideas of Cizek and Dewey (Note 3) would lead to a humane form of art education that more closely considered the needs of the individual as well as those of the state. Gaitskell saw that the art produced under a system that embraced Dewey's and Cizek's concepts on education and art instruction would be a natural form of communication and an outlet for creativity, and could have a significant effect on the total development of the child since it would be based on the child's interests and needs.

By 1939 Gaitskell had established a reputation in the field of art education with his summer sessions for teachers in Victoria and his earlier work in Peace River. In 1940, he was appointed as Supervisor of Art for Powell River, just north of Vancouver, and remained there until 1944. In that same year, still dissatisfied with his academic qualifications, Gaitskell moved to Ontario to pursue a Doctorate in Education at the University of Toronto. One day, still undecided about a topic for his thesis, Gaitskell was called to the office of Dr. John Althouse, then Chief Director of Education in Ontario. At this time, Althouse himself was searching for a candidate to conduct a survey on the state of art education in Ontario. Aware of Gaitskell's Masters thesis Althouse offered him the position of Supervisor of Art for the Province of Ontario. Gaitskell could hardly believe his good fortune in being given such an opportunity to review and hopefully assist in improving the state of art instruction in another Canadian province. In addition, Dr. Althouse was very helpful and gave him the type of personal support and encouragement necessary if serious changes were to be made (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 15).

For Gaitskell this job represented the beginning of an important phase in the development of his philosophy. In writing a critical analysis of Ontario art education for his report to the Education Department, he was naturally led to reflect upon his own criteria for a good art program. Gaitskell soon realized much of what he was encountering within the Ontario school system was at odds with his views thus far:

> The art system to my way of thinking, was not good in spite of the fact that it had some excellent teachers. Too much copying, lack of freedom to think artistically in the majority of classrooms, too many teachers who really had not been taught the true significance of that process known as 'education through art'. (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 16)

Shortly after submitting his report in 1945 to a very impressed Dr. Althouse, Gaitskell was appointed Director of Art for the Department of Education, the first position of its kind in Canada (MacGregor, 1979, p. 10). He accepted this job without hesitation which he held until 1965. For a man with his drive and ambition this was an opportunity not to be missed. Despite the heavy responsibilities of this new position, Gaitskell continued to work on his Doctorate, incorporating much of the research from his report into his thesis, Art Education in the Province of Ontario (1948). Although his report to the Department of Education had inevitably led him to begin clarifying his goals for art education, it was the writing of his Doctoral Thesis which seemed to stimulate the crystallization of his thoughts. Indeed, his chapter listing various recommendations for improving art education in Ontario reflects the views of an individual who has a clear idea of what he feels constitutes good art education.

In reviewing the history and state of art teaching in Ontario, Gaitskell became familiar with much art education literature. His writings on contemporary art education reflect a fundamental knowledge of both British and American theorists; these affected Gaitskell's views.

Many of the suggestions for improving the quality of art instruction in Ontario that Gaitskell proposed in his Doctoral Thesis, were in fact what he was already striving to accomplish at the time in his office as Director of Art. Gaitskell realized from the onset that he was bound to upset a number of supporters of traditional methods in education who based much of their teaching on the development of skills and techniques. For this group, the new art education which placed the free expression of the child first, before preparatory technical instruction, was still quite radical in its approach.

It must be mentioned here, however, that an effort to change and better the quality of art instruction in Ontario even though outside the school system, had already been initiated by Arthur Lismer. Preceeding Gaitskell by almost twenty years, Lismer had struggled to rid children from enduring the formal drills and exercises which passed for art within the schools (Grigor, 1982, p. 20). With Lismer's appointment as Education Supervisor at the Art Gallery of Toronto in 1927, he began training his young staff to teach art, working from the child's needs and surroundings. His Saturday morning classes for children provided an opportunity to

promote a less rigid form of art education emphasizing self-expression (Note 4). Lismer's end of the school year presentations, in the form of large and colourful "pageants" performed by the children for parents and the public helped to publicize this approach. In addition, Lismer also held some in-service lectures for local teachers at the Gallery to further expand an awareness of art and broaden their knowledge of new art teaching methods.

Despite Lismer's pioneer efforts, the conservative form of art instruction was still prevalent in the classroom in 1945 when Gaitskell became Director of Art for Ontario with the Department of Education. Yet Gaitskell was prepared to challenge this inflexible art pedagogy. Undaunted by the camps of opposition that were forming, and quite confident in his authority, Gaitskell knew he had the official and financial backing to pursue his aim. He possessed a strong will and was adamant about his goal to try and improve the quality of school art programs:

> I decided I would give myself 5 years to change the art program in Ontario .... I would try to get rid of that rigid program of teacher dominated colour exercises, copy work which was being confused with art .... I planned a Ministry program of no compromise, not tact even, just a new education approach to art stated simply and boldly. (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 18)

One important modification Gaitskell initiated to improve the quality of art teaching was the organization of teacher-in-service summer courses. Gaitskell had already discovered the extreme need for such a program as most of the teachers instructing art in the school system had no real background in art education. While there were a few institutions such as McMaster University, Queen's University, the University of Western Ontario, the Department of Art and Archaeology of the University of Toronto and the Ontario College of Art, offering art education courses and degrees or certificates in Fine Art, their effect on the school program was minimal (Gaitskell, 1948, pp. 27-28). At the first three institutions mentioned, only summer courses were offered and these were of a technical and historical nature and did not deal with practical methods for teaching art to children. The training offered by the latter schools cited was general in nature and most of their graduates were not teachers (Note 5).

By the mid 1960s the summer school under Gaitskell's direction became quite popular with an enrollment of 2,000 students and the program was documented in journals from UNESCO in Paris to Ottawa (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 19). There is no doubt his courses were in demand. Tait (1957) maintains that this program made a great contribution to Ontario art education and helped teachers adopt more progressive art teaching practices raising the standard of art in the schools (p. 12).

Though the summer sessions were gaining in popularity during the early stages, Gaitskell realized it would take years before their influence would be felt, and that many other projects had to be initiated before changes would truly begin to occur. Thus, in 1948, he established a research centre for art education in Essex Street Public School in connection with the Toronto Board of Education. Here Gaitskell would research his own particular art teaching methods as well as those of contemporary art education in general. In addition, he also carried out experiments to prove how the traditional approach to teaching art could seriously hinder creative art production. Other studies included a critical examination of Victor Lowenfeld's visual/haptic theory which Gaitskell found too inflexible and constricting in its division of "types" (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985).

Much of the information gathered at the research centre later resulted in a series of books on art education for the classroom teacher, most concentrating on the elementary level: Art Education in the Province of Ontario (1948), Art and Crafts in the Schools of Ontario (1949), Arts and Crafts in our Schools (1950), Children and Their Pictures (1951), Art Education in the Kindergarten (1952) and Art Education for Slow Learners (1953) written with his wife Margaret Gaitskell, and Art Education During Adolescence (1954). Initially published by the Department of Education and given away free to teachers to stimulate interest in art education, these books gained enough response to be later published by companies in the United States, Britain and Canada.

By 1949 Gaitskell's ideas on art education were well defined. For him, the writing of each book was an occasion to gain wider recognition for art education and to stress to both teachers and parents alike the need for art if a well-rounded education was to be achieved. The main goals for art education, outlined in his Art and Crafts of the Schools of Ontario were to be consistently emphasized with each publication:

1. art should assist the individual to develop to the full extent of his needs and capacities.
2. art should assist the individual to become a useful, valued and co-operative member of his social group. (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 9)

Gaitskell also cautioned that the concern of a good art program should always be a " ... properly educated child and not a piece of art and craft work" (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 10).

Much of Gaitskell's concern for retaining the individual's identity in art and encouraging art based on a child's felt experiences expressed in these and other writings, reflects the philosophy of a British circle of artists and art critics, the Bloomsbury Group (active circa 1920s). Their views on art and aesthetic education and particularly the ideas of Roger Fry (1866-1934) and Clive Bell (1881-1964) were to prove influential on his outlook.

Gaitskell's reputation was growing by the late 1940s and he was soon approached by his Japanese friend, Keichi Mori, the painter and educator, to have parts of his books translated for publication in the Japanese art magazine Biiku Bunka. This was followed by a lecture tour of Japan which gave Gaitskell another opportunity to promote art education.

Research and books prompted the production of films, radio talks, public lectures to teachers, teachers' conferences, class visits, mimeo bulletins and local workshops. Gaitskell was an aggressive and ambitious man who was determined to see the results of his work and used used any available means to further his ideas on education through art. Approval of Gaitskell's efforts seemed to be confirmed by the number of lectures and projects he was invited to do, in Ontario and across Canada and the United States. In 1950 "School Arts Magazine" called upon him to be Associate Editor, after several of his articles had brought favourable responses. Then, a tremendous opportunity opened up when Gaitskell was asked by Victor D'Amico, Chairman of Art Education for the Museum of Modern Art in New York City, if he would stand for election to The Council of the Committee on Art Education.

This offer was an exciting one for Gaitskell, as it represented for him a unique chance to regularly see the latest works by Modern masters and local New York artists, as well as exchange ideas with leading American art educators. Gaitskell and D'Amic, both outgoing and unreserved in their opinions, were to become good friends.

Gaitskell admired the work of D'Amico and often observed his classes at the Museum when he was in New York, occasionally assisting in demonstrations or arranging material for presentations (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985). D'Amico's approach centred around the "process", which he viewed as a most important element in art education. Eisner says of D'Amico, "He saw the child as an artist, who was to be immersed in the process of creation, a process more important than the product the child produced" (Eisner, 1972, p. 56). Whether or not D'Amico influenced Gaitskell's views on art teaching remains an open question. Yet, Margaret Gaitskell suggests that her husband must have been in agreement with what he saw at the Museum because he never criticized D'Amico's program and she admitted, Dr. Gaitskell was quite critical of everything (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985).

This was an active time for Gaitskell and soon an invitation to head an international seminar on art education in Bristol, England (1951) was offered by UNESCO. As a result of this symposium, Gaitskell was also involved in the creation of the International Society for Education Through Art. This organization, which endorsed a philosophy of education through art, was one which Gaitskell wholeheartedly supported. Working alongside Gaitskell on this important project was the British author and art educator Sir Herbert Read (1893-1968). Gaitskell found in Read a kindred spirit as well as a good friend. Over the following years, Gaitskell met with Read as often as possible at various conferences and seminars

where both exchanged ideas on art education. Read became an important benefactor for Gaitskell, recommending him for various influential projects as well as taking him on in 1964 as advisory editor for his own art history journal Discovering Art. While Dewey's impact on Gaitskell was indeed profound, it was Read's theories that proved to be the most significant and decisive individual influence on his philosophy.

The profound effect of Read's thinking upon Gaitskell was reflected in the formation and title of the Canadian Society for Education Through Art which Gaitskell founded in 1955 after the British model, the Society for Education Through Art, of which Read was President. Within a few years this Society was to become a powerful educational forum, helping to both unite art education across Canada and bring recognition and respect for the discipline in this country. In 1963 the C.S.E.A. played an important role in the international art education scene by hosting an I.N.S.E.A. conference in Montréal. MacGregor notes Gaitskell's part in this event:

> It was a measure of Dudley Gaitskell's status as an art educator that he was elected President of the International Society for Education Through Art in 1962. One of his first tasks in that capacity was the organization of I.N.S.E.A.'s 4th Assembly to be held in Montréal .... (MacGregor, 1979, p. 27)

This occasion was, no doubt, a great coup for Gaitskell whose reputation was now extending to the international level.

In 1965 the Department of Education promoted Gaitskell to the position of Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum in a totally reorganized Department of Education under the leadership of Minister William Davis. Gaitskell, however, became frustrated with this position finding his power and authority checked by various Department members and committees with which he now had to work. In addition, he found some of his administrative responsibilities rather routine. For a man of his energy and will he needed the challenge his previous position had provided, and the freedom to sanction changes. Now he was impatient waiting for a change. Although compulsory retirement came in 1973, Gaitskell was still determined to remain involved in the art education scene. In 1976 he became a Consultant to the Visual Arts Department of the Metropolitan Separate School Board in Toronto, assisting in the production of a number of guidebooks on art education: Art Education in the Intermediate Division: A Report to A. Mallon, Art Education: A Catholic Dimension, Art Appreciation, Artists in the Schools and Art in Special Education. Finally, a terminal illness prevented him from continuing with his stated goal:

> Most of my life has revolved around the concept of education through art. I still don't see how any young person can be properly educated without this concept. This, I think, is the pivotal idea that has motivated me for all these years. (Gaitskell, 1979, p. 36)

Gaitskell's contribution to art education has not gone unrecognized. In 1958 the C.S.E.A. made Gaitskell Honorary President, a position that lasted until 1972 and, in 1973, he was awarded the V.K. Greer Award by the Ontario Educational Association for "Outstanding Contribution to General Education". These awards were followed by a presentation for the first honorary membership given by the Ontario Society for Education Through Art. In 1979 Miami University in Ohio presented him with a "School of Achievement" Award.

Notes Chapter 1

Note 1: The Victoria Normal School was, in fact, a teacher-training college.

Note 2: In 1904 the Department of Education in Ontario dropped "Drawing" as a subject and replaced it with "Art".

Note 3: The theories of Cizek and Dewey had been quickly gaining ground in Britain through the teachings of Marian Richardson and Herbert Read and in the United States through the Progressive Education Movement.

Note 4: Lismer's approach to teaching art was primarily based upon the Project Method, developed by John Dewey. Consequently, his methods embraced group work as a means of encouraging a community spirit and sense of social responsibility within each child. Grigor's research (1982) has revealed that Lismer was also interested in child-centered methods inspired by the teachings of Frank Cizek and Marian Richardson. Grigor has found that some of the more liberal concepts linked with child-centered education were

essentially incompatible with the Project Method (Grigor, 1982, p. 60). Moreover she observes that there were further contradictions between Lismer's theory and practice (ibid., chap. 5).

Note 5: It is interesting to note that this lack of teachers professionally trained in art pedagogy remained even after Gaitskell's numerous efforts to incur positive changes. This he attempted to do at the height of his power within the Department of Education through school inspections, guide books, bulletins and films on art instruction. Indeed, art education "specialists" as they are known today, were still very much a rarity in the school system until the 1960s (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984).

Chapter 2

Influences From England and Europe

Influences From England and Europe

Part 1: Influences on Gaitskell's Views of Aesthetic Education

While the fields of education and psychology were to exert a strong influence on Gaitskell's philosophy of art education, the inspiration he gleaned from the world of art and art criticism also proved vital. There is no doubt that for those involved in teaching art, observation and study of the professional artists and his/her impact on society can give a unique insight into the nature of the creative process and personal expression as well as provide a reflection of cultural mores. The artists's world can offer the art educator a model regarding the establishment of a rapport between the student and culture, essential for the development of a sense of community. Furthermore, the world of the artist's studio can reveal an atmosphere of intensity, fullness of observation, originality of insight, enhanced perceptions, that are characteristics equally desirable in the educational process and sought out by the art educator. For Gaitskell it was the ideas advanced by the Bloomsbury Group of British artists and writers (active during the first three decades of this century) which proved influential on his concepts about art and aesthetics (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). Specifically their notions on the nature of creative activity and

the purpose of art provided Gaitskell with further insight into how children learn and grow through aesthetic expression and appreciation. While he was familiar with the work of most of Bloomsbury's members - Virginia Woolf, Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant, Maynard Keynes, Lytton Strachey - to name a few, it was the ideas of Clive Bell and especially Roger Fry that particularly appealed to Gaitskell. It was his opinion that their writings had great applications for the teaching of art (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

Bloomsbury Aesthetics

The Bloomsbury Group was a gathering of artists, writers and art critics whose friendship was based on a shared attitude to life embodied in the philosophy of G.E. Moore. It was from Moore's book Principa Ethica (1903) that Bloomsbury formed their values, devoting their life to the religion of creating and appreciating art works. Moore's thesis revolved around the idea of a "principle of organic unity" which claimed that all things which had infinite intrinsic value were likely to be highly complex wholes (Johnstone, 1954, p. 22). His philosophy put forward the idea that art was intrinsically good and thus inspiring Bloomsbury to adopt the belief in art for art's sake. Consequently, the idea that the creation and appreciation of art would intensify and expand one's awareness to life became Bloomsbury's way.

Support for this outlook was found in the expressive essays on art by the two intellectual forces behind the Group - Roger Fry and Clive Bell. For Bell, art was a spiritual necessity (Johnstone, 1954, p. 36), while Fry regarded art "... a necessary and culminating function of civilized life ... indeed the great refining and disinterested activity, without which modern civilization would become a luxurious barbarity" (Note 6) (Johnstone, 1954, p. 38). Gaitskell's philosophy reveals a support of this view that the arts are a vital means of enriching both the national cultural life and the individual's personal existence:

> Art, as such, then, is good for people and demands of its creators the highest standards of endeavor. There are indications, also, that under certain conditions, art tends to have permanently beneficial effects upon the personalities of those who create it. Any activity which engages the individual so deeply may exert a broad and lasting influence on the whole personality. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 9)

There was no doubt in Gaitskell's mind, as mentioned in Chapter 1, that art was fundamental to a well-rounded education.

Another important outcome of Bloomsbury philosophy, inspired by Moore, was the belief that the artist had no moral responsibility to society (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 1976, p. 7). The Bloomsbury Group felt that art should not be judged by its moral worth or by its effect upon society. Whether Gaitskell would have agreed with this

particular point is not known. However, his insistance on providing artists with a great degree of freedom and belief that creativity cannot flourish in a restricted environment appears to endorse the Bloomsbury attitude (Gaitskell, 1958, pp. 18-19). Yet at the same time Gaitskell held strong views on the issue that the individual must learn to co-operate with members of his/her social group. Examination of his two main goals for art education outlined in Chapter 1 reveals that the social role of art was of critical importance to Gaitskell. In his opinion art was a means of establishing a harmonious relationship with society, that also brought form and order into a child's life (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 8). It may be inferred then, that if Gaitskell held that the individual (and the artist) must develop in relation to his/her social group, he also felt that art should endow and benefit the social environment. This then would be in keeping with Gaitskell's belief that a major aim of the art and craft program should be to develop good citizens (Gaitskell, 1946-1947, Bulletin No. 2, p. 1). Thus, Gaitskell's outlook appears to differ from Fry's in that he did not condone an art program which focused solely on the product at the expense of the individual's growth as a person. According to Gaitskell, to do so would lead to anti-social behaviour:

> Much romantic tradition centres about the carefree, bohemian abandon in the lives of famous creators. The peccadillos of Gauguin, George Sand, Baudelaire and Byron are but a few examples. On the other hand, one finds the recluse such as Blake and Ryder. Neither form of behaviour can be accepted by the educationist. (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 51)

Ironically, this comment of Gaitskell's appears to negate the search for individuality and identity, which often is what motivates artists and frequently results in their rebellious and non-conformist behaviour against society's standards. In this instance Gaitskell's views seem to diverge from Bloomsbury ideology with its emphasis on the individual (Note 7).

Roger Fry and Clive Bell

The concepts which the Bloomsbury Group promoted found an articulate spokesman in Roger Fry (1866-1934) whose energy and drive helped propel the Group into new avenues of creativity. Kenneth Clark once said of this art historian, critic, curator, art educator, designer and painter that he taught his generation to how to look (Arts Council and the University of Nottingham, 1966, p. 6). Certainly his writings on early modern art helped generate amongst the artistic community and some members of the public a greater appreciation for what was considered, during the first two decades

of this century, as a radical and subversive art movement. By evolving a vocabulary to discuss Post Impressionist and Early Modern works - stressing colour, brushwork and composition - more so than ever before in the analyses of artworks, Fry became a proponent of modernism.

A revolutionary for his time, Fry protested against the formless exactitude of popular academic art arguing that art should be a vehicle for personal expression (Note 8) (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 1976, p. 10). The emotive content was, in his view, all important in art. According to Fry the slavish copying of nature should be rejected except when the likeness would be necessary to convey the emotional quality the artist was trying to capture. This stance was closely linked with his belief that the aesthetic experience is one which should be valued in and for its own sake. Recalling the "art for art's sake" credo promoted by the artist James McNeil Whistler and the Aesthetic Movement (which reached its peak in the 1880s), Fry's ideas seemed to embody the high minded spiritual and artistic values of the aesthetes. This implied a rejection on Fry's part of the Victorian outlook on art which was bounded by a concern for material and common-place things (Aslin, 1981, p. 14). He was of the opinion that true expression lay in imagination and not in the rendering of precise images. The preoccupation with narrative realism was in his view morally decadent and an outgrowth of 19th century industry with its emphasis on materialism (Note 9) (Sullivan, 1984, p. 8).

What Roger Fry (and Clive Bell) believed were the essential aspects of art were the elementary aesthetic components, the qualities and relationship between colours, shades, lines, surfaces and areas. The artist may, in his/her search for excellence and mastery, create an organization or assembly of these components which pleases the viewer. Bell referred to this organization (commonly known as 'composition' or 'design') when it produced a powerful, eye-catching assembly stimulating aesthetic emotions, as "significant form" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 11). According to Bell "'significant form' is the one quality common to all works of visual art" (Landis, 1951, p. 38). Both Bell and Fry believed these aesthetic components were intrinsically expressive and should be valued in and of themselves. As Clive Bell put it "... the supreme quality in all art is formal; it has to do with order, sequence, movement and shape" (Johnstone, 1954, p. 59).

This novel concept was introduced by Bell in his book Art (1914). Here he encouraged a response to a work of plastic art as one would to a piece of instrumental music. He suggested that in working with the aesthetic components, the artist did not have to necessarily paint a recognizable form such as flowers, for example. Rather the artist could suggest floral qualities and generate emotions similar to when they actually saw a vase filled with flowers (Edel, 1979, p. 213). In developing this doctrine of "significant form" Bell had been affected by the Post Impressionist aesthetic of simplification and plastic design. He attributed the

emergence of their style to the fact that traditional forms of representation had proved unsuitable for the communication of their concepts and emotions. Consequently, Bell explained, the Post Impressionists had to create a visual language which was founded upon the significance of form. For these artists the expression of an emotion took precedence over the use of a descriptive language (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 1976, p. 12). Bell observed that the Post Impressionists had eliminated all details from an object in order to concentrate on the significance of its form. Commenting on their methods of expressing certain spiritual experiences by means of pictorial and plastic form. "Forms and the relation of forms have been for them, not means of suggesting emotion but objects of emotion. It is this emotion they have expressed. Their drawing and design have been plastic and not descriptive" (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 1976, p. 12). In his view artists should be free to choose any degree of representational accuracy which suited the expression of their feelings. Fry subscribed to Bell's approach: "Every artist has to create his own method of expression in his medium, and there is no one way, right or wrong. But every way is right when it is expressive throughout the idea in the artist's mind" (Johnstone, 1954, p. 94). For the English art world of 1914 fascinated with polished representational images, this concept, which emphasized the formal over the mimetic, was revolutionary. Together Fry and Bell's radical insights into art developed the vocabulary of modernism. Attacking the traditional art world's preoccupation with

representational art, they asserted that the true value of an art work stems from the emotion it can generate in the viewer (Sullivan, 1984, p. 56).

This belief that art is an expressive act which communicates and reflects the feelings and thoughts of its creator is one Gaitskell also championed (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 7). As briefly discussed in Chapter 1, Gaitskell, in his capacity as Director of Art for Ontario, tried to encourage art programs based on a child's felt experiences. In his summer courses for teachers-in-service, Gaitskell emphasized this approach favouring the use of instrumental music as a means of liberating pure emotion and thought during the image-making process (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1988a). Particularly with the "noon-hour performances" he staged with his assistant Margaret (later his wife), Gaitskell created abstract images to music that seemed to ally with Bell's theory of "significant form" (Note 10). Clearly, his "performances" seem to suggest Gaitskell's recognition that an arrangement and emphasis on the aesthetic components alone - lines, colours, shapes, textures, lights and darks - could communicate an emotion, a sensation, an idea, as could musical notes.

This concentration on formal qualities which Bell had noted of Post Impressionist art, Fry had also observed to be characteristic of children's art. As with the images of the professional artist he perceived their work to be equally highly personal. According to Fry the art of the child was an expression of lived, felt

experiences, which had involved their entire being, as do all creative explorations (Johnstone, 1954, p. 47). Gaitskell shared this belief commenting that "... the aesthetic act ... engages the whole personality of the creating person and channels his actions into constructive modes of behaviour" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 9). This enlisting of the total personality Gaitskell noted, also occurred when the individual was involved in the aesthetic appreciation of objects (Gaitskell, 1943, p. 14).

Aware of the fresh sponteneity of child art, Clive Bell warned that if their artistic sensibility (which seems to dwindle with the end of childhood) was to be preserved they should be given a freedom that avoids tampering "... with that direct emotional reaction to things which is the genius of children" (Bell, 1914, p. 186). Gaitskell's response to this issue reflected an equally strong interest in maintaining the child's independence and unique form of expression from adult domination. In terms of the adult teacher's behaviour he warned that "The teacher must take care not to do the thinking for the child. The child must learn 'to stand on his own two feet' and not run to the teacher to think for him" (Gaitskell, 1951, p. 5). Gaitskell well realized that children represent in art what they think and that consequently the teacher must develop an approach which respects their ideas as well as the charm and creativeness of their work (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 2, 1944, p. 8).

Reflecting upon ...ild art, Clive Bell had noticed of his era the unfair tendency to compare adult representational images with the highly individual bold and colourful semi-abstract works of children. He admonished adults for any attempt to impose their tastes and criteria for assessing art upon children declaring "Do not imagine that adults must be the best judges of what is good and what matters" (Bell, 1914, p. 186). Bell suggested that the method for retaining "... the artist that is in almost every child" was not to provide the youngster with formal art training, but rather to place them in the position of finding out "... what they want and what they are" (Bell, 1914, p. 187). This concept of self-realization through art was one later adopted by Gaitskell and strongly emphasized in his role as Director of Art. Reviewing the qualities of a "good" art teacher, Gaitskell stated:

> She realizes that art activity is but a means to an end. This end is largely the development of personality within its social setting ... the good teacher will be more interested in general development of pupils, including mental and emotional factors, than in particular development related to skills, important as skills may be as aids to expression. (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 3, 1946, p. 6)

As with Bell, Roger Fry had also noticed a forthright simplicity and freshness of vision in children's art which he had perceived was equally evident in the work of the Post Impressionists. Fry's

sincere interest in child art was evinced in the Exhibition of Children's Drawings which he organized at the Omega Workshops in 1917 (Note 11). The work consisted of drawings by children of artists and was augmented by the student drawings of pioneer British art educator Marian Richardson. Fry was supportive of Richardson's teachings upholding her view that imagination rather than the development of skills should be the focus of the art process (British Crafts Council, 1984, p. 20). Fry believed that art was the expression of an emotion felt by the artist, communicated so as to evoke a response similar in the viewer. His ideas and support for Richardson's methods ultimately helped draw some attention in England towards the need for a new focus in art education. Indeed it has been suggested that Fry's writings most probably had an influence on British art educators of his day as many of them were, in various ways, involved with the artistic community (Sullivan, 1984, p. 128). Certainly, for Gaitskell, Fry's views held many interesting ideas which he believed were relevant to art educators. Akin with Fry he felt that a painted image was the result of a felt experience and that representation of reality should not be valued over the representation of an emotional idea. On this point, Gaitskell stated "... art is a statement which takes the form of a visual pattern or design and presents the emotions of a human being to his experiences" (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1952, p. 1).

With regards to design and its effect on society's tastes and the environment, Gaitskell shared many of Fry's concerns. The improvement of a child's sense of design and aesthetic appreciation was, for Gaitskell, a critical aspect of a good art and craft program (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). He believed that by developing children's tastes they would lead richer lives because of their ability to select well designed objects to be used in their immediate environment (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 3, 1946, p. 2). As Director of Art, Gaitskell clearly expressed his thoughts on this matter stating:

> It is important for children to think about design in everyday living. Children must learn to descriminate (sic.) between good and poor design ... These children will soon comprise the buying public, and it will be they who set the standards of design. Let us help them develop a sureness of taste so that they reject that which is vulgar, ugly, ostentatious, and will tolerate only that which is fine, orderly, appropriate and beautiful. (quoted from Tait, 1957, p. 247)

Gaitskell was painfully aware of the problematic situation which had evolved with the proliferation of gaudy, poorly designed objects which had flooded the North American market in the 19th and 20th centuries. In terms of society's urban surroundings the banality of design was equally serious. In an address to the Southern California Art Education Association in the early 1950s, Gaitskell

stressed the critical need for developing an aesthetic sensitivity within children (Note 12). He believed aesthetic education would help prevent the appearance of further visual eyesores such as the dreary suburban sprawl which envelopes many cities. In his presentation, Gaitskell emphasized his point by quoting playwright and novelist Robertson Davies who said of the Canadian visual environment:

> It is a never-failing source of astonishment to visitors that in Canada, where the landscape is so varied and so beautiful, the works of man are so overwhelmingly mean and trivial. There are literally hundreds of places in Canada - some of them large cities - in which there is not one solitary building upon which the sensitive eye can fall with pleasure. (quoted from Gaitskell, Art: A Human Necessity, unpublished paper, p. 4)

Gaitskell realized as well, that not much had changed since the days of the Bloomsbury Group. He had noted Fry's comments on the general level of aesthetic taste in the early 1920s:

> We may, I think, admit that our moral level, our general humanity is decidedly higher today, but the level of our imaginative life is comparatively lower; we are satisfied there with a grossness, a sheer barbarity and squalor which would have shocked the thirteenth century profoundly. (quoted from Gaitskell, 1947, p. 47)

Certainly Victorian craft had been banal and restricted where it was not garishly flamboyant in its applied design or heavy with pretentiousness. To counteract this disheartening situation, and in an attempt to reintroduce fine craftsmanship into the production of everyday objects, Fry had founded the Omega Workshops in 1913 (Note 13). Collectivizing a number of young artists he knew, among them members of Bloomsbury, Fry's Omega Group offered beautifully crafted custom designed objects (Beaverbrook Art Gallery, 1976, p. 14). Through this company Fry had wanted to bring the artist/designer in closer harmony with the craftsperson/machinist, adapting design to the new materials of the modern age and the new methods of manufacture. Like Fry, Gaitskell recognized the vital role art education could play in promoting honesty and simplicity in good design by teaching children to be intelligent future consumers (Tait, 1957, p. 246). According to him, a perceptive buying public who would recognize what constitutes excellence in design would then exert pressure upon manufacturers to produce objects which were aesthetically acceptable (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 2, 1946, p. 2). Gaitskell had observed that in the past, art curriculums had tried to elevate taste mainly through formal and literary analyses of great artworks and had failed. Consequently, as Director of Art, he decided to establish programs that encouraged sensitivity to quality in design through the actual creation of visually attractive and well crafted objects in addition to the production of asethetically pleasing images. In Gaitskell's view, the cultivation of aesthetic

taste had to be linked with production and expression (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 2, 1946, p. 2). Aesthetic experience and the appreciation of art were not, in his opinion, to be restricted to a passive attitude of quiet looking. Yet, at the same time, Gaitskell realized that the contemplation of good examples of art and craft work were a valuable part of fostering appreciation for the aesthetically beautiful (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 1, 1944, p. 9). To encourage a taste for superior design he urged that when teaching craft (or three-dimensional art as Gaitskell saw it), design should always be related to function (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 42). Believing in architect Louis Sullivan's motto "Form Follows Function" Gaitskell advocated that the art teacher should primarily focus on purpose related to design (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

Similar to Fry, Gaitskell had hoped to stimulate an artistic attitude and re-establish a sensitivity within society that would help people descriminate between the vulgar and the noble in their surroundings. By examining and creating well designed objects and images he believed that as the children matured they would become more visually conscious and highly developed mentally, and better able to value the artistic products and expressions of others. Indeed for both Fry and Gaitskell aesthetic education was the means of solving the social problems of a visually sterile and mediocre environment that assaulted our eyes, morally disheartening our souls.

Part 2: New Approaches to Art Education

Historical Background

Before the 19th century children were regarded as miniature adults and were treated as such by grown-ups. However, by the early part of the 19th century children came to be viewed as different from adults. With increased educational opportunities during this era, males and females were separated in order to attend to the specific needs of each group. A greater consciousness concerning the needs of children had been developing prior to the emergence of child psychology as a discipline (Biehler, 1974, p. 62). Rousseau (1712-1788) believed that the child should be viewed as an individual and that his education should be related to his interests and everyday life (Frost and Bailey, 1973, pp. 310-315). The child was seen as qualitatively different from the adult and his life characterized by stages of development, each echoing the evolution of the human race. Every stage was held to have its own needs to which education must conform, thus allowing the individual to develop to his fullest potential (Frost and Bailey, 1973, p. 311). This concept, which placed the child at the centre of the educative process was, to be later articulated by Pestalozzi and Froebel.

These same liberal views, however, were not extended to the child's natural inclination to draw and were not apparent in the first "linear drawing" programs introduced into the schools. The nature of this formal approach consisted of prescribed drawing lessons that were fixed, mechanical and utilitarian. Introduced into England circa 1840, linear drawing was taught in conjunction with carpentry, map-making, housebuilding, and surveying (Grigor, 1982, p. 47). The Victorian pre-occupation with practicality, a manifestation of the Industrial Revolution, led art to be viewed as a luxury. Consequently, the application of art to industry was used as a practical justification for including art instruction in the school curriculum.

William Morris

In Britain, the pioneer efforts of William Morris (1834-1896) had begun to generate an awareness of the need for educating the public about art. An active Socialist, Morris was appalled by the effects industrialization was having not only on people, especially craftspeople, but also on the goods they produced. Morris was driven by a concern to improve the condition of humanity and the quality of life as well as to make culture and art available to everyone. Disgusted by the misuse of the machine which was being used to market what he saw as shoddy and ill-designed products, Morris sought to develop a proper relationship between art, product

and society. Paving the way for Roger Fry's Omega Workshops sixty years later, he brought together a community of artists/craftspeople to create well crafted everyday household objects using good materials. No longer a slave to the machine, the craftsperson would be able to find fulfillment in their work overseeing the evolution of this product from its design conception to its finishing touches. In this way Morris hoped to re-unite artist and craftsperson, designer and artisan.

Morris' reflections on art and society in mid-Victorian England led him to declare in 1877 "I don't want art for a few any more than education for a few or freedom for a few" (Tames, 1981, p. 29).

As previously stated in this Chapter, a concern with the social role of art (as expressed by Morris) was also explored by Gaitskell. This is again reflected in a statement he made to the Montréal Standard Newspaper in 1947. At this time, he stressed the need for improving the public's appreciation of design and the value of the arts, especially in everyday life by means of a good art education program in the schools. Like Morris Gaitskell believed that the public's standard of taste would eventually be improved by education and by exposure to more visually pleasing quality products.

Morris' impact on the renaissance of British craftsmanship and design cannot be underestimated. By his teachings and his example he was to influence the careers and achievements of many prominent artists and craftspeople, both in England and North America. Undoubtedly, Morris' accomplishments were of particular inspiration

to Roger Fry in the establishment of his Omega Workshops. In turn, his missionary efforts were also to indirectly affect how designers/craftspersons were to be educated (Note 14). In his attempt to close the gap that existed between designer and executant in the craft industry of the 19th century, Morris (along with John Ruskin) advocated a sound artistic training for artisans and a thorough and systematic art education for artist-designers (Callen, 1979, p. 97). Furthermore, it has been observed that the accomplishments of William Morris and his firms were, on the whole, "... essentially educational and 'improving' in intention. The designers and painters wished not only to work in a new way, but to convince the general public of the rightness of their views" (Aslin, 1969, p. 33).

Further Backgrounds of Art Education

The concern for social reform at the end of the 19th century also had its impact on art education and was visible right into the twentieth century. In Ontario, this is evidenced by the justification for art within the schools stated in the Ontario Teachers Manual published in 1916:

> Not the least of the benefits that come to the pupil through the study of the subject is the vision that it gives him of the dignity of labour, in that the lowliest work well done may, through the workman's attitude toward it, come to rank as a veritable work of art. (Department of Education, 1916, p. 17)

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) asserted a contrary view to the rigid teacher-dominated system that was predominant throughout the 19th century. He stated that the most valuable knowledge for the individual's mental development was a system wherein the person solve their own problems and test his own ideas, as in the scientific method. In his book, Education Intellectual, Moral and Physical, published in 1861, Spencer expresses this condemnation of copying in perhaps the earliest reference to the child as artist:

> What is it that the child first tries to represent? Things that are large, things that are attractive in colour, things round which its most pleasurable associations cluster .... The question is not whether the child is producing good drawings. The question is whether it is developing its faculties. (Note 15)

Ruskin, also recognizing the aesthetic and psychological values derived from the spontaneous drawings of children stated: "I do not think it advisable to engage a child in any but the most voluntary practice of art .... it should be allowed to crawl at its own free will" (Note 16).

Ruskin struggled to rid the school system of drawing programs that used art as a means of developing various industrial skills. Instead, he sought to promote a notion of liberal education where art, music and literature would be used to teach culture (Field, 1970, p. 50).

In turning away from vocational art towards a concept of "natural" development regarding the child's abilities, Ruskin was followed by his disciple Ebenezer Cooke. Cooke was acquainted with James Sulley, a leading British psychologist of the period who had defined some of the stages of development employing terminology reminiscent of that used today. Cooke tried to merge his ideas about art education with psychological concepts learned from Sulley; together they discussed the significance of children's drawings. In an article written for the Journal of Education in 1885, Cooke wrote: "The child's attention is aroused and sustained by interest .... The nature of the child can no more be altered by us. We must study, sympathize and conquer by obeying it" (Note 17).

Indeed these comments are remarkable in their anticipation of subsequent theories on learning advanced by G. Stanley Hall, John Dewey and later Gaitskell. In addition to these insights into the nature of the child, Cooke's investigations into what happens when children practice art also led to the first inclusion of colour in a school's art curriculum (Grigor, 1982, pp. 48-49).

Cooke was also affected by Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852), whose theories on freedom, self-activity and self-creativity in education were to shape his own thoughts on teaching art. Froebel believed that education should be based on the interests and spontaneous activities of the child. He also felt that play should be considered an important part of the learning process: "Play is the highest expression of human development in the child, for it alone is the free expression of what is the child's soul" (quoted from Read, 1970, p. 109).

Child-Centered Education

The renewed interest in the child visible by the end of the 19th century and early on in the 20th century had also been generated by psychological insights into learning processes and the manner in which ideas develop in the maturing individual. With the 1920s a movement in child-centered education had emerged, directing attention to the idea that the educational system should exist first and foremost to serve the development of the child as an individual (Entwistle, 1970, p. 17). This notion stemmed from the belief that children should be happy in school and that they should enjoy learning and schoolwork if it was to be of any value. Thus, the Progressive Education Movement in America, which endorsed this view, tried to create a climate within the school where the child would be valued above the factual dissemination of information. Consequently

the Progressives urged for more sympathy and understanding of a child's world on the part of the teacher. Since childhood was, in their view, intrinsically valuable the child must be treated as a human being worthy of respect (Entwistle, 1970, p. 18). As chief spokesman for the Progressives, John Dewey (1859-1952) became a critical force in popularizing this child-centered form of education. Inspired by his theories on the usefullness of social education many child-centered educators also advocated that education should aim at eliminating social problems such as social stratification which prohibits social homogeneity.

By the 1930s the ideas of child-centered education had begun to seriously affect the direction of art education in the United States (Kaufman, 1966, p. 80). The student came to be treated as an individual with inherent worth and dignity possessing creative potential that could be realized in art. Expressionism in painting and diverse social pressures also directed attention to the issues of personal self-expression and originality (Lanier, 1972, p. 15).

In Europe, these concepts proved influential on Professor Franz Cizek of Vienna. In Britain this growing respect for the individuality of the child was further advanced in the teachings of Marian Richardson whose revolutionary methods tried to encourage the use of the child's imagination through word pictures. A continuing support for a child-centered form of learning art was also implicit in the writings of Sir Herbert Read. Basing his ideas on a rich and scholarly background, he emphasized how the child's realization of his/her distinct and latent abilities by means of an education through art could yield social harmony.

In their work each art educator had concentrated on the individual child and how art could be used for personal development. Each had perceived artistic learning as an essential aspect of the human experience, views inherent to child-centered education. Gaitskell's writings reveal both a close relationship with child-centered education and dimensions of Cizek's, Richardson's and Read's philosophies.

Franz Cizek

Franz Cizek (1865-1949) is credited with being the first art educator to implement a program designed to liberate creative impulses innate in children. His philosophy was based upon the principle (also akin to Rousseau) "Let the children grow, develop and mature" (Tomlinson, 1944, p. 19). This concept was to lay the foundations for a new method of art pedagogy. In his public teachings, Cizek tried to encourage children to draw on their own without adult interference. A review of some of Gaitskell's concerns for art education reflect his absorption of some of Cizek's concepts.

Like Cizek, Gaitskell favoured a pedagogy that allowed children to be personally expressive and original in their art. He found merit in Cizek's idea of "creative expression" and also strove to establish a form of art teaching that encouraged children to present in visual form, their emotional reactions to happenings in their

lives (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985). Although Gaitskell openly acknowledged Cizek's influence on his philosophy, he always maintained that his ideas affected him only in a general way (Note 18) (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). However, it has been observed by a number of art educators who knew and worked with Gaitskell that his classroom methods involved a minimal amount of overt formal instruction akin to the teachings of Cizek.

Cizek stated that children should be given a variety of materials to choose from and be allowed to mature according to their innate laws of development. But while Cizek may have publicly advocated a methodology that stressed a passive role for the teacher, this does not seem to have been applied to his own teaching. Much of Cizek's students' art work reflects a sophistication and uniformity of design suggestive of formal instruction. As Grigor notes, his lessons were in reality accompanied by clear definite instructions: "Cizek, contrary to his public statements, did not rely on the spontaneous expression of his students, but presented quite specific pictorial motivation before they began to work" (Grigor, 1932, p. 53).

Gaitskell was clearly aware of this contradiction in Cizek's teaching. He remarked upon the stylized, decorative expressions, with their bright patterns derived from Art Nouveau, which he realized characterized much of the work of Cizek's students:

> Cizek, you know, was off the beam in a lot of ways. You look at his children's art work and you'll find it wasn't natural laws that brought about the art, it was a finnicky sort of peasanty type touch to the children's work. So the teachers influenced the children unduly I thought in Cizek's establishment. (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982)

Despite this tendency in Cizek's methods, which Gaitskell labelled as "overvigorous teaching" he fully recognized at the same time Cizek's significance for art education. Gaitskell noted that Cizek was the first to discover and appreciate the decorative rhythmic art that comes naturally to children. Moreover, he found Cizek's attempt to promote child art as a valid art form, eminently praiseworthy. For Gaitskell this art educator's work deserved widespread admiration. Gaitskell observed that Cizek's belief that children have the capacity to express themselves in a personal and creative manner was not only a valid premise, but one that was to become the basis for contemporary art education methodology. Gaitskell found Cizek's adage "Education is growth and self fulfillment" an appealing concept and one that was in accordance with his child-centered philosophy. Moreover, Gaitskell approved of Cizek's view that inspiration was derived from the internal nature of a child.

It is interesting to note that Cizek's notion of the child as an individual who "... has worked out of feeling, unselfconsciously, spontaneously pressed on by some urge from within" (Art Education, 1924, p. 1) manifested itself somewhat in Gaitskell's own classroom methods. Within the classroom, Gaitskell tried to involve and motivate students "naturally" by capturing their interest through his own exploration with art media (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). A former colleague of Gaitskell's, Tom Martin, remembers how he worked with children in his summer school program. Gaitskell would sit in the room and quietly begin to work on a new art project. The children, whose curiosity had been aroused, would slowly gather around to watch (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). Margaret Gaitskell, who was her husband's assistant in the late 1940s and the early 1950s, also confirms his use of this casual and individual approach to initiate new art forms (Note 19).

This approach however, implies a contrary stance to the social and group oriented theories Gaitskell also espoused although it is in keeping with his concern for relating to the individual child. As was the case with Cizek, Gaitskell's philosophy betrays an inconsistency between the written word and his actual methodology. His personal classroom strategies seem to reveal a stronger interest in the student as an individual. This represents a departure from his advocation of an art pedagogy that gave equal consideration to the individual and social aspects of education put forth in nearly all his publications. This is again confirmed by Margaret Gaitskell

(M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985) and also by Ray Blackwell - a former student, colleague and close friend of Gaitskell's (Note 20).

Recalling Cizek's expression that each child is a law unto himself and should be allowed to develop his own technique, Gaitskell tried to preserve the child's identity in his classroom. Whether he was teaching teachers or small children, Gaitskell tried not to subject them to technical exercises but rather let the individual's own ideas and methods unfold. Like Cizek, Gaitskell's desire to preserve the individuality of the child, led him to provide a choice of materials in the classroom with which to create. (However, like Cizek too, Gaitskell only presented a 'choice' of carefully selected and arranged materials within the room. In this way he was sure it would lead to the kind of activity he wanted to have happen (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1987). Within this setting criticism was to always be sympathetically given, the student's efforts never ridiculed. Again, in apparent conformity with Cizek's advice, Gaitskell also took care not to praise skill at the expense of creative ideas. Clearly it was Gaitskell's focus on the belief that every child is creative, a concept derived from Cizek's approach, that was central to his philosophy. As Director of Art, and with the help of a devoted group of assistants and adherents, Gaitskell struggled to spread his gospel. Arnel Pattemore, another former colleague of Gaitskell's, also remembers that this emphasis on the individual was always prevalent in his words to teachers:

> What Gaitskell was saying to us was that not everyone is the same; not everybody had to do the same thing. And, so in your classes, you deal with the individual. He's always been a person very strong on the individual, on individuality, on creativity, on free expression .... and very much against the exploiting of children.... (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984)

It is surprising that Gaitskell, who was generally known as a very strong willed and aggressive man, would choose to teach using an informal approach that relegated him to an unassuming role within the classroom. Nevertheless, Margaret Gaitskell confirms that her husband did indeed try to keep a quiet and low profile in his classes. She recalls that Gaitskell would only interfere when he felt his help was genuinely needed. Yet, his influence remained strong, despite his subtle and low-key manner. This image of Gaitskell the art teacher, seems to somewhat contradict his reputation as a career man who was known by some of his young assistant-disciple-teachers as the 'Great Guru' (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984).

For many young art teachers in the late 1940s and early 1950s, Gaitskell was viewed as a formidable force not to be challenged. Arnel Pattemore recalls: "Even to be in his presence you could sense the power within him" (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984).

As outspoken as Gaitskell was, he was never known to have given direct instructions to his young staff or student teachers regarding how to teach art. Nonetheless, his philosophy and art methodology was disseminated and upheld throughout his years as Director of Art for Ontario. Gaitskell's impact was pervasive whether it was in the summer school of which he was Principal, or in the schools which he supervised, or in the workshops he gave and publications he wrote as Director of Art. Pattemore remembers:

> He was there and everyone knew he was there. I think as a student the feeling was you sort of saw him coming down the hall and almost said 'there comes the great Dr. Gaitskell' .... his presence was felt .... his being permeated the whole course. (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984)

It is evident that although Gaitskell tried to provide an atmosphere free from adult (and his) intervention in his classroom and programs, this was not the case. The sheer presence and force of his personality conflicted with and prohibited a "total" and unaffected freedom of expression on the part of student teachers and children.

Moreover, Gaitskell's meticulous organization of the art room in terms of materials and space reflected a conscious attempt to impart specific knowledge, and in a specific manner. While, from a philosophical standpoint, Gaitskell found the concept of children creating artwork free from adult constrictions appealing, this did

not occur in his own class. Each lesson had a particular goal and students were channeled through new learning experiences (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1987).

The child, the art process and not the product were the principles that would govern a provincial art program while Gaitskell was in power. He was unflinching in his determination that adult/teacher interference, which he regarded as a major flaw in most school art classes, would be reduced to a minimum after he took charge in 1945. While Cizek may not have actually practiced his philosophy of self activity and free expression, Gaitskell did attempt to implement this concept in his own classroom. In his view, this approach was seen as part of the nucleus of an art program which gave justice to the child's individuality. However, it must be remembered that Gaitskell never advocated a total "hands off" policy, always favouring an art education program of "controlled freedom". Yet, unlike Cizek's approach, Gaitskell's actual classroom methods were never as overtly inimical to child-centered art education. For the most part, Gaitskell seemed more true to his written word in simply trying to establish an open atmosphere that was conducive to individual personal expression.

Marian Richardson

Another art educator who, like Cizek, abandoned the traditional approach to teaching art was Marian Richardson of England. Her pioneer work in art education from 1912-1946 was based on the belief that all children are gifted with the power to create and should be given equal opportunity to express themselves. She recognized the power of imaginative expression and was aware of the vivid, expressive painting which children could produce, if left to work on their own. While this concept, and the belief that children possess an intstinctive desire for drawing was not a new one (Note 21), it was still considered radical in the early part of this century. Richardson's words, however, add a brilliancy to these ideas by a sense of dedication and faith captured through her revelatory teaching:

> Over and over again my story returns to the fact that children visualize naturally. They bring this precious gift, perhaps the subtlest and most delicate part of their spiritual endowment, and offer it to us whenever we teach art. Without it we should indeed be hopeless; for the truth is that art cannot be taught, but in sympathy it can be shared. I see pictures. Will you show me how to paint them? It is as though they knew that these mental images may die, like empty daydreams or live as joyful expression. (Richardson, 1948, pp. 84-85)

Richardson's thesis, based on the belief that all children have creative abilities was reflected as Carline notes in her classroom teaching methods: "... she refused to give direct instruction and allowed the aesthetic sensibilities and the imagination of the pupils to guide them" (Carline, 1968, p. 170).

Richardson began putting her ideas into practice at the Dudley Grammar School for Girls where she was appointed art mistress in 1911. Here, she one day stumbled upon a method of liberating her students' imagination that was to become her hallmark. Recalling the event she said:

> One day I decided to try giving the children a word picture. I asked them to shut their eyes while they listened to a description of a little local street, lit by the moon, as I had myself seen and painted it a short while before. I was surprised and delighted with the results. No doubt the fact that I had seen the subject as a picture gave colour and point to my words and reduced them to what was artistically significant. From this moment the work had a new quality. Whereas before it had been little more than the reproduction of something photographed by the physical eye, it now had an original and inner quality. It haunted me. I could not forget it .... I began to see that this thing we stumbled upon, as it were almost by chance, was art, not drawing .... I could free it, but I could not teach

> it, and my whole purpose was now directed to this end, as I set out to learn with and from the children. (Richardson, 1948, pp. 12-13)

This experience fired Richardson with a renewed energy. By means of her 'word pictures' she had discovered her ability to draw upon children's inner visions. The power of her extremely clear descriptions had released within her students a kaleidoscope of mental imagery that was, in her view, frequently richer and more expressive than the rather traditional drawings from observation required of children taking art at that time. Commenting on the potency of Richardson's descriptions in the "Introduction" to her book Art and The Child (1948) renowned art historian Kenneth Clark said of her method:

> .... her pupils were first hypnotised into seeing the subject and then given an appetite for the right materials. I use the word hypnotised half seriously, for the extraordinary vividness with which her pupils realized her descriptions did seem to involve some kind of telepathic suggestion. (p. 8)

Many of these images rendered by her students were of everyday contemporary subjects from the children's environment in Dudley done in a variety of media (MacDonald, 1970, p. 349). In having the pupil recall these experiences Richardson did not merely ask the child to "illustrate" some incident. She realized that to provide such vague subject matter as "fall" or "work" would yield

stereotypical and literal images. Instead, she focussed on something more specific in order that the child would remember what they actually "felt" as well as what was seen. She was convinced that these representations of vivid mental images were far more artistic than the realistic representations usually done in art classes: "I knew that the children did their best work when painting from mental images" and also noted, "I myself was a natural visualizer and found that the children were interested in descriptions of my own imagery .... and that whatever possessed for me the genuine picture quality had a sort of incandescence which I could communicate" (MacDonald, 1970, p. 350). If the children were for some reason unable to respond to her description she encouraged them to freely develop another one they had visualized. Even though these spontaneous visions might have been simply splashes of colour or abstract patterns, Richardson still considered them valid attempts at artistic expression (Richardson, 1948, p. 19).

Clearly for Richardson the child was a natural artist who visualized freely and easily: "No matter how difficult and subtle the problem, they worked with much greater confidence and security when the inner eye directed them than when they were depending upon the vision of the physical eye" (Richardson, 1948, p. 19). Richardson had also realized this same capacity amongst adult artists. Like Cizek, her association with the world of the professional artist was to prove invaluable in gaining recognition for her students' art. Acceptance of the inherent artistic worth of

her children's work by recognized artists probably gave Richardson the kind of reassurance she needed to pursue her goals. Indeed, it was while viewing the first Post Impressionist exhibition in London in 1912 that she had realized a corresponding resemblance between the work she had seen there and her students' work from the highsc'ool in Dudley (Field & Newick, 1973, p. 142). Through her friendship with Roger and Margery Fry, Richardson became acquainted with the leading artists and critics of her day, which secured a respect for her novel work in art education. She had taken some of her students' pieces with her upon visiting a children's art exhibition at the Omega Workshops. Seeing her pupils' artwork, the art critic Roger Fry had been so impressed he asked if some pieces might be added to the exhibition. Later, in 1920 at the Grafton Galleries in London, her children's work was received with considerable success. These achievements naturally affected the outcome of her career. In 1924 she was hired as Lecturer in Art at the London Day Training College and in 1930 was appointed Art Inspector to the London County Council.

In 1934, the popularity of her teachings led to an illustrated lecture-tour of Canada. These lectures, which were free and open to the public, were very well received. In Victoria, British Columbia, her addresses to the Provincial Summer School were so popular that the Victoria Times recorded that if interest continued, an alternate locale would have to be found to accommodate the crowds (The Victoria Times, August 2, 1934). As a student at the Victoria

Normal School during this time, Gaitskell attended one of these lectures (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). John Kyle, Director of the Provincial Summer School in Victoria was then a known driving force in art education in British Columbia and a supporter of Richardson (Hodder, October, 1977, p. 7). It therefore seems likely that as a young student in art education Gaitskell would have become well acquainted with Richardson's ideas influenced by the prevailing philosophy of the school as led by Kyle.

That Gaitskell acknowledged a debt to Marian Richardson has already been established (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). Certainly his unbounding admiration for the British art educator is clearly evident in his statement that "Probably Marian Richardson was one of the greatest art teachers of children the world has ever seen" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 38).

One important belief that Gaitskell shared with Richardson was that art should be taught in a way that respected the needs, capabilities and preferences of children (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 140). Richardson had tried to achieve this goal by presenting her lessons in a manner that allowed each child to express themselves individually. Gaitskell was completely in favour of this type of approach. In his view it not only encouraged freedom of thought, which he believed was important in art, but it also enabled children to follow their own instincts and thereby produce work that was genuinely personally expressive.

Another observation both Gaitskell and Richardson shared was that children's art exhibited the same creative energy visible in the work of professional artists. Gaitskell said of their work "...because of its inspiration, its form, and its subject matter, the art of children lies within the great tradition of man's artistic expression" (Gaitskell, 1952, p. 1).

A more obvious bond with Richardson's philosophy is visible in the format for art lessons in picture-making which Gaitskell promoted as Director of Art for Ontario. Reviewing the new art education policy launched by Gaitskell in the late 1940s Tait describes a methodology strikingly similar in approach to Richardson's:

> A teacher of the present time does not display pictorial materials to introduce lessons in picture-making, but she does motivate the pupils by stimulating their visual imagery. Let us suppose that a Grade VI teacher is about to teach a picture-making lesson in which the pupils are to depict a scene outside a factory. If she simply distributed the required materials and says to the class, 'Draw the picture of a factory', the results will be disappointing because the children are not mentally prepared for the problem. Some kind of stimulus must be provided to establish rich visual images in the minds of children. This may be accomplished by means

> of a short discussion preceeding the actual operations of drawing and painting. The teacher may say, "Imagine that you are standing in a street, looking through a fence in the direction of a large factory. Close your eyes and picture in your minds the factory and the yards about it. I can see tall chimneys pouring dark smoke against a bright blue sky. What can you see, John?" John sees a water tower; Mary sees railway cars; Peter sees piles of raw materials; Dick sees men at work; Amy sees a line of trucks; Edna sees hydro poles and electric wires; and so on. (Tait, 1957, p. 195)

Implicit in this use of a Richardson technique for motivation is an approval of her methodology. It is interesting to note that Gaitskell also made use of music as a means of motivation, a strategy also associated with Richardson (MacDonald, 1970, p. 351). Particularly in his summer classes for teachers-in-service he would use classical (instrumental) music to establish a mood for creating art (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1988a). Using this kind of motivation, Gaitskell hoped his students would be free to interpret an image entirely in their own way. Likewise Richardson had also realized that music was a powerful force for creating an atmosphere in which the imagination could be freed. She even spoke of "a music of shapes", her definition of beauty, which she believed her type of pedagogy would foster (MacDonald, 1970, p. 351). In addition to

music, Richardson employed poetry and dancing, which were combined with the use of bold art media, as a means of developing the child's rhythmic abilities (MacDonald, 1970, p. 351). In keeping with this viewpoint, literature was also exploited by Gaitskell and used as motivation to create an open atmosphere in which he hoped visual expressions would evolve spontaneously.

This less formal approach to teaching however, still met with much resistance in Ontario well into the late 1950s. Many educators could not accept the idea that art could be taught and understood without instructing children in the rules of design, composition, colour and perspective. Tait noted Gaitskell's reaction to this situation: "The Director, on the other hand, maintained that children make greater progress if they are plunged into the creative process, learning skills and principles as needed in the situation" (1957, p. 196). For Gaitskell this less traditional approach to teaching art by no means negated the important role of the teacher (Gaitskell, 1958, pp. 38-39). This person was always seen as a vital part of the art making process for the child, acting as a catalyst to arouse interest in a topic: "It is suggested that considerable stress be laid upon the role of the teacher as a counsellor, rather than as an adult who sets a class to work upon an imitative type of painting ...." (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 139). Richardson had also defended this position ".... work such as is seen here is not 'free expression' as generally understood, which may be merely unconscious imitation, but a disciplined activity in

which the teacher's own imaginative gifts play a very important part ...." (MacDonald, 1970, p. 351). Clearly, both Gaitskell and Richardson recognized the fact that children need positive stimulation by the teacher before they can express their ideas to the best of their ability. Yet at the same time, it must be noted that Marian Richardson's writings seem to betray a contrary stance. As previously mentioned she had said of her work "I began to see that this thing we had stumbled upon, as it were by chance, was art, not drawing .... I could free it but I could not teach it" (Richardson, 1948, p. 13). It has been suggested that Richardson's definition of "teaching" had a different connotation in her era (Field & Newick, 1973, p. 143). Ostensibly at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century a prevalent assumption was that "to teach" denoted "to instruct" in a very restricted sense somewhat like "to condition". Consequently, although teachers did "teach" extensively in that they furnished media and motivation, anything suggestive of instruction was strictly taboo.

It appears that Gaitskell too perhaps held this notion. Elizabeth Harrison, a student teacher, protégé and later colleague of Gaitskell's is also known to have held this supposition. In her book Self Expression Through Art (1951) endorsed by Gaitskell she stated: "In fact 'art teaching' in school should hardly exist at all. There is very little teaching involved in the modern method, because self expression in art cannot be taught, but it can be stimulated" (p. 2). Coming from England, Harrison's methodology and

attitude to art may well have been affected by Richardson's theories (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1988a). Gaitskell's subscription to this line of thinking (and indirectly Richardson's pedagogy) seems evident in the supporting comments in the 'Foreward' he wrote for Harrison's book.

Yet Gaitskell was aware of this issue regarding terminology (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 43). Though, unlike Richardson, he did use the word "teaching", it was always linked to the term "helping". "Teaching" was for Gaitskell "guiding" the child in the Progressive sense. Never did his use of the word imply "dictation" of formulae that inhibited freedom of thought. Gaitskell was known to have practiced this informal "teaching" in his own classrooms, avoiding giving direct instructions to either his pupils or teachers (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1984) (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1987). Former student and colleague Ray Blackwell remembers he was "... very positively encouraging and quietly informal in his teaching" (Cassette Tape, 1984). Nevertheless, when challenged, Gaitskell's strong personality gained him the reputation of being quite a formidable force. Arnel Pattemore recalls: "If he didn't like something he told you .... He would tell you what he thought .... you sensed his wrath" (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984). Gaitskell was not complaisant and he would not stand for any dissention in his ranks. Only those, it seems, whose methodology upheld his were taken on. Pattemore clearly recollects that teachers, especially for his Summer School were "carefully chosen

because of who they were and what they stood for. Gaitskell always watched them carefully and what was being done" (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984). It is not surprising that a man of such determination and will as Gaitskell would permit only those art methods which he supported in his programs. Undeniably Richardson's approach met with his approval and aspects of her doctrine were encouraged under his leadership as Director of Art.

Part 3: Sir Herbert Read

Apart from his admiration for the work of Marian Richardson and some aspects of Cizek's philosophy, Gaitskell felt a tremendous respect for the teachings of Sir Herbert Read (1893-1968), philosopher, historian, educator and poet. Gaitskell met Read in 1951 at the UNESCO Bristol Seminar on art education and from that point on became a devoted follower and close friend. As Margaret Gaitskell recalls: "He met the man, immediately fell for him. He couldn't help it. The man was a saint" (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985).

The esteem Gaitskell held for this "... towering yet lovable figure" as he himself described Read, was equally as strong as that of Gaitskell's wife (Hodder, 1980, p. 44). Their friendship, which grew steadily over the years, led Gaitskell (as well as his wife

Margaret) to look upon his scholar friend with indeed almost saintly virtues, leading him to declare Read as "... really a genius if ever there was one" (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

Gaitskell's intensely fond memories of Read were no doubt the result of the kind and generous support this learned man had shown him. As a recognized critic and scholar of art, Read's friendship and reputation had provided Gaitskell with invaluable opportunities to expand his knowledge of and career in art education. Undoubtedly, Read's acquaintenceship with other known educators and art educators throughout the world helped Gaitskell to further establish important contacts critical to his career. Margaret Gaitskell recalls that Read was always ready to recommend her husband for any writing assignments (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985). It seems logical then, that when Read asked Gaitskell to become Associate Editor of his British magazine "Discovering Canadian Art" in 1964, Gaitskell immediately accepted it as an honour.

The immense regard Gaitskell had for Sir Herbert Read was not, however, merely the result of career related help which Read had extended to his young colleague. Philosophically, Gaitskell wholeheartedly agreed with the approach set forth by read in his best known book Education Through Art (1943). Gaitskell's adoption of Sir Herbert's thesis of art as a means of education was to be clearly evinced in the name of the art education group, the "Canadian Society for Education Through Art" which he founded after Read's British model the "Society for Education Through Art" (MacGregor, 1984, p. 3).

Sir Herbert Read was a prolific author whose philosophical views in the area of politics and sociology were considerably influential in his time. It has been noted that what was rather remarkable about Read was his contribution to the discipline of art education, since he had never declared himself to be either an artist or teacher (MacGregor, 1984, p. 57). In his publication, Education Through Art, which became an inspiration to a number of prominent art educators in post-World War II Britain, he examined the importance of art in society as a critical means of communication and expression. The thesis he proposed, which he acknowledged had been advanced by Plato centuries earlier was: "The thesis is that art should be the basis of education" (Read, 1943, p. 1). In this and later writings such as the Grass Roots of Art (1947), Art and Industry (1953), Education Through Art: A Revolutionary Policy (1955), and The Redemption of the Robot: My Encounter with Education Through Art (1966), Read presented a broader view of the educational potentials of the individual by means of art. He suggested that art should be seen as a branch of education as it provided a form of communication within the realm of feeling.

In 1951, at the UNESCO Symposium in Bristol, England, Read presented his key concept of an "education through art". He said:

> The particular point of view which I represent in this symposium is not education in art, nor the place of art in education, but education by means of art. It is claimed that the experience involved in the process of artistic creation ... is in itself an educative one, and that art is therefore an essential instrument in any complete system of Education. (quoted from Zeigfeld, 1954, p. 25)

The viewpoint expressed in the latter part of Read's statement was reiterated by Gaitskell in his book Children and Their Art when he proclaimed:

> The definition which children give to events in their lives, by performing expressive acts, allows them to come to grips with their environment and to profit from their contact with it. For this reason alone, art may be considered an extremely valuable part of general education. (1958, p. 42)

Here, working from Read's central idea of an education through art, Gaitskell argued that art has an intrinsic value as an agent for learning in a general program of education.

For Gaitskell, Read's premise that the purpose of education should be to encourage spontaneous growth within children, nurturing a healthy mind and body sensitive in perceptions and independent in thought was a valid one. This approach, which was closely linked to Read's concept of "education through art" also implied that the

character of the individual could only be fully developed by aesthetic means:

> I cannot regard Art as something external which has to be imported into the sphere of Education. Nor can I regard education as something which has an existence separate form Art. In my view Art is nothing less than a way of life. And since it is a way of life it must also be a way of education, for education is merely a prelude to life ... (quoted from Black, 1979, p. 17)

What Read implies by this statement is that education is aesthetic. Since signs and symbols exist everywhere in our environment no individual in society can develop as a reasonable adult unless the person becomes more aware of the quality and quantity of their experiences. Art, in Read's view, was the means to sharpen the individual's awareness of reality. Indeed it has been suggested that Read, like Dewey, believed existence itself was only possible on an aesthetic level (Logan, 1955, p. 223):

> Art is one of those things which, like air or soil, is everywhere about us, but which we rarely stop to consider. For art is not just something we find in museums and art galleries, or in old cities like Florence and Rome. Art, however we may define it, is present in everything we make to please our senses. (Read, 1943, p. 15)

A greater insight into Read's thoughts was communicated in a paper presented at the UNESCO conference of 1951:

> What I have in my own mind is a complete fusion of the two concepts, so that when I speak of art I mean an educational process, a process of upbringing; and when I speak of education, we look at the process from the outside; as artists, we look at the same process from the inside; and both processes, integrated make the complete man. (Read, 1955, p. 28)

It has been observed that Read's ideas were warmly received especially in post-war Britain by art educators who were struggling to re-organize their discipline in the schools of an educational system in the course of being rebuilt (MacGregor, 1984, p. 58). Certainly Marian Richardson's energetic pioneering efforts in the 1920s and 1930s had defended the need for art education within the schools and had fired teachers with enthusiasm to explore new approaches. Read's words now seemed to possess the same dynamic quality and evangelistic zeal, helping teachers to cope with less than ideal working conditions in Britain in the late 1940s. Strongly recalling Marian Richardson's words, Read's comments also seem to cloak the creative process in a shroud of mystery:

> Art cannot be learned by precept by any verbal instruction. It is, properly speaking, like a contagion, and passes like fire from spirit to spirit. But always as a meaningful symbol, and as a unifying symbol. We do not insist on education through art for the sake of art, but for the sake of life itself. (quoted from Ziegfeld, 1954, p. 27)

It is interesting to ponder whether Gaitskell wished to transform this statement of Read's into action by the noon-hour "performances" at his Summer School for teachers-in-service. These "performances", involving himself and his assistant Margaret (later to become his wife) took place in the school's auditorium. Drawing in response to the mood and emotions aroused by a piece of classical music, Gaitskell and his assistant would create large, seemingly spontaneous abstract images, for the most part in chalk pastel or other dry media (Note 22) (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1987). Inspired by both Richardson and Read's examples, Gaitskell may have used this strategy to generate an enthusiasm for art as a natural outlet and form of communication of the human soul. Perhaps he hoped it would spread like fire amongst the crowd of student-teachers and children watching.

Since Read supported the widespread belief that learning is a primary form of communication and experience, he argued that art therefore, must also be a basic part of formal education in the schools. Read saw in art education the practical means to develop the individual into a thinking, feeling citizen, who was visually aware of his/her environment and experiences and thus better able to communicate his/her ideas and expressions.

Gaitskell also was supportive of his theory that aesthetic expression could have a significant impact on a child's overall growth and development. At the first conference of the C.S.E.A. in 1955, Gaitskell as President, articulated some of his feelings on this issue:

> As artists and educationalists, we must believe that art is one of man's highest forms of expression and communication. Again, we must hold that creative activity in art is a basic need common to all people. As teachers, whether of kindergarten children or of university students, we must maintain that education through art is a natural means of learning at all periods of the development of the individual, and that such an education fosters values and disciplines essential for full intellectual, emotional and social development of human beings in a community. (quoted from Flemming, 1972, p. 142)

In accordance with Read's outlook Gaitskell saw the artistic process as a key means of harnessing and directing the individual's intellect and emotions, encouraging a better understanding of the person's environment. This was largely due to the fact that the aesthetic act in his view, engaged the whole personality of the creator, directing the individual's actions into worthy patterns of conduct. As Gaitskell explained:

> Art ... is good for people and demands of its creators the highest standards of endeavor. There are indications, also, that under certain conditions, art tends to have permanently beneficial effects upon the personalities of those who create it. Any activity which engages the individual so deeply may exert a broad and lasting influence on the whole personality. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 9)

The concept that education should address the development of the whole individual, implicit in Gaitskell's statement above was also acknowledged by Read who asserted "Education from beginning to end should be the education of the whole man" (Read, 1966, p. 106). These words seem to represent a reaffirmation of Read's general philosophy that art should not be used in and for itself but rather as a way of reaching the children, helping them develop into normal, well-adjusted individuals who have self confidence and recognize their responsibility to other individuals in society (Tait, 1954, pp. 40-41).

It should be noted that Read's outlook reflects an influence from Gestalt psychology which promoted a theory of learning based on the thesis that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Gestaltists believed that to separate a whole into parts could destroy the object we are endeavoring to analyze. These psychologists showed that in learning, the organism acts as a total entity and does not use only specific parts. Rather, Gestalt psychology contended that the human organism acts in totality. Like Read, Gaitskell was also effected by this school of thought. Indeed, it is probable that Read's support of Gestaltist ideas reinforced Gaitskell's interest in their theories (Note 23).

Read's interest in Gestalt psychology may provide a further insight into his theory that art has no subject matter barriers and thus is a means of uniting all learnings. In keeping with the Gestalt emphasis on "wholes" Read felt that art was capable of playing a primary role in an integrated school curriculum.

> Art is not to be treated as something external which has to be inserted into the general scheme of education ... art, that is to say, is a way of education - not so much a subject to be taught as a method of teaching any and all subjects. (Read, 1966, p. 28)

Gaitskell fully supported Read's central idea of an education through art translating it into practical terms for the classroom. As Director of Art he wasted no time calling for integration across the curriculum at the Elementary level (Gaitskell, 1948, pp. 43-44). Certainly Gaitskell's own teaching reflected the use of another subject, music, integrated with art. Ray Blackwell recalls that in the summer courses for teachers-in-service, that classical music and reading were widely used by Dr. Gaitskell as motivating forces (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, November, 1988a).

Gaitskell's case for integrating art in the general education system was forcefully presented in the 1970 edition of his book Children and Their Art, co-edited with Al Hurwitz. With a direct reference to Read and his philosophy of education, the authors presented their position:

> If one examines the 'grass roots of art' to borrow Sir Herbert Read's evocative phrase, the distinctive qualities of visual art become less apparent as one compares the formal characteristic of art to those of its neighbours. As an example, design features, such as line, rhythm and pattern, have their counterparts in

> music, drama and dance. For this reason design components are often used as the basis for many related art programs. (Gaitskell and Hurwitz, 1970, p. 408)

For Gaitskell art was an essential and natural unifying factor at the elementary level. In presenting his case that art should take its rightful place with other core subjects of an integrated curriculum, Gaitskell tried to reassure the Elementary school teacher that he/she could teach this subject like any other:

> Art like any other subject, of course, contains a certain content and requires of the teacher some specific knowledge and skills ... However, the insights demanded of an art teacher in an elementary school are no more exacting than for any other subject. With relatively little effort, a competent teacher may gain knowledge and master the skills associated with art education .... (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 37)

In his attempting to encourage elementary teachers to teach art, Gaitskell's statement seems to convey the dangerous impression that art is not a subject which requires a great deal of knowledge to teach. This view appears to be at odds with Gaitskell's recommendations for art in the highly specialized secondary school system where he surmised that total integration of art with other subjects is not feasable. With regards to the teacher at this level, Gaitskell establishes a very different set of criteria: "The successful art teacher of adolescents must have most of the insights

and at least some of the capabilities expected of an artist" (Gaitskell, 1954, p. 19).

There is no doubt that for both Gaitskell and Read art had a primary role to play in the learning process. For Read, however, an "education through art" also meant a progressive refinement of the senses in addition to a training of the intellect. Yet he clarified that all individuals be educated by their contact not just with superlative works of fine art, but through actual personal experiences with the process of creating art forms. Only by means of this type of education did Read feel true individual growth would occur, which in turn, he believed should be the primary goal of education. Echoing the great American philosopher, psychologist and educator John Dewey, Read further emphasized: "In a democratic society the purpose of education should be to foster individual growth" (Field and Newick, 1973, p. 152). Since growth is a complex process according to Read, which involves a psychological orientation of subjective feelings and emotions to the objective world, he viewed aesthetic education as being of vital importance. Thus Read was careful to stress that he was not just concerned with art education but more extensively with "... the education of those senses upon which consciousness and ultimately the whole intelligence and judgement of the human individual are based" (Read, 1943, p. 7). He went on to argue that "One of the principal aims of education should be to preserve what every child is born with - a physical intensity of perception and sensation" (quoted from Ziegfeld, 1954, p. 25).

This fostering of aesthetic growth is the premise on which Read's thesis and book Education Through Art must be accepted. Since individual development, in Read's opinion is made visible through expression (audible and visible signs or symbols) he goes on to explain that "Education may therefore be defined as the cultivation of modes of expression - it is teaching children and adults how to make sounds, images, movements, tools and utensils" (Read, 1943, p. 11). In keeping with this concept, Read suggests that if an individual can make or do anything well within his/her field, the person is well educated and in fact involved in art "... for art is nothing but the good making of sounds, images etc. The aim of education is therefore the creation of artists - of people efficient in the various modes of expression" (Read, 1943, p. 11).

While Read was concerned with how art could provide the basis for enriching an individual's general education he was also strongly interested in its social implications. Like Dewey before him, Read saw the educational system as intimately linked with society as a whole, observing that "Education, in fact, is not separable from our social policy as a whole" (Read, 1943, p. 296). Thus for Read this meant that "... since we are concerned, not with the production of that artifact, the scholar, but with an organic unit of society, the citizen, we must plan our educational system against the broad outlines of a social background" (ibid., p. 296). From this standpoint the teacher was no longer an agent of the school whose function was to impart knowledge to the individual. Rather, the

teacher was a representative of the community whose duty it was to produce, via their students, a sense of well being in the community (ibid., p. 296). In Read's opinion "Unless we are primarily citizens, conscious of the common needs of the community and of the rights and responsibilities which belong to us as citizens, we can never be good educators" (ibid., p. 296).

In sympathy with Read (and Dewey), Gaitskell also addressed this issue in Chapter 11 of his book Children and Their Art (1958). In discussing "the Democratic Group", Gaitskell observed that while education has as its goal the development of the individual, the group should also be considered. For Gaitskell the welfare of the individual and the group were interdependent and had common goals which were achieved through the co-operative activities of its members. Certainly Gaitskell supported the concept that learning to function in and communicate with other members in society be one goal of art education. This would seem to be substantiated in the publication Art: A Catholic Dimension (1979) produced by the Metro Separate School Board of Toronto. As an advisor to the writing team, it is highly likely that Gaitskell was in accordance with the view expressed of art education and its social obligations: "Art is taught so that children may gain insight into the nature of their social group" (Note 24) (p. 34).

In terms of the social group Read also believed that individuality could only be realized within the organic wholeness of the community (Read, 1943, p. 5). Inspired by the theories of Dewey and Gestalt psychology he cautioned, while stressing the uniqueness of the individual, that "the general purpose of education is to foster the growth of the individual in each human being, at the same time harmonizing the individuality thus educed with the organic unity of the social group" (quoted from MacDonald, 1970, p. 32). Living and working in a world inhabited by others the individual must be taught to communicate effectively with people in their community. Read said "Art is also - and its educative importance derives largely from this fact - a social process, for it is essentially a means of communication" (quoted from Ziegfeld, 1954, p. 25). In Read's view, social isolation would surely curtail the desire for expression, the desire for communication, inhibiting a basic human need. Thus for Read, like Dewey, the individual could only attain self-fulfillment within the totality of a community setting (Read, 1943, p. 5).

For Gaitskell also, this theory held true since he too believed that both the artist and the child do not function in a vacuum but rather draw their inspiration from experiences which occur in the community and environment in which they live:

> As has been pointed out previously, the substance of art is to be found in the immediate environment. Artists have invariably discovered subject matter in those experiences which arise from the part of the world which they know. In this sense art is always local. If the work of the greatest artists displays a universality, it does so because its producers have discovered this comprehensive quality in the local scene. The art of children of course, will be greatly affected by their community, and it is fitting that this should be so. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 95)

Consequently Gaitskell felt that in living and working in harmony with their environment, the individual's community, served by the school, would yield a good deal of the subject matter for art (ibid., p. 95). It follows then that Gaitskell emphasized that "It is the teacher's duty to encourage artistic expression which is derived from immediate experience" (ibid., p. 95). The teacher was to now function as a mediator between the child and their environment.

While Read was concerned with the societal aspects of an "education through art" he did recognize that a balance should be struck between catering to the needs of the individual and those of society. On this issue he commented that "education should be ... a reconciliation of the individual in all his uniqueness with society in all its unity" (Read, School Arts Magazine, 1955, p. 5). It

follows then that Read believed education to have two goals: "to develop the personality and capacity of the individual and to effect an understanding between man and man" (quoted from Ziegfeld, 1954, p. 25).

A focus on these two points are also manifest in Gaitskell's ideas on art and education and form the basis of his general philosophy of education through art (A. Pattemore, Cassette Tape, 1984). In his Doctoral dissertation (1947), Gaitskell outlined the two concerns which he felt art and craft education should address. "The purpose of teaching art and crafts" he declared is:

1. to assist the individual child to develop to the full extent of his needs and capacities;
2. to help the child become a valued and co-operative member of his social group.

(Gaitskell, 1947, p. 142)

The teacher's role was to be crucial in achieving these goals. Gaitskell, like Read, believed the child's participation in art class must be voluntary in order that learning be meaningful. In order to establish an atmosphere of creative freedom Gaitskell urged "that considerable stress be laid upon the role of the teacher as counsellor..." (ibid., p. 139).

Similarly Read had also called for minimal interference on the part of the teacher. His views reflected his belief that art could not be formally taught. His rather romantic outlook upon art and the creative impulse as a dormant smoldering ember within the

individual which only needed to be ignited into a full blaze of creative energy led Read to recommend that the teacher stand back to only fan any embers. According to him, the educator's role was to counsel the child during the constant state of transformation that marked the individual's creative growth in the learning process: "... the duty of teacher is to watch over this organic process to see that its temperament is not forced, its tender shoots distorted" (Read, 1943, p. 212). He further advised "the role of the teacher is that of attendant, guide, inspirer, psychic, midwife" (ibid., p. 209). Read, however, was also aware of the vital role the teacher played in terms of motivating students and establishing an atmosphere: "The atmosphere is the creation of the teacher, and to create an atmosphere of sponteneity, of happy childish industry, is the main and perhaps the only secret of successful teaching" (ibid., p. 295). Read also perceived the function of the teacher to involve balancing the child's character with their own personal style so that the child could be expressing him/herself in a way appropriate to their personality. He said of this "The first aim of the art teacher should be to bring about the highest degree of correlation between the child's temperament and its mode[illegible] expression" (ibid., p. 104). Again for Read these aims could only be attained in a relaxed environment in which any suggestions offered by the teacher did not suppress what the child him/herself had in mind. The emphasis Read placed on a system of education which moved toward "originating" thought and activity on the part of the student,

adopted by Gaitskell, is one that is widely subscribed to today (Housemann, 1965, p. 61).

Read's approach to the role of the teacher found support with Gaitskell who also endorsed the view that children be encouraged to think for themselves if artworks of a truly personal and expressive nature were to be produced in the classroom. This aspect of Gaitskell's philosophy was articulated as early as 1944 in a series of Bulletins for Teachers: Aids for Teachers in the Use of the Arts and Crafts in General Education written by Gaitskell for the Department of Education. He commented:

> Children can usually be made to produce work which is quite good in the eyes of adults. If too much pressure and direction are used, however, the expressions of the children tend to express the teacher's feelings and ideas and not the child's. If such is the case, artwork tends to have disintegrating effects on the child's personality. In other words he may turn into a 'yes man'. As we realize, such a person does not make a good citizen in a democracy. (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 1, 1944-45, p. 5)

Consequently in light of this statement Gaitskell advised

> The good teacher therefore refrains from coercing the pupil into her ways of thought. She approves a show of independence in his work rather than too great a dependence upon the ideas of others. She makes his environment sufficiently rich to assist expression, enters into the pupil's activity and is ready to offer guidance when it is needed. (Gaitskell, Bulletin No. 3, 1946-47, p. 6)

Both Gaitskell and Read believed that art could yield insight into a child's character as each stage of their development reveals a different mode of visual expression. In order to help a child grow aesthetically as well as intellectually, Read advised that a teacher become familiar with the various levels of visual expression. He thus advocated "Education ... must be based on an understanding of the temperamental differences, and the claim now to be put forward is that the child's modes of plastic expression are the best key to the child's particular disposition" (Read, 1943, p. 73).

Read found that children's drawings could be classified into 8 categories. To make the varieties of expression more useful to the teacher he linked them to art characteristics that may be predominant in one work but not in another. Inspired by the research of Victor Lowenfeld, Edward Bullough and C.G. Jung, Read identified eight classifications: Organic, emphatic rhythmical pattern, structural form, enumerative, haptic, decorative and imaginative. These categories of human response were organized into types of personality he labelled "introvert" and "extrovert".

It is in Read's attempt to classify children into personality types largely according to the art they create that Gaitskell's philosophy appears to differ from Read's. While Gaitskell agreed with Read that education should consider individual differences and can give us clues as to a child's needs and preferences, he felt that defining children into static typological categories of personality was unacceptable. For Gaitskell, Read's classifications were too rigid in their analysis of inner personal development (Note 25): "Many teachers who work intimately with children may regret the apparent static quality of personality which the classifications of Read and in particular of Lowenfeld, seem to imply" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 147). In Gaitskell's view, Read's classifications contradicted the statements about the intuitive nature of artmaking which Read defined as "... beyond logical analysis" (quoted from Gaitskell, 1958, p. 150). In addition, Gaitskell perceived Read's categories as a repudiation of Read's previous theories on individual uniqueness (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 148). Moreover, Gaitskell argued that Read's categories of personality types negated the importance of social experience and its effect on the child's emerging character:

> Can it be that experience - especially art education - has so little effect upon the basic personality that one who works at art may not exhibit a change in type? Actually, there exists no indisputable evidence that the personality remains stoic, and there is evidence to indicate that a personal change can result from experience. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 148)

In Gaitskell's view children were dynamic individuals with the capacity for personal growth and unique artistic output. Thus, for Gaitskell, Read's (and Lowenfeld's) typology represented a serious detriment to aesthetic growth in that children may be restricted with reference to experience or form of expression since they are believed to fit a type. Gaitskell warns of this situation:

> The danger, if one exists, arising from a typology such as that of Lowenfeld or even of Read lies in its possible effects upon teaching methods. By stretching the imagination, one can see the ultimate extreme in an art lesson by a mythical teacher entirely convinced of the existence of static types of children. Here would sit one-quarter of the class - the 'haptics' - blindfolded and making drawing of abstract nouns. There would sit one half of the children - the 'visuals' drawing the chalk boxes before them. In the middle would wait the others, hoping someone will decide what they are! (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 152)

Gaitskell's criticism of Read in this particular area appears incongruous in light of the fact that he too had described three levels of a child's artistic development:

1. The stage of Manipulation (up to Kindergarten and Grade 1);
2. The stage of Symbols (Grades 1-3);
3. The Preadolescent Stage (Grades 3-6)

(Gaitskell, 1958, pp. 127-142)

However, Gaitskell was careful to cite that the characteristics he describes in his stages appear in most children's art and do not minimize the unique qualities typical of each child's work as an individual. Defending his position he stated "Indeed, within the framework of the recognized artistic stages and modes of expression, the individuality of children shines more clearly" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 127).

Despite this healthy disagreement with Read on the issue of classifying children developmentally according to their art, Gaitskell's ideas nevertheless reflect a strong bias towards Read's philosophy. Clearly Gaitskell's adoption of "education through art" reflects a certain philosophic standpoint supporting Read's thesis that art is an integral part of education and life. For Read and Gaitskell who followed, art education was seen as a field which contributes richly to the total learning experience of the child. Both men ardently believed in the positive effects creative experiences would have on a child's intellectual, emotional and social development. Through art they believed the learner would also come to grips with their environment. Moreover, Gaitskell and Read saw the deep significance of art education as a deterrant against the cultural deterioration and stagnation which they felt formed an insidious part of 20th century life (Read, 1943, p. 91) (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). So Gaitskell was led to declare "Art has always contributed untold benefits to human beings" (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 59). For Gaitskell then, Read's words "...

that art should be the basis of education ..." were fundamental (Read, 1943, p. 12). Indeed, according to Read and Gaitskell who was to follow his example, there was no question that the education of the individual was not complete unless the child had undergone a system of education through art.

Notes Chapter 2

Note 6: In keeping with Fry and Bell's ideas, it has been suggested that most enlightened teachers and artists feel that art ought to be taught, as an awareness of art can foster the development of a more civilized human being and can result in a more stimulating life (Carline, 1968, p. 149).

Note 7: This preoccupation with "the individual" was logically reflected in their forms of expression - biographies, memoirs, portraits - which betrayed their vision of art as a highly personal experience.

Note 8: It should be remembered that Fry wrote at a time when the story-telling quality and realism were the main criteria for judging a painting. Fry's ideas on this subject were presented in his book Essay on Aesthetics (1909).

Note 9: Fry's belief that art should transform and not imitate nature is one whose roots are also to be found in the ideals of the French Impressionists (Sullivan, 1984, p. 13).

Note 10: For more information on Gaitskell's "noon-hour performances" see p. 71.

Note 11: Fry founded the Omega Workshops in 1913 assuming the role of director, working frequently on behalf of the young artists who were employed there. For more information see p. 36.

Note 12: The author has been unable to locate the exact date of Gaitskell's presentation to the Southern California Art Education Association.

Note 13: Fry's attempts to reconcile the old antithesis between the aesthetic and the practical, the fine and the useful in industry were not new and had also been the concern of the 19th century artist, poet and socialist William Morris. Morris' companies had, similar to Omega, produced handmade goods in competition with the soulless machinery of goods that had so easily satisfied Victorian bourgeois taste. For more information on William Morris see p. 39.

Note 14: Morris' second daughter, May, was to carry on her father's work and proved to be influential regarding the artistic training of gentlewomen in needlework and embroidery in the late 19th century. Initially this occurred as a result of her appointment as Director of the Embroidery Workshop for her father's firm in 1885. May's influence on design education was also apparent through her book on embroidery (1893) and her lectures at the Royal School of Needlework and her classes at the Central School of Arts and Crafts established in 1896. (For more information see Callen, Anthea. (1979). Women Artists of the Arts and Crafts Movement: 1870-1914. Chapter 3: Embroidery and Needlework. New York: Panethon Books.)

Note 15: Spencer, H. (1861). Education, Intellectual, Moral and Physical. London: Williams and Norgate. (Quoted from Grigor, A. (1982). Arthur Lismer: A Critical Analysis of his Pedagogy in Relation to his use of the Project Method in Child-Centered Art Education. Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Art Education. Concordia University, Montréal, p. 47.

Note 16: Ruskin, J. (1857). Elements of Drawing. London: Dent. (Quoted from Field, Dick. (1972). Change in Art Education. London: Routlege and Kegan Paul Ltd. p. 49.)

Note 17: Cooke, Ebenezer. (1886, January 1). Art Teaching and Child Nature. Discussion Paper from the International Conference, Health Exhibition. (Quoted from Read, Herbert. (1943). Education Through Art. London: Faber and Faber. p. 170.)

Note 18: Gaitskell was only ever to acknowledge the influence of three educators: Marian Richardson, Herbert Read and John Dewey. He openly admitted the tremendous influence these three held upon his own ideas (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

Note 19: It must be noted that this approach, however, was much more characteristic of Arthur Lismer's technique of motivating his art students.

Note 20: Ray Blackwell worked closely with Gaitskell at the Ministry of Education and later inherited his duties after Gaitskell's retirement in 1973. He remembers that Gaitskell always seemed to place more emphasis on the individual rather than the social in his teachings on art education (R. Blackwell, Phone Interview with Krystyna Czereyska, November, 1987).

Note 21: It is often claimed in the history of art education that Cizek was the discoverer of children's creative abilities. One must also not forget the prophetic concepts set forth by Froebel before him. Writing in 1826, Froebel said of the child and his art:

> The word and the drawing, therefore, belong together inseparably, as light and shadow, night and day, soul and body do. The faculty of drawing is, therefore, as much innate in the child, in man, as is the faculty of speech, and demands development and cultivation as imperatively as the latter; experience shows this clearly in the child's love of drawing, in the child's instinctive desire for drawing. (MacGregor, Ronald (Ed.), 1984, p. 55.)

Note 22: That these performances were not totally spontaneous is confirmed by Margaret Gaitskell (Cassette Tape, 1987). She observed that her husband "was always afraid. He didn't trust himself, to let himself go and he would insist on certain marks for himself alone and he knew what was going to happen there" (ibid.) The artwork produced during the noon-hour period were not spontaneous images as far as Margaret Gaitskell was concerned.

Note 23: A more detailed examination of how Gestalt psychology influenced Gaitskell's philosophy is explored in Chapter 3.

Note 24: It must be noted that both Read and Gaitskell's beliefs that education should reconcile individual uniqueness with social unity was a concept put forth by John Dewey at the turn of the century. Dewey's ideas on this matter had a profound effect on education in the United States and Canada. The impact of Dewey's theories on Gaitskell will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Note 25: Gaitskell felt much the same way about Lowenfeld's stages of development of which he was highly critical (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1987).

Chapter 3

Influences from Psychology and American Education on Gaitskell's Theory of Teaching Art

Influences from Psychology and American Education on Gaitskell's Theory of Teaching Art

When Gaitskell began teaching in 1933, his background in art instruction was rather limited. The Victoria Normal School had not offered a program in the study of art education and so he acquired practical experience on his own initiative. Gaitskell's knowledge of pedagogical methods was largely based upon personal readings and research and on trends popular in art education in Britain and America at the time. Since art education, as a branch of education, was naturally effected by developments in general education and psychology, Gaitskell absorbed many ideas from both these disciplines.

Part 1: Psychological Influences

By the late 19th century new developments in psychology had led to a serious re-evaluation of education, and later of art education theory and practice. A number of psychologists had begun to focus their attention on learning and perception in an effort to understand human behaviour and mental development more fully. There was an increased interest in the child as a key to understanding this

growth. Gradually, a new image of child development and of the educational conditions that foster a child's growth emerged. Some of these schools of psychology which effected education, art education and Gaitskell's ideas were: the Child Study Movement led by educational psychologist G. Stanley Hall, Gestalt Theory and Functional Psychology as interpreted by John Dewey (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985).

G. Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement

For Gaitskell, G. Stanley Hall (1846-1924) was perhaps, with John Dewey, one of the most influential educational psychologists in the history of American education. His theories on learning, the nature of the child and child development were to deeply influence many art educators' notions of the learning processes of children. Hall's pioneering studies, which were begun in the 1880s were based on the belief that a child's mind is qualitatively different from that of an adult (Note 26). Hall saw the child's development as characterized by clear and distinct phases which he felt should be respected by the ideal school. As an early American exponent of so-called "natural education" and of the child-centered school of thought as it subsequently became known, Hall was a seminal figure in the crusade for a school adapted to the child's nature (Note 27). In his demand for an "education according to nature" (Strickland and Burgess, 1965, p. 8) he conceived of a new role for the teacher as a guide, facilitating and nurturing the child's natural development.

Hall's research on the child, conducted while he was professor of psychology at Johns Hopkins University was to provide educators and art educators with valuable insights and real understanding of a child's capabilities. His observations contrasted sharply with the popular "faculty" or Herbartian psychology which viewed the mind as a receptical for ideas. This was the approach dominating much of the teaching of art in the 19th century. Herbart (1776-1841) held that the teacher's role was to mold the young student according to adult patterns of thought through an imposed, formalized series of exercises.

Along with Hall, a small group of university professors of psychology and pedagogy who had also been interested in studying the child since the 1880s began some careful observations of children's drawings. Their acknowledgement that the drawings of young children seemed to have an individualized character were to stimulate a reform of art teaching methods.

In the early 1880s, English and German scholars had published studies on child nature as seen through their drawings. Similar investigations were conducted in America shortly afterwards. In 1908, Dawes Parton Haney published Art Education in the Public Schools after years of research on the subject. The extent to which art educators were unaware of the unique qualities of child art at the beginning of the century was expressed by Logan who comments:

> A cross section by child-study experts of their observations of child art shows how objectively they studied this work at a time when most artists and art teachers were blind to the positive values of child art. The drawings of young children were seen to have individualized character. Educational values greater than just the encouragement to go on to more disciplined drawings were recognized when boys and girls of the lower grades drew freely. Particularly it was noted that imagination was stimulated and child experience was recognized in the process of drawing. (Logan, 1955, pp. 118-119)

Further serious studies of children's drawings were also carried out (from the 1880s) by M.V. O'Shea of the State Normal School of Mankato, Minnesota and later of the University of Minnesota. O'Shea observed that young children between the ages of four and nine exhibited an interest in drawing people, objects and animals and drew without any apprehension. He noted a systematic diagrammatic scheme of representing things such as "dog, man, house and woman" would be used constantly whether or not the look or the position of the model would change (Logan, 1955, p. 120). His final conclusion was that there existed no logical methods of rendering proportion in the images or the visual perception of young children.

This last theory has been somewhat modified by today's art educators who have come to recognize that children's visual logic is primarily the result of their own experience and vision of the world.

Another work in child study was the two volumes Studies in Education by Earl Barnes (the first volume was written from 1890 to 1897, the second in 1902). Barnes' second volume contained an analysis of different facets of children's drawings based on actual sketches. His investigations into this aspect of child study led in 1908 to an article on "Child Study in Relation to Elementary Art Education" (Logan, 1955, p. 120). While the publication of this article may have indicated that art education recognized the benefits of child study and research in art, prevailing methods for teaching drawing did not change abruptly. Rather, it took many more years of psychological research into the nature of the child before a genuine understanding of the child's abilities was acknowledged within the art room (Logan, 1955, p. 121).

According to Logan, a crucial aspect of the research in child study and drawing at this time was that many drawings were assessed which encouraged more plausible assumptions (ibid., p. 122). The studies, which first began in Germany and then were undertaken in England and later America, revealed three aspects of the child's nature and his understanding of and aptitude for drawing. A greater comprehension of a child's capacity to pick up the technical aspects of drawing was first observed. In addition, an apparent structure

by which children develop visual skills and imagery was also uncovered. It became evident that when children drew on their own they did not exhibit a concern for rendering geometrical forms or ornamental borders or creating surface decorations for craft pieces. Consequently, a drawing program that was founded upon the meticulous representation of abstract shapes, as was typical of the era, was contrary to any of the child's natural inclinations. Attempts, however, to unite these new insights with the child's nature, and his art with traditional theories on aesthetics proved difficult. The question always remained: "How could the awkward, even brutal drawings done by many children as forceful expressions of experience become, in course of time, (sic.) transformed into expressions of the 'beautiful' and, hence artistic?" (Logan, 1955, p. 125).

It remained for later art educators to provide a proper grounding that would expand young children's expression in drawing and painting in a manner that was in keeping with their experiences.

Studies in psychology however, continued to give a sense of direction for the development of arts experiences that were natural for young children. Educational psychologists like G. Stanley Hall went on to uncover aspects of the child's nature that were to have significant applications for art education. Eventually a slow absorption of this research into child study would lead many art teachers to realize the importance of first nurturing an enthusiasm for expression over the acquisition of skills.

Hall's concepts, which slowly changed the traditional notion of education as the inculcation of facts, were partially realized by the 1920s to 1930s, an era of experimentation in American education. With the rise of the Progressive Education Movement during this period, an interest in a more child-centered orientation for classroom teaching evolved. It was not long before Hall's ideas soon found fertile ground in the area of art instruction. Hall called upon the teacher to study children and be sympathetic to their abilities if a true learning situation was to occur. Through the efforts of the Child Study Movement Hall's ideas gradually spread. With the acceptance of Dewey's concepts in the 1930s, Hall's ideas also found their way into the art room as teachers began to allow children the opportunity for creative self expression. Hall's support for this type of art pedagogy is apparent in an early discussion of an ideal education for 8-10 year old children:

> Art training should not result in intimidation, but first everything should be drawn - battles, fires, shipwrecks and railroad accidents, with plenty of human figures and action .... This would make drawing as it should be, a real expression of the child's soul and the child should copy what he, and not what the adult sees. (Strickland and Burgess, 1965, p. 120)

As a student in the 1930s, it was likely that Gaitskell would have been exposed to Hall's theories and the new teaching trends which had been absorbed into the culture for at least thirty years by then

(T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). It is also probable that he may have felt an immediate sympathy with Hall's ideas since they generally coincided with the observations of psychologist/philosopher/educator John Dewey, for whom Gaitskell was developing a great admiration (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1985). While he never overtly acknowledged Hall's influence, this study suggests that Gaitskell's pedagogy embraces a number of Hall's recommendations. Firstly, Gaitskell's overall concern for respecting the child's intellectual capacities and needs, which marks much of his philosophy of art education, is reminiscent of Hall's ideas.

Gaitskell's support for an educational system which exists always to serve the development of the individual child, a concept advanced by the Child Study Movement is seen in one of his early publications after his appointment as Director of Art for Ontario in 1945. In Art Education in the Province of Ontario (1948) Gaitskell stresses the importance of considering the child's needs over the creation of an art product: "It will be realized then, that although art is a matter of self expression, its educational goal is self realization" (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1952, p. 2).

Gaitskell's insistence on art education centered around the child infers a respect for childhood and a belief that childhood is intrinsically valuable, a concept championed by Hall as well as Mann, Parker and Dewey. In addition, these ideas were also present in contemporaneous religious, philosophical and psychological positions which recognized the self-conscious mind as structuring experience (Grigor, 1985, p. 39).

Like Hall, whose ideas were later restated by Dewey, Gaitskell was also concerned that a teacher be aware of a child's psychological development. He was convinced that the effectiveness of an art course largely depended on how well the teacher had designed it to complement and assist a student's intellectual growth (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 74).

Gaitskell was to re-address this issue many times in later publications, but he particularly stressed this point regarding the art education of youth in Art Education During Adolescence (1954) when he stated: "The outstanding function of a program of art education for adolescents must be to assist these young people to arrive at a well balanced maturity" (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 7).

For Gaitskell, a good teacher of art had to be cognizant not only of child psychology, but also of the adult's artistic developmental levels which are intimately linked with mental growth. In his most notable work, Children and Their Art (1958) he clearly articulated his view on this matter.

> It is highly desirable that a teacher be familiar with developmental stages of artist production and with accompanying modes of expression. Often the stage of expression which a child has reached will give clues not only to the type of subject matter which may interest him, but also to the tools, materials and activities with which he would cope successfully. Knowing his stage of expression will, furthermore, help

> the teacher to determine what kind of stimulation, assistance and general educational treatment he requires (Note 28) (p. 125).

This concept of developmental stages was not, of course, a new one and had been articulated by Victor Lowenfeld in his book Creative and Mental Growth, first published in 1947. His major thesis, which partly drew on the Progressive's notion of the "whole child" argued a view of child development based on child art. Primarily concerned with the child, Lowenfeld saw art as a vehicle for nurturing intellectual and emotional growth in order to develop a seeing, thinking and creative human being. His idea that art is an educational tool that can foster the child's sensibilities, and encourage co-operation and an overall capacity to function creatively was to have a significant influence on teacher education in art. Gaitskell, as a student of art education in the late 1940s, was well aware of Lowenfeld's concepts (especially his ideas on haptic and visual modes of perception). Although he did not admire Lowenfeld as a person (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985) it is likely Gaitskell could not escape his pervasive influence on art education (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). Certainly Gaitskell shared Lowenfeld's concern for the child's general ability to develop creatively through direct tactile, visual and audial experiences. Moreover, Gaitskell's preoccupation with the overall development of the child through art and involvement with the social and contextual aspects of art production were akin to Lowenfeld's viewpoint.

Implicit in Gaitskell's approach to art education was the acceptance of Hall's view (through Dewey) of a new role for the teacher as a guide. Gaitskell well realized that if the child was to achieve intellectual self awareness within the school system, Hall's approach that "the child must be the ultimate controlling participant in the process of education through art" must be adopted (Gaitskell, 1976, p. 4).

Gestalt Theory

In addition to Hall's school of thought, concepts in Gestalt psychology are also evident in Gaitskell's view on education and artistic learning. An understanding of Gestalt theories was obtained during his years at university in the 1930s, when Gestalt ideas were gaining credence in educational spheres (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). This movement in psychology was to effect not only Gaitskell's views of learning, but also that of a number of his young colleagues. In an address to the C.S.E.A. in 1969, Gaitskell acknowledged the impact of this branch of psychological thought on education and art education:

> we were aware, my generation of another psychology, and this was called Gestalt. It comes from Germany and there's a fellow working there called Wolfgang Kohler and another fellow Kurt Koffka. And you know behaviourists have denied the mind, but we knew there

> was a mind because Koffka said so. He wrote a book called The Growth of the Mind and this was terribly influential as far as my generation was concerned. (Gaitskell, 1969, pp. 6-7)

The Gestalt theory of perceptual development argued that the mind does not perceive objects as the sum of a number of observed parts, but rather sees them as perceptual wholes or total images. According to the Gestaltists, the brain registers and sees global perceptual features first before specific details of a visual object are grasped. Kurt Koffka's (1886-1941) experiments on memory images, published in his book The Growth of the Mind supported this thesis. Koffka stated that initially individuals see basic qualities of colour, movement or form before finer characteristics of an object, person, or event are perceived (Arnheim, 1966, p. 30).

The Gestaltists also noted that when an object is perceived, it is accompanied by a "field" against which it is set (Francher, 1979, p. 20). Wolfgang Kohler (1887-1967) observed that when perception occurs stimulus elements and figures are registered by the brain in simple configurations against a ground. These experiements led the Gestaltists to conclude that learning is not, as the Behaviourists maintained, based on "trial and error" or the response to separate elements of a problem. Rather, they believed learning is the product of insight or the result of the progressive realization of forms (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 26).

They further asserted that one's personality is not assembled in an additive way out of many independent traits, but rather each trait depends upon all others in the total field.

As previously mentioned it was during his studies for university in British Columbia that Gaitskell became aware of Gestalt principles. Certainly his C.S.E.A. speech in 1969 confirms that he had been impressed by their concepts. However, the influence of Gestalt thinking is perhaps more apparent in Gaitskell's general concern for educating the whole child, the total personality through art (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 9). In Children and Their Art (1958), Gaitskell plainly disclosed his reasons for supporting the belief that art education must consider all aspects of human existence when he stated: "The Gestalt psychologists have reminded us .... that the human organs act in totality; when a person is occupied with an act of artistic expression both his feelings and intellect are involved" (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 73).

Indeed in his early publication Art Education in the Province of Ontario (1948), Gaitskell describes the artistic process very much in Gestaltist terms of learning. He reports the making of art as the active searching through emotions and thoughts, whereby the child is able to clarify reactions to life experiences and gain insight (p. 14). This Gestalt vision is further in evidence in his account of aesthetic learning: "To appreciate a work of art, one enlists the total personality which is the result of interaction of one's inherited structure with the environment" (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 14).

In keeping with this line of thought, Gaitskell saw integrating art with other subjects as one way of involving the total personality: "It is often desirable to link together as many subjects as possible for in general education, wholes, not parts, are of primary importance" (Gaitskell, 1980, p. 13).

Evidence of Gestalt influence on Gaitskell's approach to the teaching of art, however, is most strikingly apparent in a publication written after his retirement, Art Education: A Catholic Dimension. Here Gaitskell forcefully summarizes and reveals an approach to art education partly nurtured on Gestalt findings when he summarizes that education:

> has but one aim: the total development of the child: educated emotionally, intellectually, physically, spiritually and socially. Art education is no exception. It's aim is not art production but the development and growth of the total personality in all aspects of his being. (Gaitskell, 1976, p. 31)

Gaitskell worked hard to achieve these ideals in his summer courses for teachers-in-service which he reintroduced in 1945 (Note 29) (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). Educators enrolled in the courses were strongly cautioned that they must not think for their students, but rather let them select, assort and adapt experiences and ideas on their own. Gaitskell encouraged his teachers to adopt this essentially Deweyian approach as a means of stimulating creative thinking. At this time, this idea was still quite new to Ontario

teachers and many responded with indifference and even hostility. It was primarily due to Gaitskell's forceful insistance on the merits of this method that a more child-centered pedagogy was slowly adopted into Ontario public school art programs (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985).

The Psychology of John Dewey

During the last half of the 19th century in the United States, the new psychology had generated further insights into child behaviour. This, in turn, had led to an espousal of a more humane education which considered the child's needs and preferences to a greater extent. John Dewey (1859-1952) was among those psychologists/educators who advocated this progressive approach. In the first two decades of the 20th century he became a key progressivist figure and in 1919 the major exponent for the newly founded Progressive Education Movement. While Dewey was to strongly contest some of the movement's ideas, the body depended upon his direction and standing to sustain their authority. With his death at age 93, Dewey emerged as one of the most prominent 20th century psychologist/philosophers in America and a major world figure in education.

While it is generally accepted that Dewey's interest in education and philosophy were a primary part of his life and career, his involvement in psychology was also notable (Note 30). Dewey enriched the new education by assimilating the insights of

Functional psychology (and of his own Instrumentalist theory of knowledge) to bear on educational theory, examining the effectiveness of his ideas in his laboratory school (Note 31) (Dykhuizen, 1973, p. 92). As a result of his interest in Functionalism Dewey perceived the mind as an active force which consisting of functions, requires continual stimulation from social agencies. This psychological approach, which originated in late 19th century America emphasized the importance of rational thought over an experimental, trial and error approach. Functionalism had developed from several sources including Darwin's evolutionary theory with its stress on adaptation and W. James' and C.S. Pierce's pragmatism with its concern for the practical efforts of action. It had also emerged from Dewey's holism with its bias toward examination of the whole functioning organism with its environment.

This biological and functional psychology led Dewey to conceive of the mind as continually growing and changing in capacity and interest; learning was for him a "process of continual reconstruction and re-organization of experience" (Garforth, 1966, p. 19). Childhood was, in Dewey's view, a period of vital mental growth and development, in contrast to the settled framework of habit and specific skill associated with adulthood. This recognition of the psychological distinction between child and adult led Dewey to argue that the child must be given the same freedom, initiative and responsibility for developing his mental powers as granted to an adult. Moreover, he perceived the child as a vital,

dynamic creature who possessed desires and interests of his own. Consequently there was no necessity for the teacher to develop other topics or suggest directions. As Dewey explained: "The work of the educator, whether parent or teacher, consists solely in ascertaining and in connecting with these activities, furnishing them appropriate opportunities and conditions" (Dykuizen, 1973, p. 94).

In addition, Functional psychology viewed learning as the consequence of these activities. Whereas more traditional educational psychology stated that concepts can precede and exist independently from activity, the new psychology explained:

> that ideas arise as the definition of activity, and serve to direct that activity in new expressions .... that a motor factor is so closely bound up with the entire mental development that the latter cannot be intelligently discussed apart from the former. (Dykuizen, 1973, p. 94)

Following this school of thought Dewey concluded that within the ideal school the interests and life of the child should be paramount.

The Functionalist position had also advocated that both learning and the daily activities of life were basically social in nature. Thus the school, as Dewey had explained in his book The School and Society (1900) must consider the social over the individual. The child must be allowed to participate in group events and by means of sharing and exchanging ideas and experiences find the stimulus for the fullest intellectual growth.

While it is known that Gaitskell was profoundly affected by Dewey's later writings on education (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982) his views on learning and intellectual development also appear to reflect aspects of Functional psychology. Undeniably Dewey's psychological (and philosophical) insights had great relevance for education and art education. As a student of these disciplines it is probable that Gaitskell became acquainted with Dewey's Functionalist approach to psychology.

Gaitskell's concept of mental development was centered around the belief that in order for children to fully mature on an intellectual level, their needs had to be met (Note 32). This meant that within the classroom the individual child had to have a freedom to choose to have options, yet always within the framework of a necessary pedagogical strategy. For Gaitskell, the teacher was always an important part of this strategy, establishing an atmosphere that would assist children to recall an experience for expression: ".... a teacher had the task of helping children not only to recall an experience, but also to establish goals or purposes" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 43). However, Gaitskell went on to remind the art educator that "Motivation in art must be built upon the child's existing needs" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 41).

It is important here to note that Dewey's own emphasis on the problematic situation in the learning process was, in fact, the outcome of his Instrumentalist theory of knowledge. For Dewey, an attitude of personal inquiry in response to a problem was a

necessary precondition for mental development (Dykhuizen, 1973, p. 95). Gaitskell shared this view that intellectual maturation would result provided that the pupil was given the chance to find a personal and meaningful solution to the problem before him/her (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 43). In this way the child would learn to take the initiative and think independently.

For Gaitskell, art was a reflection of the individual's intellectual understanding of a changing world (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1952, p. 1). In keeping with this outlook he naturally stressed that the art teacher allow children to exercise their perceptive powers to this advantage. To accomplish these ends Gaitskell suggested creating a classroom situation which allowed children to become involved in problems, using the inductive and deductive methods of reasoning to teach the principles of design (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 145). In keeping with Dewey's ideas and the Functionalist outlook which maintains that learning is a by-product of activity, Gaitskell also realized the educational value of self-initiated study and practical experience:

> .... urge that the learner form his own generalizations after he has enjoyed many varied experiences in art class, and that he be encouraged always to put these generalizations to a pragmatic test. In other words, conclusions drawn should result from activity on the learner's part. Only in this way can a satisfactory 'liberation of intelligence' occur in relation to art activities in the schools. (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 42)

It appears evident that Gaitskell was in accord with Dewey's theory of reflective thinking which held that most learning occurs in response to a problem (Note 33). Gaitskell's desire, however, to initiate art programs that stimulated critical thinking extended to special as well as normal students (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1953, p. 3).

Part 2: The Historical Background of the Progressive Education Movement

By the 1920s the psychological insights presented by Hall, the Gestaltists and Dewey were beginning to make themselves felt in educational literature. Their discoveries, as well as investigations by other psychologists profoundly changed many teachers' notions about the child's nature. The new conception of child development emerging in America at this time was reflected in the growth of the Progressive Education Movement.

Throughout the United States and the world at large, Dewey's name had become synonymous with innovation in education and Progressivism. Under his nominal leadership (beginning in 1919), this association was to prove highly influential on the evolution of American education (Logan, 1955, p. 152). Although, as previously mentioned, Dewey was to disagree with a number of Progressive

issues, particularly the child-centered approach which emphasized the individual (Grigor, 1985, p. 120), it was his presence and standing in the Education scene that ensured the success of the movement. With the end of World War II the new education began to emerge. It has been noted that in the philosophy of Dewey and the Child Study Movement, the idea of the unsuppressed actions and natural inclinations of the child temporarily prevailed in terms of a teaching pedagogy during this period (Logan, 1955, p. 154).

The Progressive Movement emerged not only as a reaction against traditional forms of education, but with the aspiration to establish a modern pedagogy that was concurrent with contemporary psychology and the goals of an expanding industrialized democracy.

By 1925 Progressivist ideas and practices which "Shook the schools free from a deadening attitude that ignored the worth of the individual and concentrated on outmoded scholastic values ..." had become widely accepted (Kaufman, 1966, p. 74). After a century of public education during which textbooks and an accumulation of factual subject matter had been of primary concern, the child's needs now became pre-eminent. A handbook written in 1928 by Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker reveals one of the new emphases of Progressive education. In their publication The Child-Centered School (1928) the authors proclaimed:

> that every child is endowed with the capacity to express himself, and that this innate capacity is immensely worth cultivating. The pupil is placed in an atmosphere conducive to self expression in every aspect. Some will create with words, others with light. Some will express themselves through the body in dance; others will model, carve, shape their ideas in plastic materials. Still others will find expression through oral languages and some through an integrated physical, emotional, dramatic gesture. But whatever the route, the medium, the materials - each one has some capacity for expression. (Rugg and Shumaker, p. 63)

Within Progressivism there existed two differing streams of thought (Grigor, 1985, pp. 120-121) and Gaitskell was influenced by both. One branch, expressed in the work of Rugg, Shumaker, Mearns and Florence Cane represented a child-centered Progressivism. This branch of Progressivism which became generally accepted by leaders and researchers in education after 1920, believed that that and the nurturing of children's own interests could bring forth a more stimulating curriculum (Logan, 1955, p. 155). Logically, self-expression through the various art forms was advocated as the most creative of all potential child activity. No topic in art need be provided since the child would look inward expressing his/her inner psyche. This individualistic child-centered position stressed emotional development, freedom and self-expression.

The other approach present in Progressivism, centered around Dewey's objective view towards the student which emphasized development and growth within a communal learning experience. Prompted by Dewey's collectivist pedagogy, a rather large body of Progressive educators began planning classroom lessons that allowed children to actively participate in projects confluent with their needs and interests. Employing the unit (a problem or task that taps a number of sources) the Progressives hoped to encourage active involvement in a learning situation. Within this structure, the role of the teacher was to act as a guide, providing motivation while allowing children freedom to develop naturally and at their own pace.

Gaitskell's philosophy of art education was firmly rooted in Progressive theory. His philosophical leanings toward child-centered education emerged during his university years in British Columbia in the 1930s. Here, he was exposed to child-centered concepts while studying and researching education and art.

Much of Gaitskell's knowledge of educational issues emerged not only from classes which dealt with this topics, but also from his readings on psychology. As discussed in Part 1 of this chapter, his interest in three specific approaches to psychology - Gestalt, G. Stanley Hall and the Child Study Movement and the psychology of John Dewey - encouraged and complimented Gaitskell's proclivity towards the liberal pedagogical methods of Progressive Education.

It has been noted that this propensity for Progressive practices was evident as early as 1935 in a number of experimental lessons and surveys. These were piloted until 1944 while fulfilling his various teaching and supervisory duties (Wilson, 1978, p. 13). Following a 1936 questionnaire aimed at extending his art program to all schools in the Peace River District, Gaitskell realized that traditional authoritarian classroom practices were commonplace. In response to what he thought were very backward methods, Gaitskell attempted to implement lessons in the Progressive tradition with minimal teacher guidance. His strong sympathy with Progressive methods led him, three years later, to criticize The Teacher's Manual of Drawing produced by the British Columbia Department of Education. This document violated Gaitskell's major concern for an education based on the child's life experiences and right to free expression (Sketchley, 1978, p. 79).

It was while completing his Masters degree in the late 1930s that Gaitskell became quite conversant with Progressive thought, particularly the ideas of John Dewey. Due to the influence of a certain professor who advocated Dewey's ideas, Gaitskell soon developed both a deepening awareness of and a favourable disposition towards Progressive methods and Dewey's philosophy (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985).

Outside of his classes, Gaitskell continued to do further independent research on Dewey. His will to succeed in his chosen discipline led him to read avidly about various educational trends

while also trying to keep abreast of contemporary art education theory. In time, his knowledge of and admiration for Dewey's ideas formed the basis of his philosophy of education. Gaitskell's respect for these ideas was reflected in his support for Dewey's notion that "We learn by doing" (Boyd and King, 1972, p. 407) and also in his own dictum that "We learn by Dewey" (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985).

Part 3: The Educational Theories of John Dewey

As an educator, John Dewey was undoubtedly the most important and respected figure in the Progressive Education Movement. From his work in Functionalist psychology and his investigations into the evolution of learning (University of Chicago's Elementary School), Dewey became deeply involved in educational issues by the late 19th century. His approach to education, however, reflects his familiarity with Functionalist psychology and his Instrumentalist view of knowledge. This is revealed by the concepts of experience, growth, experiment, and transaction which are central to his educational theory. The idea of "experience", at the heart of Functionalism, Instrumentalism and Progressive education, forms the basis for Dewey's definition of education as experience: "It is that reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience" (Dewey, 1916, p. 76).

For Dewey only certain types of experiences were educative. Such events were ones in which the individual makes a link between what he/she does to things and what occurs afterwards to them or the individual as a result. The value of an experience, according to Dewey, lay in the individual's ability to perceive relationships or continuities between experiences.

Thus, Dewey conceived of education as a specialized form of experience that should draw upon the child's past experiences. This involved a process of "experiencing" wherein a child's present experiences helped reorganize and clarify past and subsequent experiences, conferring them with new meaning. Dewey concluded, therefore, that all learning was a by-product of action and experimental scientific method. He theorized that education must be constructed out of action, experience, doing - where observation and information are combined to develop social interest and insight.

Dewey's ideas in education were also closely connected with his ideas on social reform. He believed traditional schooling made learning individual and competitive, reducing the activity of teaching to the inculcation of fact. He argued that effective learning, whether of lessons or life, is most likely to occur in a social context. Dewey conceived of education as a natural form of co-operation in which the teacher and pupils should be associated in a common enterprise. He considered the group over the individual and saw the child's interaction in school, at home and in the community as the basis of education. Dewey firmly believed that

unless a connection was forged between life at school and the everyday experiences of the child, genuine learning would not occur. He recommended that: ".... the school itself shall be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons" (Dewey, 1900, p. 24).

Dewey firmly believed that to isolate the school from everyday life was to sever students from the psychological bonds which make learning intelligible. He further maintained that not supplying a situation at school which groomed students for life in society is a wanton use of the school's resources as a socializing institution. Clearly, Dewey viewed the school as the real environment in which to train the individual for citizenship (Garforth, 1966, p. 23).

Dewey's conception of education as a social process led him to openly declare that "Education is the fundamental method of social progress and reform" (Dewey, 1934, p. 57). He conceived of education as a major force for establishing social unity through the elimination of social stratification (Entwistle, 1970, p. 42). Grigor points out that part of Dewey's motivation was the pressing need to integrate a growing immigrant population into the American Democratic system. He believed that education was the ideal vehicle to achieve a homoginous society (Grigor, 1982, p. 44).

This strong concern for social education has prompted some educators to criticize Dewey's pre-occupation with the social aspects of experience. As Entwistle cautions: "he undervalues the individual's need for a strong inner life of his own" (quoted from

Entwistle, 1970, p. 35). Another critic of Dewey's, Bantock, went so far to decry that his advocation of social education "... approaches social conformism, which is a short step to McCarthyism" (ibid.). Clearly for Bantock, Dewey's outlook prohibited individual autonomy (Entwistle, 1970, p. 36). Entwistle notes that this strong interest of Dewey's with the social in education is perhaps due to his anxiety and misgivings about the belligerant individualism which was present in American society in the late 19th century (Entwistle, 1970, p. 36).

Whether Gaitskell was aware of the substantial emphasis on the social in Dewey's theories remains unclear. Nonetheless, he absorbed many aspects of Dewey's ideas on social education (and psychology) that suited his own outlook. Gaitskell's philosophy, however, does not reflect the intense focus on social issues characteristic of Dewey's approach. Rather, his publications reveal support for an art program which gives more equal consideration to the individual (in relation to the social group).

Gaitskell's awareness of this two-fold concern for both the social and the individual in education is first revealed in his Doctoral Thesis (1948). In this document he outlines that the two most important goals of school art programs of the day were:

1. Art is included in the school program so that the individual may develop to the full extent of his needs and capacities
2. Art is offered so that the individual may become a valued and co-operative member of his social group.

(Gaitskell, 1948, p. 54)

Gaitskell considered this balance to be critical to good art education. This is reflected in his reiteration of this point in an address to the C.S.E.A. 'On Canadian Art Education Philosophy' (1969) in which he states:

> We have brought in a new concept to art education and that is the development of the group citizen. Remember, we're keeping our eye on the development of the individual as an individual and probably that's primary. But we're also saying that art has social purposes and we have many ways now of bringing this to the attention of the children. (Gaitskell, 1969, p. 10)

This attempt to make students more socially aware, however, had been advocated by Arthur Lismer long before Gaitskell's arrival on the art education scene in Ontario. Lismer, following Dewey, also believed in art as an effective tool for changing society. It has been noted that Lismer's faith in the potency of education to transform society and in the strength of the individual to initiate reforms were goals of his Saturday children's art classes at the Art Gallery of Toronto during the 1930s (Grigor, 1982, pp. 17-18). Specifically this was evident in his use of the socially oriented Project Method.

As with Lismer, Dewey's socially oriented ideas had deeply influenced Gaitskell, despite his attempts to maintain an equilibrium between the social and the individual in education. As

previously noted, however, his commitment to a form of art education which promoted social ideas was established by the time he left university. It appears that subsequent initiation to Dewey's concepts through one of his professors effected a strong and lifelong sympathy for his theories on democracy and education (Note 34) (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985).

Dewey's ideas regarding the social responsibilities of the school were particularly important to Gaitskell and he placed a high priority on the socialization of the student in his own teachings (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). In addition, he held firm views on the social benefits derived from art education which he promoted through his writings and powerful position as Director of Art for Ontario schools: "The development of the individual in such a manner as to make his life richer and to contribute to the welfare of the state is acceptable to those interested in contemporary art education" (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 16). Later, in 1954 he emphasized: "One of the most important aims of general education is the development of the individual within his social group and art, being part of education, must contribute to the achievement of this aim" (Gaitskell, p. 109).

In Art Education During Adolescence (1954) Gaitskell went on to comment:

> The education of an individual is not complete unless he has learned to participate to the full extent of his abilities in affairs involving a group. As well as exerting beneficial effects upon the individual pupil, art may assist him to develop insights into the techniques of working with others. Many art activities allow the young person naturally and creatively to solve numerous problems which arise when people gather together for the purpose of thinking as a group. (Gaitskell, 1954, p. 114)

Gaitskell agreed with Dewey that art is a social manifestation since the art instinct grows out of the need to construct and communicate with others. As Dewey had observed: "Provide the child with a social motive, something to tell and you have a work of art" (Dewey, 1900, p. 60). Gaitskell's belief in the social nature of art is again reflected in a statement he made in the early 1950s to the Southern California Art Education Association on the nature of creative thinking:

> Like Dewey, however, most of us believe creative thought to occur when from our experiences we are able to gain an insight which for us is new, distinct and different when compared with all our previous insights. When we are able to resolve the new insight into a new formal arrangement to act as a vehicle of communication to others we have consummated a creative act of thought. (C.D. Gaitskell, unpublished paper, p. 2)

For Gaitskell, the arts were the only true vehicle for creativity and social interaction. In his eyes it presented a unique opportunity to communicate with a broad selection of different peoples and societies. Its visual format transcended the barriers of writing or speech.

It is precisely this point, however, which makes Gaitskell's philosophy of education very different from that of Dewey. Every area in education was seen by Dewey as a vehicle for developing social skills and he regarded art as merely one subject among many which could achieve this task. Gaitskell, on the other hand, saw art as the primary forum for teaching socialization. Dewey (as well as Sir Herbert Read) believed the social instinct, the desire to tell, to represent was an inherent quality of the art impulse (Dewey, 1900, p. 61). Gaitskell also believed it was the key unique quality which made art such a vital and necessary part of the curriculum.

Gaitskell's support of the social goals for education put forth by Dewey are evident in his Doctoral Thesis (1947) when he suggested that: "... art should help the individual become a useful and co-operative member of society" (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 148). When outlining "Topics for Consideration" regarding "Arts & Crafts" in his "Proposed Course of Study for the Normal Schools of Ontario", (chap. 5), Gaitskell stressed the value of group activities in art and crafts programs to foster social awareness. Using language strongly reminiscent of Dewey, he spoke of studying "the nature of

the democratic group" in order to gain a better understanding of the benefits of group activities, suggesting that student art teachers might investigate the following projects:

1. Form a group and plan a co-operative activity such as the making of a model village, puppet show, mural or illustrated story.
2. Report on examples of artists, writers or musicians whose extreme individuality mitigated their function as citizens.
3. Describe how you would help a group of pupils decorate a classroom or the hallways of a school.

To develop the child's social skills and intelligence, Gaitskell went on to recommend establishing group projects directly relating to society outside the school. In Art & Crafts in the Schools of Ontario (1949) he explained that children should be expected: "to realize not only that their actions affect the lives of their associates, but also that the highest satisfaction they can obtain is derived from serving their fellows" (p. 8). Subsequently, Gaitskell advocated that picture-making deal with issues such as community planning, the disposition of parks and factories, the removal of slums and construction of proper housing. Three-dimensional work was to be encouraged based upon occupations of those living in the local environment and the creation of model houses and communities.

Despite Gaitskell's emphasis on using group projects to develop social skills he nevertheless continued to stress that the art teacher address the social group and the individual on equal terms: "The functions of the teacher in a group activity in art are parallel with those associated with individual learning" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 261).

By the 1940s the idea of integrating education with social goals, initially promoted by Dewey and adopted by Gaitskell, had become widespread. In his first Ontario Ministry Publication Art Education in the Province of Ontario (1948) Gaitskell suggests that a number of art educators began to employ this philosophy when he observed that the contemporary art scene:

> ... has been affected by the idea that the school must be a place where children go not merely to learn but to carry on a way of life. The art education program today is not considered adequate unless it tends to bring about growth in the child's social intelligence. (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 18)

To advance the cause of socialization within the school Gaitskell promoted the workshop format. This method saw workshop teachers as counsellors who assisted students to solve their individual problems, chairing group discussions and orchestrating the organization of group activities. For Gaitskell, the adoption of the workshop format was a natural step as it was most in keeping with his theories on art curriculum development.

Central to this approach, as previously mentioned, was the idea that the art program must consider the individual's previous experience and the needs and capacities of the learner. Echoing Dewey's emphasis on the active participation of the learner, Gaitskell thus declared:

> ... the strong recommendation is made that children should be given every reasonable opportunity to select the activities in art they wish to follow .... All art programs should be designed to allow the children to act as the controlling participants, and often the initiators, of the activities performed. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 91)

During the latter part of 1944 and early 1945, Gaitskell had begun to investigate the workshop technique particularly in the United States. He had gained experience with this orientation in Victoria, British Columbia in 1941 and 1942 when he had organized the summer art courses for teachers (Wilson, 1978, pp. 8-9). Familiar with this system, he wasted no time introducing the workshop method for teachers-in-service summer courses which he re-established for the Ministry after World War II. This approach allowed him to present what he thought the "model" art room should be: a resource center furnished with a rich variety of visual materials and a choice selection of art materials that would both stimulate the creative imagination as well as yield insight into the history of art. He therefore recommended: "No matter what field of art may be engaging

the child's attention - pottery, textiles, drawing, painting - the teacher will find it necessary to have available suitable works in similar areas for reference, comparison and study" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 385).

Within this type of space, rich with a variety of visual and material resources, Gaitskell believed children would be free to explore a number of processes and media guided by a teacher ".... helping children to say what they want to say in terms in which they want to say it" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 43). Clearly Gaitskell realized, as did Lismer and Cizek before him, that a more effective learning situation would occur if children were encouraged to select, as a basis of expression in art, their own experiences (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 6) (Wilson, 1978, p. 12).

While Gaitskell valued the informal atmosphere of the workshop he never endorsed a "laissez-faire" methodology which he regarded as seriously detrimental to good art education. Rather, Gaitskell felt that if creative activity was to occur, some restraints were necessary, realizing as Dewey had said "No rules, then no game" (Entwistle, 1970, p. 60). He was well aware, as were many other art educators, that known artistic innovators succeeded not by disregarding rules but by changing them (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). As Entwistle notes "This is the point of democracy; in art no less than in political activity we need a frame of reference" (Entwistle, 1970, p. 60).

At the same time Gaitskell realized, particularly in the case of adolescents, that providing freedom of thought and action are traditionally an integral part of artistic ventures. Yet he also cautioned:

> In allowing these freedoms the teacher in no way removes disciplinary measures. One cannot be responsible for artistic acts without exerting a high degree of self-discipline .... To allow these freedoms in no way eliminates the need of guidance in the art class. Whatever guidance is given must be timely and closely associated with the pupils' problems as they arise during the course of expression and must be supported by exceptional professional insight into both education and art. (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1954, p. 115)

To ensure the social unity critical to a democratic form of education Dewey had proposed correlating all subjects so that life at school would be linked with life at home. This meant that in art, students would be involved in practical activities such as sewing and weaving in addition to painting and drawing thereby fostering a synthesis of art, science and industry (Dewey, 1900, pp. 104-105). Gaitskell found this Deweyian strategy favourable for the acquisition of a well-rounded education, which he ultimately valued. The importance he attributed to integrating art with other subjects is evident in his dedication of an entire chapter to this issue in

Children and Their Art: - "Relating Art to the General School Program". While Gaitskell encouraged an integration of visual art with language and theatre arts, music and social studies he always maintained that art retain its identity and individual status. Under no circumstances should art be allowed to degenerate into a series of busy work activities merely illustrating issues in other subject areas (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 356). If a correlation between art and other subjects was not practiced within the school, Gaitskell advised: ".... let art itself be the integrating factor in school life, for indeed, it is sufficiently all embracing in its subject matter, its processes and its educative effects to serve this purpose" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 356).

Gaitskell, however, did favour an integrated curriculum as a means of achieving social harmony within the school community as Dewey had advocated, yet not to the detriment of art. As Gaitskell was interested in art education more than general education he naturally attributed more importance to art. In his view, art was always the most flexible and therefore the most essential subject for the development of a child with "Renaissance" qualities (Note 35).

Although Gaitskell believed that art education should be concerned with social integration, he never held it to be the most important goal (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1988a). Rather, as previously mentioned, he maintained that a balance should be established in education between a concern for the individual's

social development and effective personal growth: "They go both together. As the individual develops, he develops in relation to his social group" (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

In contrast to Dewey, Gaitskell saw art as essentially an individual activity and strongly believed that the individual's need to discover and reflect upon his experiences on his own be safeguarded. Thus Gaitskell asserted: "The teacher must keep in mind that no matter how desirable it may be to encourage children to work co-operatively, art is a matter of individual concern and will always remain so" (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 262).

In reviewing the objectives for developing an art program for adolescents, Gaitskell's concern for safeguarding the rights of the individual is also evident: "The programme must be conducted largely for the benefit of individuals since each pupil differs from his fellows both physiologically and with regard to personality" (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1954, p. 7). Particularly with regards to the "slow learner" Gaitskell believed it necessary to promote more individual activity in keeping with the specialized needs of this type of student. In his book Art Education for the Slow Learner (1953), he explained: "Every slow learner must be studied as an individual and not as some sort of standard type of personality" (Gaitskell and Gaitskell, 1953, p. 21) and so went on to point out: "The nature of the mentally retarded child makes guidance largely a personal matter. Group guidance appears to be far less effective for slow learners ...." (Gaitskell, 1953, p. 25).

This attention to the individual is again reflected in Gaitskell's comments on what role the teacher should assume as far as assisting his/her students:

> Much of the help in art offered by a teacher must be provided on this individual basis. On occasion, however, the teacher may observe that many members of the class seem to have a similar difficulty. This, of course, means that he may give a short general lesson to the group. Unless the majority in a class will profit from a group lesson, however, the act of teaching should remain an individual matter. (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 47)

This interest in the individual, which is also present in Dewey's position to a much more limited extent, is also evident in Dewey's educational philosophy. Viewing the school as a necessary route towards progress, democracy and growth, Dewey held one of its aims to be to effect a refinement and elevation of the power of the individual in order to achieve the best in life (Boydston, 1970, p. 263). Consequently he placed a value on individual independence and individual uniqueness and felt that freedom of thought should never be suppressed by the group. In keeping with this outlook Gaitskell also felt that artistic endeavours would naturally establish a pattern for freedom of thought with the teacher acting as a guide, nurturing critical thinking.

It must be remembered however, that Dewey's branch of Progressivism always placed a higher priority on the social benefits to be achieved from education than on preserving the individual's rights. Nonetheless, the individual child still retained an important status as a figure central to the educative process. Thus Dewey spoke of the school as an important vehicle for assisting the individual to develop his intellectual power, sense of moral responsibility, aesthetic sensitivity and expression and a practical outlook on everyday life. Its goal must be the formation of a stable individual. Yet in describing the evolution of such a person through the educational process, Dewey always deliberated how he/she would augment the social group, as an ideal democratic citizen. Strongly suggestive of Dewey, Gaitskell also spoke of education and art education in terms of the development of the total personality, the whole child, into a stable mature adult who would become a worthy citizen (Gaitskell, 1949, pp. 9-10).

Nearly all of Gaitskell's publications reveal the influence of Dewey's ideas on education, particularly its social significance. What distinguishes Gaitskell's philosophy from Dewey's however, is a more visible attempt to include educational goals which preserve the integrity of the individual.

Notes Chapter 3

Note 26: Certainly this idea and Hall's recommendations for an ideal education did not originate with him. Hall's views of the child were based on concepts previously formulated many European pedagogical reformers including Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Froebel (Eisner, 1972, p. 40).

Note 27: It must be mentioned at this point that although Dewey is usually credited with the child's needs, Hall also played a critical role in the dissemination of this idea (Eisner, 1972, p. 41).

Note 28: This was all being practiced much earlier in the 1930s by Lismer at the Art Gallery of Toronto (see Grigor, Angela, Arthur Lismer: A Critical Analysis of His Pedagogy in Relation to His Use of the Project Method in Child-Centered Art Education. (1982). Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Art Education. Concordia University, Montréal.

Note 29: The summer courses sponsored by the Ontario Department of Education had stopped in 1940 due to World War II.

Note 30: In 1884, Dewey began teaching psychology and philosophy at the University of Michigan. His first major book was Psychology, published in 1887.

Note 31: Indeed it must be pointed out that there always exists a very close connection between Dewey's ideas on psychology and education. Since much of his psychological thought had significant implications for education. Dewey started as a philosopher, was then a psychologist, then an educator. All are closely united.

Note 32: Again, it must be remembered that although Gaitskell considered the Functionalist encouragement of independent thinking an important goal for education, he was more concerned with the overall development of the child. For Gaitskell, the psycho-motor skills, as well as the emotional, social and intellectual aspects must all be nurtured (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985).

Note 33: Dewey's theory of reflective thinking was based on his belief that true learning is born of experience and that thinking about and reflecting upon experiences was the essence of genuine education (Boydston, 1970, p. 265).

Note 34: The name of this professor is not known.

Note 35: The author here suggests that, in light of her research and investigations on Dr. C.D. Gaitskell, he was striving to produce a child who was educated in many areas; thus to borrow from history, a child with "Renaissance" qualities.

Chapter 4

Summary and Conclusions

Summary and Conclusions

This study has explored C.D. Gaitskell's career and background as an art educator from his early beginnings as an art teacher in rural British Columbia during the 1930s to his appointment in 1945 as Director of Art for the Province of Ontario to his retirement from this position in 1973. During the over 40 years Gaitskell was involved in art education, he consistently promoted a philosophy of "education through art" which advocated the benefits that art could provide the individual and society within the scheme of general education. Art education, in Gaitskell's eyes, was a valuable means of achieving self-realization and growth while developing worthy citizens capable of leading a more harmonious pattern in group life.

This study has further revealed that in terms of Gaitskell's two main aims for art education (1. Art is included in the school program to assist the individual to develop to the full extent of his needs and capacities and 2. that art is offered to assist the individual to become a useful, valued and cooperative member of his social group) (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 9), he actually placed a stronger emphasis on the individual over the social aspects. Although Gaitskell believed that the development of social skills should be of primary importance to the art educator, his writings suggest a greater concern for the individual's personal growth over the benefits art could provide to society. This observation by the

writer was supported by Margaret Gaitskell (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985) who stated that she felt that the individual and his/her development always came first in her husband's list of priorities for art education. Moreover, research also supports the conclusion that Gaitskell was ultimately concerned with using a program of education through art to develop the "whole" child. In his view art was a "... totally unique discipline" that involved the complete child since "Art demands that the emotions, the intellect, the social environment of the child, the total child in other words, must be involved in an artistic activity" (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982). Working from a Gestalt frame of reference, Gaitskell conceived of art as the stimulus for producing a child with a well-balanced character, who was educated to the fullest extent in all aspects of his/her personality. In other words, Gaitskell envisioned the development through art of a sensitive, well educated child with "Renaissance" qualities (Note 36). An indication of this desire to integrate the personality into a harmonious whole is reflected in an address Gaitskell made to the Southern California Art Education Association in the early 1950s when he stated:

> art teachers have ... placed themselves as leaders in the development of effective general educational practice because they appeal to the education of the whole man. They have recognized the fact that the sensitively courageous and honest thinker, willing and able to venture into the unknown, is surely the type of

> person which our society is desperately in need. Since art can be produced by no other type of mind, the study of art is of utmost necessity as part of a general educational procedure for every learner. (Gaitskell, Art: A Human Necessity, p. 5)

This theory, however, does not refute the fact that Gaitskell also maintained an intense interest in the social applications of an art program which form a significant part of his vision of art education.

This study has also tried to examine the basis of Gaitskell's ideas and pedagogical methods and the people and events which proved influential in shaping his philosophy. This included a review of the work of Franz Cizek and Marian Richardson, advocates of child-centered education. Gaitskell openly acknowledged a debt to Cizek, although he noted that Cizek's ideas had only affected him in a general way (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982), since he was well aware of the contradictions in Cizek's theory and practice (Gaitskell, 1958, p. 32). Nevertheless, it became apparent that Cizek's central goal was that children should be encouraged to present in visual form their emotional reactions to happenings in their lives and this formed a significant basis for Gaitskell's own approach. The Cizekian belief that all children possess a creative power (also later championed by Marian Richardson) which could blossom if they were left to develop "... in accordance with natural laws" (Tomlinson, 1944, p. 27) was absorbed into Gaitskell's

philosophy and reflected in his own informal classroom teaching methods (T. Martin, Cassette Tape, 1985). It also became apparent that a premise pioneered by Cizek that children are capable of expressing themselves in a personal, creative and acceptable manner formed the core of Gaitskell's child-centered outlook on art education.

A somewhat stronger source of inspiration on Gaitskell's approach to art education was traced in the teachings of Marian Richardson. In addition to Gaitskell's open acknowledgement of her influence (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982), it was further discovered that the format for art lessons which Gaitskell promoted as Director of Art for Ontario owed a great deal to Richardson's methods (Tait, 1957, p. 195). Moreover, there was a close parallel between Gaitskell's use of music in his summer courses for teachers-in-service and Richardson's belief that music encouraged the imagination (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, 1988a).

An appraisal of the theories of Sir Herbert Read, as well as the concepts of John Dewey played an important part in the investigation of the influences which affected Gaitskell's attitudes to art education. The strong admiration and respect Gaitskell held for both Read and Dewey became manifest in his adoption of numerous aspects of their theories. The most significant concept advanced by Read which Gaitskell used was the thesis that art should be the basis of education (Read, 1943, p. 1). Working from Read's central idea of an "education through art" Gaitskell sought to promote

Read's concept that education is aesthetic and that art has an intrinsic value as a vehicle for learning within the general scheme of education. Gaitskell's efforts to carry out this goal by helping teachers relate art to general education was reflected in his production of booklets from 1944-47 (through the Ontario Department of Education) entitled a series of Bulletins: Aids for Teachers in the Use of Arts and Crafts in General Education. Gaitskell's attempt to realize this goal was also achieved through the Canadian Society for Education Through Art which he modelled on Read's British organization, the Society for Education Through Art (Flemming, 1972, p. 142). Borrowing from Read's expression theory of art, Gaitskell promoted, through the C.S.E.A., the idea that art provides a means of exploring the self. Accordingly, Gaitskell believed that one of the purposes of art education was to assist the child in clarifying his/her emotions and discovering his/her self.

An important factor the researcher discovered, probably accounting in part for Gaitskell's strong interest and support of Read's concepts, was his good friendship with Read (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985). This situation no doubt stimulated a greater familiarity with Read's theories and led perhaps to a more open acceptance of his views.

A concern for social policy and education evident in Gaitskell's philosophy was also traced to Read who, like John Dewey, perceived the educational system as intimately linked with the community (Read, 1943, p. 296). Upon closer analysis, however, it

became apparent that Gaitskell's two-fold concern for art education - fostering the growth of the individual and harmonizing the individuality thus achieved within the social group - found its basis not only in Read's theories, but more importantly in those of Dewey. Gaitskell's writings clearly revealed that the social integration of the students was one of his major concerns (Gaitskell, 1947, p. 148). He believed with Dewey that one of the main goals of education was to help children realize their responsibility as a unit within society (Gaitskell, 1954, p. 114). As previously stated, the researcher discovered, however, that while Dewey placed the requirements and well-being of the group above those of the individual, Gaitskell placed more importance on the development of the individual. Further, Gaitskell believed that art provided the best environment for teaching socialization whereas Dewey saw it as one subject among many. Even though Gaitskell did not completely adopt all of Dewey's recommendations, he was, nonetheless, deeply affected by Dewey's theories, which comprised the foundation for his philosophy of education (Gaitskell, 1954, p. 109). It was observed that Gaitskell's interest was partly the result of encouragement by a former professor of his who had favoured Dewey's theories (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985). The researcher discovered the extent to which Dewey's ideas had affected Gaitskell not only by his own verbal admission (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982), but through his writings, where a Deweyian concern for the applications of education within the context of a

democratic society was always in evidence. Gaitskell's promotion of group art activities and his introduction of the workshop format for the summer school courses for teachers-in-service showed the importance he placed on the development of social skills and intelligence through art (Gaitskell, 1948, p. 18). Gaitskell's commitment to Dewey's ideas was ultimately reflected in his acceptance of the Deweyian thesis that learning is based on experience and that, therefore, art should come from the child's felt experiences (Gaitskell, 1949, p. 5).

In summary, upon examining the work of Dewey, Read, Richardson and Cizek, it became apparent to the writer that Gaitskell's philosophy was not original. Rather, he had adopted strands of thought from each one of these figures, blending them with his own emerging views on art teaching. Additional study indicates that Gaitskell's approach to art education was also affected by other factors. In particular, his notions about learning and intelligence were conditioned by Dewey's Instrumentalist view of knowledge and his work in Functionalist psychology. Gestalt psychology had also influenced his perception of learning and shown him the need for addressing the total personality in education. Within the context of his university training in the 1930s, it also became clear that Gaitskell's ideas on child development and his respect for childhood had been coloured by G. Stanley Hall's studies in psychology. Hall's concepts, as well as those of Dewey, prepared the way for Gaitskell's acceptance of Progressive education. Finally,

Gaitskell's views on art and aesthetics were also influenced by the ideas of the Bloomsbury Group (C.D. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1982).

This study of Gaitskell's philosophy of art education has made it clear that Gaitskell's major aspiration was to establish art as part of every child's education. His vision of what Canadian art education should involve was reflected in an article he wrote in 1957 entitled "Art in Canadian Schools":

> It must not be assumed, however, that the art programme in Canadian public education is conducted primarily for the production of art forms. Rather, its main function, except perhaps in schools operated for purely technical education, is to contribute to the general education and development of young people. (p. 119)

At both the Elementary level (which was his main concern) and the Secondary level, Gaitskell stressed the use of art as a cultural and civilizing influence. In his capacity as Director of Art he encouraged the Elementary schools to abandon the rigid, teacher-dominated system in favour of an art program which was more expressive, intuitive and emotional. The Secondary schools were called to adopt this type of program as well, with provision made to incorporate intellectual activities (Gaitskell, Canadian Art, 1953, p. 25).

Gaitskell was a determined man of energy and will, with a strong, outgoing personality which helped him to gain the recognition and power he needed to initiate changes in Canadian art

education. His driving ambition as Director of Art for Ontario was to reform the province's form of art education from one in which the teacher was dominant and the child passive to a system wherein the child was free to determine subject matter, guided by a teacher who was sensitive to the student's needs and capacities. The task was a most difficult one since traditional pedagogical methods were still favoured and practiced by a great number of teachers across Ontario when Gaitskell arrived in 1944. However, he possessed strong organizational abilities and proved an excellent administrator in that he was able to maintain contact with educators all over the province. Within a decade of his appointment as Director of Art for Ontario he had launched significant changes in the art programs of Ontario schools. Moreover, he had succeeded in establishing the Canadian Society for Education Through Art, of which he became the first president. A post as Vice President for the International Society for Education Through Art was also secured within that time period. These and many other accomplishments made Gaitskell a legend in his own time. Commenting on Gaitskell's nomination as Director of Art, G.E. Tait had remarked in 1957:

> Although he was highly recommended, there was little then to indicate the Director would in the course of ten years, revolutionize art education in this province; there was little to indicate that he would become an art authority of national and international reputation during the same short period of time. (pp. 176-177)

Unlike Lismer, who refused to work within the limitations of bureaucracy (Grigor, 1982, p. 81), the politically astute Gaitskell worked around any restrictions to effect changes where he felt they were most needed - the established school system. Clearly, his leadership in this area was one of his most important contributions to the art education scene in Ontario. Doubtless, Gaitskell was forceful in his opinions and enjoyed his position of authority as one of Canada's leading art educators after Arthur Lismer. In his desire to maintain his influence, Gaitskell had gathered around him a number of young art teachers who became loyal disciples. In later years these followers were to assume important positions of responsibility within the Ontario educational system as art education professors, consultants and ministry officials, ensuring the spread of his gospel (Note 37).

While Gaitskell gained support in mainstream education circles, he was not always regarded as a source of inspiration in private sectors, particularly for those art educators who worked with Arthur Lismer. Discussing the concept and educational value of creative art work which was promoted through the C.S.E.A., Doris McCarthy, a former student and later student teacher of Lismer's said:

> It was a very enlightened thing, Gaitskell gave a lot of leadership to it. We took a comparatively detached view of Gaitskell. He was not a great inspiration, but Lismer was the thing that started this whole ferment. He was behind this whole movement in education ...
>
> (D. McCarthy, Cassette Tape, 1987)

It is also interesting to note that Lismer himself, whom Gaitskell admired, was very unaware of Gaitskell and his work in art education. In a letter to H.O. McCurry, Director of the National Gallery of Canada, concerning the selection of a representative for the UNESCO Symposium in Bristol, England in 1951, Lismer remarked disapprovingly:

> I hear that the Canadian Arts Council have appointed a delegate ... a Mlle Loise Barrette. She came to me for information about child art and education and asked me what could she do? Another one is 'Gaitskill' (sic.) from the Ontario Dept of Educ. (sic.) All that we have done in that field has been apparently overlooked and people who know little are going ...

Although no doubt irritating to Lismer, Gaitskell had been in the right place at the right time to have been chosen for this important task that finally brought him international recognition. Indeed this had also been the case in 1945 when Althouse, the Director of Education for Ontario was looking for a Director of Art. Gaitskell, who had just recently begun writing a comprehensive report on the state of art education in Ontario was an obvious candidate. Margaret Gaitskell explains her husband's view of Lismer's philosophy and the reason for the lack of cooperation between the two men:

> He accepted it and respected certain parts of it, but they were never friends. He didn't go for Lismer as I did. I knew him as a student. He was fascinating to listen to, his lectures, his hands; they were so long and thin and he used them as he talked. And all the girls at the art gallery connected with him, just idolized Lismer. I think that was the way he worked. And you can't have two people, who are 'prima donnas' with two sets of disciples being too friendly. I think that perhaps had a little to do with it.
>
> (M. Gaitskell, Cassette Tape, 1985)

Despite the fact Gaitskell had been present at the critical time when decisions were being made about the future of art education in Ontario, he had also put in a great deal of effort on his own. Gaitskell had worked extremely hard as Director of Art and any rewards were probably justified. His ever strong leadership and presence in the Canadian art education scene for over three decades from 1945 led a writer on Gaitskell to comment:

> It is clear that into the history of art education is incised the philosophy of Gaitskell. His tremendous contribution is not a myth. Indeed, he <u>is</u> perhaps a hero. Reflected in his research, publications and lectures is a firm belief in the humanization of man through the education of individuals integrated with their environment. Gaitskell's dedication to this idea is evidenced too, in the impetus provided by him in establishing INSEA and CSEA. (Wilson, 1978, p. 18)

It is evident that in some circles Gaitskell has acquired the reputation of being a "phenomena", but his hero-like status is still open to question. For those who worked with and admired Gaitskell, it is fitting that this study should close with a quotation from a tribute paid him by the O.S.E.A. Journal in 1973. Despite its tendency to place Gaitskell on a pedestal, it reflects an appreciation and recognition of his pioneering efforts for art education in Canada:

> His life reads like a legend. His accomplishments are monumental. In a time of educational soul seaching and change and theorizing, Gaitskell stands apart and above. Competency-based education; that is Gaitskell. Integrated learning opportunities and individualized learning; these are Gaitskell. The humanization of man through personalized education, the self-actualization of the individual, the need for creative expression; these are all Gaitskell. Gaitskell's philosophy is encompassing because Gaitskell himself stands as a man integrated with life, his work, his environment. Charles Gaitskell stands as complete a man as it is possible to be. (O.S.E.A. Journal, 1973, p. 5)

In this excerpt from the O.S.E.A. Journal, Gaitskell emerges as an original thinker of superhuman proportions. However, in order to preserve a balanced view of his contribution to Canadian art education it should be remembered that he did not in fact originate

any of the ideas mentioned above. Rather, he created an effective and timely synthesis of various concepts which eventually transformed art education in Ontario, and through the C.S.E.A., perhaps even across Canada.

Notes Summary and Conclusions

Note 36: Ray Blackwell, a former colleague and good friend of Gaitskell's had indicated that this theory is a plausible one and "... not an unreasonable assumption ..." according to his knowledge and understanding of Gaitskell's methods throughout the years he knew and worked with him (R. Blackwell, Cassette Tape, November, 1988).

Note 37: The extent of Gaitskell's influence, right up until the present day, was made apparent to the writer in a policy written by the school board (York Regional Roman Catholic Separate) for which she now teaches. Remarkably, her Board's new "Arts Policy" document, the first of its kind in the Toronto area, was largely inspired by Gaitskell's concepts.

Bibliography

Althouse, J.G. (1950). Structure and Aims of Canadian Education. Toronto: Quance Lectures in Canadian Education, Gage Publishing Co.

Arnheim, Rudolf. (1966). Toward a Psychology of Art. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Ashwin, Clive. (1975). Art Education: Documents and Policies 1768-1975. London.

Aslin, Elizabeth. (1969). The Aesthetic Movement: Prelude to Art Nouveau. New York: Excalibur Books.

Beaverbrook Art Gallery. (1976). Bloomsbury and Their Circle. Frederickton, New Brunswick: catalogue for an exhibition, November 1976 - January 1977.

Beihler, Robert P. (1974). Psychology Applied to Teaching. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Bell, Clive. (1958). Art. New York: Capricorn Books.

Birdsall, Peter. (1977). Tunnel Vision: Looking at Art Education in English Canadian High Schools. Peterborough, Ontario: Canadian Catalogues in Publishing Data.

Boyd, William and King, Edmund J. (1972). The History of Western Education. London: Adam & Charles Black Ltd.

Boydston, Jo Ann. (1970). Guide to the Works of John Dewey. Edwardsville, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

British Crafts Council. (1984). The Omega Workshops 1913-19: Decorative Arts of Bloomsbury. London: Crafts Council Pub.

Callen, Anthea. (1979). Artists of the Arts and Crafts Movement: 1870-1914. New York: Pantheon Books.

Canadian Art Education Association. (1952). The Improvement of Art Education in Canada: A Report on the Proceedings of the Art Education Group. Toronto: Art Gallery of Toronto, September 16-18, 1952.

Carline, R. (1968). Draw They Must. New York: Edwa d Arnold.

Courtney, Richard and Park, Paul. (1980). Learning Through the Arts: The Arts in Primary and Junior Education in Ontario - Roles and Relationships in the General Program of Studies. Unpublished report. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

D'Amico, Victor. (1942). Creative Teaching in Art. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Dewey, John. (1900). The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, John. (1934). Democracy & Education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Dewey, John. (1934). Arts As Experience. New York: G.P. Putnam's and Sons.

Dewey, John. (1952). Experience & Education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Dykuizen, George. (1973). The Life & Mind of John Dewey. London: Feffer & Simons Inc.

Edel, Leon. (1974). Bloomsbury: A House of Lions. Toronto: Avon Books.

Eisner, Elliot W. (1972). Educating Artistic Vision. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Entwistle, H. (1970). Child-Centered Education. London: Trinity Press.

Fancher, Raymond E. (1979). Pioneers of Psychology. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Field, Dick and Newick, John (Eds.). (1973). The Study of Education and Art. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Flemming, W.G. (1972). Educational Contributions of Associations. Ontario Educative Society, Vol. VII. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Frost, S.E., and Bailey, Kenneth P. (1973). Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co.

Fry, Roger. (1972). Vision and Design. London: Chatto and Windus.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1944). Bulletins: Aids for Teachers in the Use of the Arts and Crafts in General Education: 1944-45. Toronto: Department of Education.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1946). Bulletins: Aids for Teachers in the Use of the Arts and Crafts in General Education: 1946-47. Toronto: Department of Education.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1947). Art Education in the Province of Ontario. Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Education. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1948). Art Education in the Province of Ontario. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1949). Art and Crafts in the Schools of Ontario. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1950). Arts and Crafts in Our Schools. New York: Peoria Chas A. Bennet Co. Inc.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1951). Children and Their Pictures. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1952). Visual Arts in General Education: A Report on the Bristol England Seminar 1951. New York: UNESCO Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and Gaitskell, Margaret. (1952). Art Education in the Kindergarten. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and the Canadian Society for Education Through Art. (1953). The Improvement of Art Education in Canada. Report of the Art Education Group of the Canadian Education Association; Seminar at the Art Gallery of Toronto, September 16-18, 1952. Toronto: C.E.A. Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and Gaitskell, Margaret. (1953). Art Education for Slow Learners. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and Gaitskell, Margaret. (1955). Art Education During Adolescence. Toronto: Ryerson Press.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1958). Children and Their Art: Methods for the Elementary School. New York: Harcourt, Brace Janovich Inc. and Co. Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1969). The Address of Dr. C.D. Gaitskell, Honorary President of the C.S.E.A. at the Opening of the 15th Annual General Assembly, October 6, 1969, St. John's, Newfoundland. Unpublished paper. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and the Metropolitan Separate School Board. (1976). Art Education: A Catholic Dimension. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1978). Art Education in the Intermediate Division of the Metropolitan Separate School Board: A Report. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1979). An Autobiography. Unpublished paper. Toronto.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and Mallon, Al. (1980). Art Appreciation. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1981, June). Art in Special Education: A Report to the Visual Arts Department of the Metropolitan Separate School Board. Toronto: Metropolitan Separate School Board Publishers.

Gaitskell, Charles D. Art: A Human Necessity (abridged transcript of Dr. Gaitskell's address to a meeting of the Southern California Art Education Society). Unpublished paper.

Gaitskell, Charles D., and Hurwitz, Al. (1970). Children and Their Art: Methods for the Elementary School. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc.

Garforth, F.N., (Ed.). (1966). John Dewey: Selected Educational Writings. London: Heinemann Press.

Grigor, Angela. (1982). Arthur Lismer: A Critical Analysis of His Pedagogy in Relation to His Use of the Project Method in Child-Centered Art Education. Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Art Education. Montréal: Concordia University.

Harris, Robin S. (1967). Quiet Evolution: A Study of the Educational System in Ontario. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Harrison, Elizabeth. (1951). Self Expression Through Art. Toronto: W.J. Gage and Co. Publishing.

Hodder, Geoff. (1977, October). Marian Richardson. Unpublished report to the C.S.E.A. Calgary, Alberta.

Housemann, Jerome (1965). The Report of the Commission on Art Education. Washington, D.C.: N.A.E.A. Publishers.

Johnson, Henry F. (1968). A Brief History of Canadian Education. Toronto.

Johnstone, J.K. (1954). The Bloomsbury Group: A Study of E.M. Forster, Lytton Strachey, Virginia Wolfe and Their Circle. London: Secker & Warburg.

Kaufman, Irving. (1966). Art and Education in Contemporary Culture. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Logan, Frederick M. (1955). Growth of Art in American Schools. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishing.

Lowenfeld, Victor and Brittain, Lambert. (1975). Creative and Mental Growth. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

MacDonald, Stewart. (1970). History & Philosophy of Art Education. London: University of London Press.

MacGregor, Ronald N. (1979). History of the Canadian Society for Education Through Art (1951-1975). Toronto: Ginn Custom Publishing.

MacGregor, Ronald N. (1980). Canadian Art Education in the 80's: An Appraisal and Forecast. Vancouver: C.S.E.A. Publishers.

MacGregor, Ronald N. (1984). Readings in Canadian Art Education. Vancouver: Western Division Group, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia Publishers.

Ministry of Education. (1916). Ontario Teacher's Manual: Art. Toronto: T. Eaton Co.

Moody, Margaret M. (1974). An Analysis of the Goals and Activities Recommended by Canadian Provincial Elementary Art Curriculum Guides, Compared with Each Other and With Recent Art Education Literature. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Portland: University of Oregon.

Munro, Thomas. (1956). Art Education: Its Philosophy and Psychology. New York: Liberal Arts Press.

Ontario Curriculum Institute. (1965, October). The Creative Arts: A Survey of Professional Opinion. Toronto: Ontario Department of Education Publishers.

Ontario Department of Education. (1959). Art: Senior Division - Grades 11 and 12, A Curriculum Guide. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education Publishers.

Osborne, Harold. (1970). Aesthetics & Art Theory. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc.

Pearson, Ralph. (1941). The New Art Education. New York: Harper Brothers.

Phillips, Charles E. (1957). The Development of Education in Canada. Toronto: W.J. Gage and Co.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1943). Education Through Art. London: Faber and Faber.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1951). The Meaning of Art. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1955). The Grassroots of Art. London: Faber and Faber.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1955, January 3). Education Through Art: A Revolutionary Policy. Unpublished manuscript. London: University College.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1963, August 19). Art As a Unifying Principle in Education. Presidential Address to the Fourth General Assembly of the International Society for Education Through Art. Unpublished paper. Montréal.

Read, Sir Herbert. (1974). Art and Industry. Bloomington, Illinois: Indiana University Press.

Richardson, Marian. (1946). Art and The Child. London: Chas A. Bennet and Co.

Rugg, Harold and Shumaker, Ann. (1928). The Child-Centered School. New York: World Book Co.

Rusk, Robert. (1954). The Doctrines of the Great Educators. London: MacMillan and Co.

Saunders, Robert J. (1954). The Parallel Development of Art Education in Canada and the United States with Emphasis of the History of Art Education in Canada. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Penn. State University.

Shone, Richard. (1976). Bloomsbury Portraits: Vanessa Bell, Duncan Grant and Their Circle. Oxford, England: Phaidon Press.

Sketchley, Violet. (1978). The Historical Development and Philosophy of Art Education with Special Emphasis on the Years 1930 to 1950. Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Art Education. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Smith, Ralph. (1970). Aesthetic Concepts & Education. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Strickland, Charles E., and Burgess, Charles (Eds.). (1965). Health, Growth and Heredity: G. Stanley Hall on Natural Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sullivan, Patricia A. (1984). Roger Fry's Writings on Modern Art (A Study of His Literary Career Emphasizing His Theories and Their Application to Modern Art in France and England, 1899-1934). Unpublished masters thesis, Department of Art History. Kingston: Queen's University.

Swift, W.H. (1958). Trends in Canadian Education. Toronto: W.J. Gage.

Tait, George. (1957). A History of Art Edcation in the Elementary Schools of Ontario. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Tames, Richard. (1981). William Morris. Aylesbury, England: Shire Publications Ltd.

Tomlinson, R.R. (1944). Children As Artists. London: King Penguin Books.

Visual Arts Department & Curriculum & Special Services Department. (1979). Art Education: A Catholic Dimension. Toronto: Metro Separate School Board Publishers.

Wilson, Francesca. (1921). A Lecture by Professor Cizek. London: Children's Art Exhibition Fund Publishers.

Wilson, Joan. (1978). Charles Dudley Gaitskell: His Work and Influence on Twentieth Century Art Education in Canada. Unpublished paper, Department of Art Education. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Wooff, Terence. (1976). Developments in Art Teaching. London: Open Books Publishing Ltd.

Ziegfeld, Edwin. (1954). Education and Art: A Symposium - The Bristol Seminar, 1951. Paris: UNESCO Publishers.

Periodicals

Art education considered as growth and fulfillment. (1924). Design, 26, (6), 1.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1953). A conflict in art education. Canadian Art, 10, (3), 25.

Gaitskell, Charles D. (1957, Spring). Art in Canadian schools. Canadian Art, (3), 117-119.

Lanier, Vincent. (1972, March). Objectives of teaching art. Art Education, 25, (3), 15-19.

Mulcaster, Wynona C. (1951). Children and their art by C.D. Gaitskell: A book review. Canadian Art, 8, (4), 181.

Savage, Anne. (1948). Art education in the Province of Ontario by C.D. Gaitskell: A book review. Canadian Art, 6, (1), 38.

Younkie, G.W. (1947). Ontario Department of Education sponsors summer arts and crafts course for teachers. Canadian Review of Music and Art.

Newspaper Articles

An honour and a viewing: A Canadian heads a UNESCO seminar. (1951, June 12). Saturday Night.

Art attracts young folk. (1952, January 7). Hamilton Spectactor.

Art authority will speak here tonight. (1951, January 25). Paris Star.

Art director C.D. Gaitskell visiting here. (1960, November 25). Brockville Recorder Times.

Art director to speak here. (1952, January 17). London Evening Free Press.

Art lecturer draws crowd at university. (1934, August 2). The Victoria Times.

Art study by teachers required. (1951, September 20). Leader Post.

Brown, Bill. (1951, August 23). School for teachers: new art methods attract many. The Standard.

Check on type of art done naturally. (1950, November 11). Kingston Whig Standard.

Director of art will speak at home and school banquet. (1953, February 21). Stratford Beacon Herald.

Discuss changes in art course. (1948, November 15). Peterborough Examiner.

Dr. C.D. Gaitskell heads art conference. (1951, June 12). Toronto Daily Star.

Former Brooks art teacher receives Ph.D. (1947, June 18). Powell River News.

Gaitskell, C.D. (1976, Winter). Should artists teach?. Backstage With the Angels - Inner City Angels Newsletter, 3, (1).

Let child use his imagination in art says Dr. C.D. Gaitskell. (1964, October 17). Barrie Examiner.

One of 12,000 pictures. (1949, November 10). Ottawa Eve Journal.

Phillsworth, Ann. (1952, April 17). Says art is essential for complete education - Dr. C.D. Gaitskell. Oakville Record Star.

Powell River. (1951, March 8). Vancouver Daily Province.

Sees need for art instruction to round out primary education: C.D. Gaitskell Speaks to Long Branch Home and School on second birthday. (1950, February 10). New Toronto Advertiser.

Storr, Carter B. (1953, July). Art education for slow learners by C.D. and Margaret Gaitskell. Canadian Forum.

Talk new ways: children's art. (1952, [illegible]uary 24). London Echo.

Teachers open art workshop. (1948, November 1). London Free Press.

Other Sources

Blackwell, Ray (Associate Director of Curriculum, Ontario Ministry of Education - retired). (Speaker). (1984, November). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Blackwell, Ray. (Speaker). (1988, July a). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Blackwell, Ray. (Speaker). (1988, November b). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Courtney, Richard (Professor of Arts Education, Department of Curriculum, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto). (Speaker). (1985, April). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Emerson, John (Professor, Department of Art Education, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto and Honorary President of the C.S.E.A.). (Speaker). (1985, April). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Gaitskell, Charles Dudley. (Speaker). (1982, February). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On Dr. C.D. Gaitskell's Philosophy of Art and Craft Education. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Gaitskell, Charles Dudley. (Speaker). (1973, April). An Interview with Dennis Mills On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape).

Gaitskell, Charles Dudley. (Speaker). (1980). An Interview with Peter Rempel On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Gaitskell, Margaret. (Speaker). (1985, June). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Gaitksell, Margaret. (Speaker). (1987, November). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Hughes, Roy (Art Supervisor, York Board of Education). (Speaker). (1984, November). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Lindsey, Isabelle. (Speaker). (1985, September). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Mallon, Al (Former Art Supervisor, Metropolitan Separate School Board - retired). (Speaker). (1985, February). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

McCarthy, Doris. (Speaker). (1987, October 24). An Interview with Dr. Angela Grigor On Arthur Lismer. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Martin, Tom (Former Superintendent of Curriculum, Peel Board of Education). (Speaker). (1985, September). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Martin, Tom. (Speaker). (1988, July). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

McCullough, Nora (Arthur Lismer's Assistant at the Art Gallery of Toronto). (Speaker). (1982, August). An Interview with Angela Grigor and Leah Sherman On Arthur Lismer. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.

Pattemore, Arnel (Former President of the Ontario Society for Education Through Art and Art Supervisor, Lincoln County Board of Education, St. Catharines). (Speaker). (1984, November). An Interview with Krystyna Czereyska On C.D. Gaitskell. (Cassette Tape). Toronto.