tainty what men live by in this world. The great teachers and educational workers of the past gained and retained lofty conceptions of their work among their fellows; they had high views of the functions of teaching and consistently magnified their office. They knew that those whom they taught should carry away from their teaching increased powers of endurance and liberation from slavery, prejudice, irrational fear and passion and be equipped to face the vicissitudes of life. Above all, they knew that teachers can never give their students that which they themselves do not have. They believed that genuine teaching is an art that no rash hand may profane.

Perhaps at no time in our history has transitory pedagogical opinion played so large a part in our educational life as in recent years. Especially has the immediate, which is only a mere fragment of our past and of our future, held a large place in the realm of education. It seems within the limits of the facts to say that much of our current educational philosophy is a creature of the immediate moment, a condition that may make it difficult for schooling to enrich deeply or to sustain fully those who have access to it. Education without a definite, worthy purpose cannot long endure.

To be a teacher today and indifferent to social problems is to deny the claims of the future. In a real sense the teachers of this nation are the trustees of posterity. Their main task is to teach. But before teaching we must learn how to teach. We cannot teach with a certainty that which we do not ourselves possess. The command to teachers to discover what men live by in this world is not often written in the books on pedagogy. It is not found in our traditional and conventional codes on school teaching. But this command is nevertheless written plainly in the great constitution of the race and bears the weight of the unquestioned authority of humanity.

EDGAR W. KNIGHT

ART AND MORALS

AN AGE which gives reign to social imagination, marked by a rising sense of beauty, is now laying a great responsibility for moral leadership upon the arts, upon the humanities. There is even the disposition to make theirs the chief responsibility, on the easy assumption that religious sanctions have lost their power, and good taste must function in their place.

In an age of shifting standards, we welcome every ally in the war against evil, which knows no discharge, and in the reinforcement of the good life, personal and social. Science is a powerful ally. Aesthetics, apart from extravagant claims and with less of obvious power, goes further in the realm of spiritual insight. It shapes ideals and aspirations.

To give free scope to this power, beauty must be cultivated in our universities with as much seriousness and confidence as truth. That it may do its rightful work in the world, it must, like science, be cultivated in and of itself, without subservience to ulterior purposes, without subservience even to moral purposes.

It will be found, nevertheless, that science, art, and morals cannot be grown in separate compartments. The beauty that runs through science is not an unimportant aspect of science. On the other hand in this age, as never before, the results of science are material for art; while now as all the way down from the beginning the intuitions of beauty find their way to truth, outstripping logic and research.

Morals are bound up with both inseparably. The conditions of public morals are subject to all manner of scientific investigations; and art at its highest deals with human life as shot through and through with moral struggle, hope, and retribution, with love and death.—ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN, Chancellor of New York University.