which argues well for the intellectual and moral attitude of republican France. It also abounds in quotable passages which deserve place beside certain chapters in Ruskin’s latter-day gospel. Such, strong and exquisite in their simplicity, are expressions of pure, generous thought like these:

“The people have the right, not only to knowledge, but also, and to a still higher degree, to beauty. To socialize science is well, but beauty also demands and requires to be socialized.”

“Society, if it imposes duties upon the individual, also contracts toward him obligations: the first of which is to associate him in the general progress.”

“All human beings have need of casting aside the material cares of existence; of raising the soul toward the Ideal; of refreshing it at that source of pure delight which is the art-sensation.”

“The enjoyment afforded by beauty is no sterile pleasure. It is, on the contrary, the mother of intellectual force and of moral purity.”

From such encouraging beginnings as are made by the papers of Mr. Warner and M. Gans, it is hoped that The Craftsman’s sympathy with one of the greatest of modern movements will be productive of a good appreciable and measurable; that it may be translated from words into action.

The series of papers upon cognate subjects will continue throughout the year 1904, and, as now proposed, stands as follows as to subject, each paper to be written by a recognized authority in his own field:

**First Group**
I. The Importance of Municipal Improvements.
II. The History of Village Improvement in the United States.
III. The Commercial Value of Design.

**Second Group**
IV. City Plan.
V. Parks.
VI. Street Fixtures.

**Third Group**
VII. Architecture; foreign point of view.
VIII. Architecture; American point of view.
IX. Painting; foreign point of view.
X. Painting; American point of view.
XI. Sculpture; foreign point of view.
XII. Sculpture; American point of view.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENTS. JOHN DEWITT WARNER

In its essentials, the city, as an institution, is as old as the race. But the present problem is peculiarly a Twentieth Century one. Not but that great and beautiful cities have existed, by whose experience we may be guided as to one or another of even the more important items with which we have to deal; but that, until now, municipal development, so far as consciously planned, has been but an incident of self-defense, government, religion, or commerce. Indeed, in their more important aspects, most cities now existing are the uncalculated “survival of the fittest” in the
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attrition of human aggregates—the later incidents of original development as a fortress, a court, a temple, a market, a workshop, with a tendency toward combination of several or all of these; but of gravitation rather than conscious mutual intent.

Of the old cities now extant two characteristics are, therefore, common—one the virtual combination of all the principal features of cities; and the other the frequently grotesque unfitness of each, as an original proposition, for what to-day are the principal ends it serves—commerce, for example, being hopelessly handicapped at a site chosen for a fortress that is now in ruin, or for a cathedral now long the memorial of burned out zeal, or for a court of an extinct local dynasty.

The Twentieth Century City must be planned and studied as the normal focus of a constantly growing proportion of the whole life of a people—in which there is no excuse for sacrificing all other ends to any one; but rather an obvious need, and growing disposition to see how far all uses may be at once accommodated. For the conditions of modern civilization leave ever more hopelessly in the rear the city—no matter how ideally fitted for one use—that is so situated as not to be generally available for others. To thrive, therefore, a city must be made attractive for all purposes—not all purposes that cities have some time served; but those that cities now serve.

In our greatest cities—London, New York, Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Constantinople, Pekin, Chicago, St. Petersburg, Glasgow, St. Louis, Buenos Ayres, we have survivals or examples of every class—but all now thoroughly modern in this—that, however they were originally developed, no really great city is now dependent upon remaining a center of war, government or religion; or would not survive the loss of all such advantages; or would not be ruined by failure of her commerce, and crippled by that of her manufactures; or where, with late raising of standards of life and comfort, the extent to which it is the chosen residence of those who are free to go elsewhere is not a great and increasing factor in its prosperity and prospects.

In short, as contrasted with the city of the past, the city of to-day is best characterized by the dwindling of military, political and ecclesiastical factors, and the growth of business and domestic ones. Less and less can it be “left to grow.” More and more must it be planned and built. To the essential use of each old city other uses were casually added. In the new city, mutual coöperation towards service of all interests must be its foundation principle.

Perhaps the most important point to be kept in mind is that late increase in facilities for communication and transport has made of each city a potential center for a wider district than it used to reach, and at the same time has left it rivaled by others, and itself in danger of losing influence, in the very field where it has hitherto been supreme. This means that, for an indefinite time to come—until the world is thoroughly readjusted as a single limited country—a city cannot stand still. It must grow or decay.

It can never be too often recalled that Art is not a thing to be done, but the right way to do whatever is to be done. Municipal Art is, therefore, simply the best way to make a city what it ought to be—best fitted for all ends of a city—a city of to-day—a city of the future.
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First and most important of all are the means of ingress and egress, and of transport within the city. Upon such development of the former as make it a center for a locality, a state, a continent, a world—absolutely depend the possibilities of any given city. Upon the latter equally depends the economy of a city's life and business—in the long run the extent to which its possibilities shall be realized. These, therefore, are the first essentials of a city plan—the data with relation to which all development must be had.

These possibilities, however, are those of a home, a shop, a caravansary, a place for the life, the work, the culture and the entertainment of human beings, ever more and more free to choose the best opportunities anywhere offered. The prosperity of a city will, therefore, ever more and more depend upon the extent to which such demands are met. Next after the general features of a city's plan come, therefore, bright skies and abundant water; and—scarcely less essential—cheap fuel and clean streets.

No mistake could be greater than that which assumes Municipal Art engrossed with, or mainly interested in, mere decorative features. Rather is it true that in its more essential features, a city must fairly have achieved dignity and beauty and order and cleanliness and convenience, before it is fit to be generally decorated, or decoration can be made really effective. These essentials provided for, the beautiful—not as opposed to the useful, but useful in whole or in part because it is beautiful—can then well be sought, and such civic adornment had as shall serve religion—as at Athens, civic pride—as in Florence or Buda-Pesth, or offer hospitable welcome and attraction for residence and amusement—as at Paris; or express national ideals—as at Washington or Berlin; or more or less equally meet or serve all these—as at Rome or Vienna.

Of this, perhaps the most essential item is proper emphasis of Civic Centers—the architectural treatment of the city considered as a whole. Indeed, this might well have been included in the prerequisites for adornment. And the finest examples of such emphasis, serving as they do the convenience and the dignity of the city, are striking arguments for the truth that, in its last analysis, fitness for use is the normal of beauty. That public business can best be transacted at the most natural place for greatest public resort; that the various classes of such business can be transacted most conveniently in the neighborhood of each other; that, in proportion to the variety and amount of public business to be provided for, economy permits and popular sentiment dictates extensive and imposing architectural groups, with park and plaza treatment; and that foci thus developed are the points at which may best be located the more important transport connections—each is obvious. Combined, they show the ideal of a city to be that of an organism, rather than of an aggregation. From the standpoint of utility as well as of art, a thoroughly developed and dignified civic center with secondary local ones, as naturally characterizes an ideal "city" of to-day, and distinguishes it from the mere massing of humanity that has sometimes been called such, as does a definite head with well defined subordinated vital centers a man, as distinguished from a jelly fish.

As to the general importance of beauty to a city's welfare, there are few who do not
feel it without waiting to reason it out, and probably none who, having thought, will raise any question. Take growth in prosperous citizenship. The individual factors of such citizenship, wherever they may have attained their prosperity, are precisely those who have thereby become most free to choose the location of their residence, and most disposed to do so with reference to pleasant life for themselves or other families. As between any given city and every other at which such citizens might settle, there is, therefore, a most practical rivalry as to which shall offer the most potent attractions. To most, this will largely mean the most beautiful, healthful and comfortable place of residence. And it goes without saying that far more than residence is thus involved. For in proportion as one is held at a city, or brought back to it by his comfort—his tastes—his home associations, in like proportion will that city tend to be the place of his investments, the arena of his enterprise, the beneficiary of his bounty.

As a business proposition, therefore, Municipal Art in its widest sense is the most tempting investment possible for a city so favored as easily to be made beautiful—a most essential one for one less fortunately placed, and one of the most profitable possible that either can make.

Again: The principle of democracy—that the public expenditure should be most favored that most equally benefits the greatest number—suggests adequate—liberal—investment in public art. For, after all, attracted and held as are the well to do by its aggregate at a given city or neighborhood, keen enjoyment of its details characterizes our masses far more than our classes. In our courts, on our exchanges, in our legislatures, at work in our laboratories, we find many distinguished and worthy men who have cultivated one or a few senses at the expense of the rest, and who have become blind to color, deaf to music, or dumb to feeling. But your average fellow-citizen is not so. Nine out of ten, taken at random from your schools, your workshops, your holiday crowds, can still see and hear; and their heartstrings sound true to every touch of sentiment. The masses of no city have ever failed to appreciate a great temple, a beautiful park, a dignified statue, an effective historic painting, a stirring drama, a strain of lofty music, or a rhyme that deserved to be popular.

Not only this, but public art is peculiarly for the enjoyment and profit of the great masses of those in straitened or moderate circumstances, rather than of the well-to-do. One whose home is one of ideal comfort, and filled with art and literature, is so far independent of outside conditions as to be least affected by them—and too often least concerned in them. With the average citizen, however, such of art as he can gather at his home is far too little to satisfy him. It is, therefore, the great masses of our people—wage earners in especial—the very ones whose home resources are most limited—who most appreciate and are most interested in the public art upon which they must depend to gratify their sense of beauty, to rouse their civic pride, to stir their public spirit.

And, finally, for the perpetuation of its ideals and the culture it prizes, each city should cherish public art. We cannot tell precisely what fathers or mothers are now rearing those who shall control its affairs fifty years hence. But one thing we do know, beyond peradventure—that they will
be almost exclusively, not of those who have crucified their senses to serve their ambition, but those who are yet in touch with nature. It is upon public art, therefore—the art that inspires the “proletariat,” the thousands from whom will rise the leaders of the future—that we must rely for any inspiration broad enough or virile enough to count in culture.

Art for the city’s sake—Art for its people’s sake. Such is the end sought. But in seeking it there is found, more certainly than in any other way, the most effective promotion of what we hear called “Art for Art’s sake”—much or little as one may care therefor. For Public Art is the only great Art, the inspirer of all other Art. On the Acropolis, in our cathedrals, in sculptural or mural adornment of buildings dedicated to church or state, we find the ark of the old covenant between humanity and beauty, and the evangel of the new one. Shut in, as it were, to serve its owner, private art is but a hearth fire that warms only its builder, and leaves but few or no embers that can ever glow again after the breath of his fortunes has ceased to fan it. But Public Art is a fire built in the market place, from which each citizen borrows live coals for his own home; an inspiration of those whose tastes and impulses are, in the future, to represent the private as well as the public culture of Art among us—of those through whom every cult of the beautiful can in the end be best promoted, and by whom must be cherished if it is to prosper.

If the general proposition needed further support, it could be found in the recent and growing practice throughout the world. During the past generation Vienna has been re-planned and decorated—not especially as a national stronghold, a cathedral town, an imperial residence, a university center, but as all these at once; and more than all as an attractive place for residence, business and sojourn of “the million,” who but shortly since would have been left to themselves as far as concerned provision for art or beauty. Berlin has been similarly developed until, in aught but the ripening of time, it rivals Paris. Paris, more largely from business considerations, has been so constantly adding to her attractions that it has been fairly re-transfigured since the days of the empire. In London, the (apparently) most hopeless of problems in city beautification has been radically attacked by the cutting of an avenue from the Strand to High Holborn. In New York, Chicago and Boston, ring systems of park areas—inland and water front—have been laid out, within which, on scale never before conceived of, these cities are transforming themselves on more or less systematic plans. Washington, from the first a “show” city, has so proved itself commodious and convenient, about in proportion to its show features, as to have practically decided Congress on a scheme of extension and beautification not before or elsewhere had; while in such cases as that of Cleveland, Springfield, and many another larger or smaller city, the tendency of our time is shown. It may, therefore, now be assumed that the business instinct of our city councils, popular interest among our citizens, and art in its broadest sense are at agreement and effectively coöperating toward beautification of our cities.

The richness and variety of the resources to be exploited are as yet scarcely appreciated by those who have studied the subject. Not until to an understanding of
the street systems of Washington and Paris, and the art of designing civic groups—such as at Vienna is largely realized, at Berlin promised, developing at Washington, and dreamed of at New York—are added use of color as lavish as at Moscow, but better guided; the harmonies and contrasts of such park schemes as those of Boston and New York; river treatments as elaborate and characteristic as those of Paris and New York; the subtle fitness, each for its place, of scores of richly decorated plazas and appropriate adornment of their civic buildings that dignify and grace the cities best entitled to be called such—can one see, even in his mind’s eye, the City of the Future—the beauty, the wonder, and the glory that it is to be.

THE WORKINGMAN’S DWELLING IN FRANCE. BY CHARLES GANS. TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY IRENE SARGENT

THE future historian who shall study our epoch in sufficient perspective to include its entirety in one glance, and shall sweep away the minor facts obscuring it, will try to understand the philosophy of our contemporaneous social history. He will see, without doubt, one dominant idea rise and prevail: that is, the principle first accepted by our times of the right of every man to existence. The working classes, that is, the very considerable portion of the world’s population who live solely upon the product of manual labor, have been too long misunderstood and sacrificed. Furthermore, it is incontestable that they themselves have been largely responsi-

ble for this situation. Submitting for centuries to injustice, they had accustomed themselves and others to the idea that their own social state was normal, inevitable and unsusceptible to change. Again, the working classes had no share of profit—although they suffered—in the social revolutions which occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Revolution of 1789 was effected outside their limits. They could not or would not profit by it, and the middle classes who effected it for their own advantage, continued to regard the workingman as an indeterminate quantity, as a being who, having his hunger and thirst satisfied, ought to be contented and happy.

Toward the middle of the nineteenth century, however, the working classes awakened suddenly to a sense of their condition. But quickly they relapsed into their former state of apathy.

It is only within a period of thirty years that this unfortunate condition has begun to modify. On one hand, education becoming gradually more general and almost compulsory among these classes, created new needs, and also new aspirations. On the other hand, men of liberal mind, of broad intelligence and free from old-time prejudices, arising outside the working classes, appreciated and approved the demands newly formulated. The convictions of such men swept others into the movement, and, little by little, a principle to-day undisputed, acquired strength and controlling power: the principle of the right of every man to existence, that is, to physical and moral health.

This dominant thought had important consequences in France, where individuals friendly to such ideas necessarily existed in