

presented a report on art education in U.K. which was a beginning. At our third Congress in 1960 we finally got down to the serious business of tackling this problem.

It was agreed that a major interest of our association was that we should consider . . . the education of artists as distinct from general education; this led to the appointment of a Committee to prepare a questionnaire." He continued "I think everybody agrees that during the last thirty or forty years a system of art education in Europe or anywhere else has been subject to a good deal of criticism . . . probably very well merited." "With the developments of contemporary art, new methods, new approaches made some of the older methods appear old-fashioned and often useless, and, feeling that this was a general situation, we thought it was time to sound out the opinions of artists in respect of the kind of education they felt was needful to train young artists. To this end, we prepared a questionnaire. As a result we discovered an enormous divergence of opinion, and much passionate feeling was expressed. We had a great number of replies from about 28 countries and it became clear that there were a number of highly controversial issues which it would be valuable to discuss. A thorough analysis of the results was embodied in a report which was submitted to the Fourth Congress of the Association held in New York in 1963, (See Appendix 1). There the whole subject was discussed and it was recommended that a future congress should be devoted entirely to this issue; and since we, in Great Britain, at about this time, were engaged in a major change in art school training, it seemed appropriate that the Conference should be organised by us in this country. And that is how we come to be here."

Professor Claude ROGERS, Vice-President of the U.K. National Committee, in explaining the plans for our discussions, said "a Conference of this sort, limited to one theme, is rather new for our Association." The present one was concerned with a very precise point. "We felt it would be more useful to examine a narrow professional field carefully and in detail . . . we did not even think we could conceivably exhaust the theme we have set. The purpose of the Conference might be made clear by expanding its title thus: 'to consider in detail and in the context of the contemporary artistic situation, what kind of organized training, if any, is appropriate to-day when a young man or a young woman has ambitions to become a professional artist'." The first part of the Conference would be devoted to collecting information and facts, while the latter part would be concerned with opinions and the expression of ideas. It never would be possible to have a single sort of art education since "different situations demand different solutions. As a matter of convenience, we have distinguished four categories of art schools, without suggesting that one is better than another. Each offers advantages and seems to suit different individuals, and we seek information about them as they exist in different countries. Factual information about schools in other countries and the training provided in them is particularly hard to obtain, and it is hoped by the end of this Conference to have some body of information which could later be published."

Miss LEE was again thanked by the Chairman and this concluded the opening session.

A telegram was sent to Mr. Paderlik of Czechoslovakia who had been prevented from coming by illness.