

rationalization the ends of the strings should be left wide open; it would be a great mistake to formulate a closed system; the new image of art would call for a new basis of drawing which would have to be accounted for by the teacher.

Now that techniques were changing, the student would have facilities for making his own technique, which meant art schools would have to spend a lot of money on technical equipment, and there should be technicians available to the student. To enable the student to think for himself, this was the great basis of modern art training.

*"Now, students don't like thinking for themselves. I find the most academic, white-hired old chaps are the art students; they won't think for themselves, they don't want to think for themselves, so it puts an enormous effort on the part of the art teacher—it means that the art teacher has also got to think for himself, and they don't like thinking for themselves either. So this does mean revolution in the art teachers' training course."*

*Every art school has a particular teacher who must know something about painting and sculpture, so it is possible for each art school to formulate its own basic course according to the lights of the artist in charge. If he's an artist he must know the difference between black and white and he should be able to formulate—he's studied pictures, he's seen nature, he's got an eye, he's got feeling—he should be able to formulate a basic course of his own and not try and ring up the next art school and say 'what is your basic course?'"*

Mr. DAS GUPTA (India) gave an account of his own experience; when he began as a sculptor he never thought of teaching, because he would never pretend to teach anything concerning art. It was circumstances that compelled artists to take to teaching; he spoke of the frustration resulting from compromise when artists took to teaching; he would therefore prefer to have studio training in which there was a close contact between teacher and pupil. The pupil would be guided rather than taught, he could be shown his tradition and told that he was now at liberty to formulate his own ideas. He would not agree with unfettered freedom.

Mr. PASMORE said he agreed to some extent with the Indian Colleague and he personally thought that the situation in England was very much the same as Mr. Das Gupta had said it was in India. It was a very important point that the tendency in art schools in England, and elsewhere in the West, was for the art student to be left to do what he liked, because the art teacher had no idea what to teach and was afraid of being old-fashioned, and so took the line of least resistance. This was a complete misrepresentation of liberty, and he thought that meant there was the need for certain objective disciplines which would help the student to think for himself.

Professor SQUIER said that in the United States it was also necessary for an artist to teach in order to live, and Mrs. OSTROWER remarked that in Brazil it was not a career for anyone to be an art teacher, but thought that there had to be some idealism.

Professor SHAW suggested that art research might be established in universities without linking it with teaching; he was thinking in terms not of a single person but of a community of artists on the campus doing research of some sort.

The CHAIRMAN mentioned in this connection the Gregory Fellowship at Leeds University.

Mr. RUHEMANN (U.K.) made the suggestion that art colleges might conduct research into the technical methods of masters old and modern; in this connection he mentioned the international Institute of Conservation and its work. He further said that the teaching of art history might be made more fruitful to the