

One thing should be made clear at the outset; in framing these questions there was no intention of arriving at an "ideal" universal method of teaching. The world is still a vast place with the widest differences of conditions and approach. Who would wish it otherwise in art? Another possible misunderstanding should be cleared up; the actual form of the questions was designed to make comparisons of answers possible, and while many could be answered by a simple "yes" or "no," this was not intended to exclude wider comments, and, in fact, many artists did make liberal remarks in this way.

As to the answers themselves, some 80-odd replies have been received from North America, Latin America, Asia and Europe) and nearly a thousand questions were to be analysed. Finally, a word on the method of this report. First, I have thought it convenient to analyse the answers in the order they were put. Then, by way of summing up or conclusion, I have tried to see if any comment of general value could be made on the basis of the replies, and lastly to suggest any further discussion or activity that might appear desirable.

QUESTION A—1

Do you consider that teaching in professional art schools (or private ateliers) can serve a useful purpose?

Only one answer was in the negative. Of those who thought that schools could serve a useful purpose 75 per cent expressed their views either by a simple "yes" or in terms of decided approval; while approximately 24 per cent, although in favour, expressed various doubts or reservations. These reservations, in some cases, really amount to criticisms—referring to possible deficiencies in art-schools or harmful tendencies. Some typical answers are quoted below to give an idea of the various points of view expressed.

As clear approval :

"Yes, a great and useful purpose, where else can a student get the necessary *concentrated* laboratory training and analysis of visual art?" (United States of America.)

Or, on the other hand, from Argentina :

"I am not aware of any school which is equal to the present development of art and hence their didactic activity is insufficient."

Again,

"Not much in our time. It can be of use to the academic-minded artisan, . . . the old type technologist. But this type must be sharply distinguished from the creative artist!" (United States of America.)

Many replies laid emphasis on the need for good teachers :

"On condition that the regular teachers have a certain minimum of talent, which is not always the case." (Switzerland.)

" . . . that depends on the personality of the teacher." (Belgium.)

"Certainly, *if* the staff are practising artists of distinction!" (United Kingdom.)

" . . . only if you have a great and sympathetic teacher!" (Canada.)

Another point frequently advanced was the need to develop the individuality of the student and to avoid methods which would tend towards a uniformity in the work of the students.

"Traditionally, the schools have a tendency to distort the student . . .

Efforts are also made to direct the student on the aesthetic level rather than to provide him with the basic elements (sometimes having no direct connexion with art) which would enable him to trace his own path." (Uruguay.)

Again, from the same country : Yes, but . . .