

But on the other hand, came this vehement assertion :

"As for art-schools in colleges—I would abolish them . . . Most of the instructors who teach drawing in college do not know how to draw, and those who teach painting cannot paint. In order to hide their own lack of ability, they stress "creative art." The whole system results in the perpetuation of mediocrity." (United States of America.)

Another distinctly tart comment, also from U.S.A., on this issue :

"I believe the University type school now prevalent here to be generally useless and out of its proper scope; something in the manner of a kindergarten, for adults!"

To sum up, virtually all the replies express belief in the potential usefulness of art-teaching, though about one third of these have decidedly critical points to make. An important issue of art-school versus University-type training is also developing on the ground that the latter is more in tune with contemporary needs.

#### QUESTION A—2

*Or would you consider that the main value of such schools consists in throwing ambitious young people together to benefit by mutual contact (plus the facilities of studios, etc. . . . for work)?*

Those who considered that the main value was benefit by contact, etc. . . . amounted to 12 per cent. About 40 per cent were clear in their view that the main advantage lay in the training, and a rather smaller number—38 per cent—felt that while the teaching was the most valuable part, the contact with fellow-students was also important.

#### QUESTION A—3

*Or would you consider that students should work entirely on their own (from the outset), without "teachers," and sharpen their talents by facing the criticism of others?*

79 per cent answered "No." 6 per cent thought this might benefit a few exceptional students. 3 per cent were in a state of doubt. Two replies indicated that this was definitely the main value. 20 per cent of those who answered "No" expressed the reservation that this might be desirable during the final year of training. The remaining 12 per cent gave no answer. From Uruguay, came the comment that the idea was "somewhat utopian."

The North American and European answers were more inclined to express doubts, while near unanimity (i.e. "No") was expressed in the rest.

#### QUESTION A—4

*Do you consider that the study of "nature" is helpful at any stage of a student's development?*

This clearly was a question of the first importance. Only one was categorically against. 75 per cent were unreservedly for.

14 per cent were in favour, though with the reservation that the study of nature was not to be regarded as an end in itself, but a means to an end.

Four per cent made it entirely dependent on the needs and capacities of individual students.

Against and doubtful amount to 7 per cent.

The South American answers, on the whole, were more inclined to be critical of study from nature. A view frequently expressed was that, in the study from nature, students must be encouraged not to copy appearances but to select and interpret.

"Apart from representational forms, the student must interpret nature in a stylized fashion and also through simplification of forms." (Brazil.)