

"No, the only assistant useful to an artist is a technical assistant provided he is content to remain technical. *No studio is big enough for two artists.*" (United Kingdom.)

QUESTION B—2

If you feel that the present system of art-schools should be abolished, how would you envisage the future training of young artists?

This question received the fullest answers and here the artists were able to indicate positive suggestions for change or reform. It links up logically with Question I and completes the picture. The "for" and "against" is much the same in both cases. Again all but one are in favour of continuing with art-schools, but many criticisms are made and changes proposed. A résumé of these is more easily conveyed by a series of quotations.

The sole voice *against* :

"I suggest very flexible teaching which shows due respect for the student as an individual . . . It must provide him with very extensive knowledge of the world today by means of frequent lectures, controversial discussions and screenings of art films and slides . . . The application of such new "discoveries" as the psychology of form and visual problems, always on an optional basis." (Argentina.)

From Belgium, a strongly practical view :

"It is of prime importance that he should keep abreast of architectural developments . . . offer visits to practical studios where works of craftsmanship are carried out . . . indicate processes using cement, etc . . . visit quarries, foundries, etc. . . enable him to visit other schools at home and abroad."

Again from Belgium :

"I would like to see them transformed and adapted to current problems . . . indicate from the outset perspectives . . . which clarify the reasons why study of nature is necessary . . . the profound crisis of present teaching lies (1) in the lack of technique, (2) in the lack of study devoted to *the causes* underlying the transformation of art throughout history."

For students this highly liberal régime of freedoms would obviously have much appeal :

" . . . ideal school as an establishment comprising different studios with masters of differing outlooks. The student could choose . . . The school would be free . . . No curriculum, no compulsory time-table . . . no certificates, no final examinations. The master would accept or reject . . ." (Belgium.)

The notion of "ateliers libres" received support elsewhere :

"In other words, each teacher is responsible for his students from the first to the last year and teaches in his own way with full independence. In the course of his six years, the student . . . has the opportunity and right to change studios." (Peru.)

From U.S.A., another answer favoured :

" . . . workshop group arrangement or some directed form of individual training—selected talent, small groups."

This last point is echoed in a criticism drawing attention to a grave weakness in art-schools.

"The thing which is most harmful to schools is the enrolment of too many students, most of whom are not equipped to become artists." (Belgium.)

From Peru came a description of a training in three stages lasting six years :

"(1) General plastic training—basic elements . . . line, plastic form, perspec-