

As more attention was given to art training, those connected felt the need to prove its usefulness and so to rationalize, not only the training of the young artist, but the business of art itself; this led to an excess of theorizing and intellectualizing; there was not enough carelessness. Many of the recent progressive and enlightened changes in art training in this country had nevertheless brought in their wake a clouding of issues and an over-rationalization. "I have seen plans," he said, "put forward by schools which, if carried through, a student would require thirty years of his life to complete; he could only graduate as a fifty-five year old man, and yet these people can prove to you that all this is absolutely essential!" He thought that there was a need to cut back to what was truly fundamental and not to worry so much about justifying the artist's usefulness to society.

Mr. AUJAME (France) summarizing the discussion said that he had particularly enjoyed the statements of Mr. Willequet and Mr. Fullard. Above all, he said, an art school should be "open" because a frequent mistake was to explain to students what they should do before knowing what in fact they were going to do. We suffered terribly from theory in art; quoting Mr. Willequet with approval when he said art was a miracle, we did not know what it would be like tomorrow; he continued to say that teachers must set an example, not only in painting, but above all, one of honesty and courage. Also, we had to help the pupils, he said. As technical adviser to the French museums, he supported Mr. Willequet's comments on the physical condition of contemporary painting: the least that teachers could do was to advise their pupils to use durable materials and to learn something about techniques. He agreed with Mr. Willequet, but not with Mr. Fullard, on the connection between art and architecture; it was the teacher's job to make architects and painters and sculptors co-operate in the early stages by creating a training centre where they would be obliged to work together. To re-establish the mural function of painting, the painter would have to work with the architect from the planning stage. Summarizing, he said the painter must be completely free, the school should be free and end in real workshop training with real exhibitions; there could be no better way of transforming the artificial environment into a real one.

Professor SQUIER (U.S.A.) said he was prompted by what had been said by Mr. Aujame, Mr. Fullard, Mr. Pack and Mr. Strijbosch, to suggest that it was in the power of this conference to make certain that only practitioners of demonstrated ability should teach and that the appointment of teachers to life-time positions should be abolished; he himself spoke as one who held such a position.

Mr. AUJAME replied that he was in agreement on the whole.

Mr. Victor PASMORE (U.K.) said these Conferences were a wonderful opportunity for speaking completely freely and individually, independently, on the problem of art education in the twentieth century; this had been recognised as a problem since William Morris in this country. The difficulty was that the whole question of art training was more of a paradox than ever before; on the one hand, the painter and sculptor had asserted their complete freedom and independence and on the other hand, we had the artist who had to earn his living.

The wonderful independence lasted for three years at an art school and then collapsed; a few successful artists could demonstrate their independence while the rest had to go into art teaching or industrial design. This was a great difficulty in the way of establishing reform. It seemed to him that art schools had improved; in fine art departments the artist was allowed complete freedom and in the average art schools the students "ran the show." We had to be careful that in any