

school—nearly all obtained a bursary from this fund for from one to three years in the case of the most talented; this allowed them to live without material worries and nothing was asked in return, since earlier experience of requiring works from them, which were accumulated in cellars, had led to an unfortunate situation.

Professor ROGERS drew attention to a different aspect of the problem which interested him. Since art in certain countries including Great Britain, the United States and France, as well as elsewhere, had in the last ten or fifteen years become big business a promising young artist found very soon that a gallery would be willing to give him an exhibition—this would immediately make him feel professional. But there were at the same time peripheral dangers and the speaker wondered what the experience was in other countries and whether students should not be prepared for the commercial world of the art dealer. He mentioned how different it had been when he was a student—it then took longer to become a mature and professional artist than it would nowadays.

Professor PACK said that students came to the Academy at Vienna mainly from the provinces and because they had insufficient money to live and work, nearly everyone had a bursary, grant or prize. When they left they might be supported for a time by parents, but after that they depended on the purchase of their work by the warm-hearted Minister of Education, and slowly they became not artists but beggars. There were also grants made by the Municipality of Vienna for projects. He did not think this was a way of creating artists or of integrating them into society in a positive sense, nor did he know what was to be done about it; half the pupils would become art teachers employed by the State and would slowly cease to paint, but it was the twenty or thirty other young people, out of the hundred who finished their courses each year, who worried him.

The CHAIRMAN thought it was difficult to see a solution, because if students were not to be compelled to seek dealers and try to exhibit before they were ready, they were, according to Mr. Pack, going to become professional beggars.

Mr. KESTELMAN said this was the time-honoured complaint against the lack of patronage which every generation tried to modify. Wastage had to be expected in any profession where the chances were risky, and too many tears should not be shed. To-day, there were many more ways of helping people to keep afloat than there had ever been; he cited the three or four University fellowships and said that if every university had such a scheme it would help the artist to gain an audience, which was what he really needed; there, young people could speak freely with artists and find out the difficulties of understanding contemporary art. He mentioned art centres but said that any very dramatic developments could hardly be expected.

The CHAIRMAN thought grants and fellowships were desirable so long as they were administered under very controlled conditions.

Professor GOTTSÉN said that in Sweden a hundred artists were now paid five thousand dollars a year for life; there were none of the difficulties in Sweden which had been discussed by delegates from other countries. It was not difficult to have exhibitions—even pupils in the Academy had them—and different State departments were obliged to buy paintings, so that even if he did not find private patrons an artist could be sure of selling his work.

Mr. STONJ (Yugoslavia) thought the real problem for students after leaving school was in trying to become painters. Any help was good—if he became a beggar it was not a sign that helping him was wrong but that he had a weak character; this was equally true of artists with a big reputation who sold themselves