

"whenever the teacher avoids imposing methods and disciplines harmful to the student's natural formation."

Another typical point was the insistence on the need for being "of our time":

"Yes, on condition that what is involved is an art school which, contrary to tradition, liberates the contemporary spirit." (Yugoslavia).

I think this would be a convenient place to refer to an important issue raised by a number of artists, that is, the very basis on which the young artists' training should be organised. Broadly speaking it might be put this way: the traditional training has hitherto been given in schools of art, where the student learns to master his technical problems, to draw, paint or work at sculpture, in the framework of the atelier, and in company with other young artists—a world of its own. But against this, there is a growing tendency to regard such a training as narrow, too technical and too isolated from the wider cultural interests of a well-educated person. Briefly, the idea is that the art-student should study within the framework of a University, that he should mix with students of philosophy, science, psychology, etc . . . that he, too, should be educated in what may be described as the Liberal Arts. The art-training and the broader education would be interlocked.

There is no doubt that this issue is going to claim more and more attention. In the United States of America, there are now many Art-Departments in Universities; in other countries, too, the idea is being discussed. For example, the notion of a Liberal Arts education has recently been introduced into a major reform of the art-schools in the United Kingdom. Other answers in this sense came from Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Peru. Of course, there is keen opposition too, and answers in this sense came from the United States of America where the system is most widely current. One American reply insisting on the desirability of this type of education says :

"The college and university by their very diversity and variety of minds, which form this atmosphere of learning, provide and stimulate the disciplines that lead to discovery, invention, creativity."

In a highly interesting answer another artist from U.S.A. writes :

"The complexity of contemporary life suggests that it is extremely important for any human being dedicated to any profession and especially for an artist, to understand the mechanics of our society . . . I feel there is no better place than a college or university to give a young mind . . . a sound and thorough knowledge of the social and artistic evolution of man!" The same letter goes on to say : "Future artists can only be taught by artists . . . The only way for an artist to teach effectively is for him to be working himself . . . We must find a way for the artist to teach for a limited time . . . The matter of using or not using a model for three hours three days a week is not the question. Each society will find the method of teaching that suits their need . . . I think the best solution to the teaching of art would be for UNESCO to compose a symposium of key people in this field to discuss the specific."

From Canada :

"I feel the art-school as an isolated and autonomous institution has lost its effectiveness . . . little more than a place for the technical teaching of painting, etc . . . the university can offer a healthier and more enlightened atmosphere . . . than the ivory tower that our art-schools have become . . . much more lively and critical human association . . . totally lacking in an art-school . . . I do not think this necessarily rules out the art-school completely . . . a place for training . . . in applied art for commerce, industry, but certainly, for painting and sculpture, University offers far more . . ."