or context which gives them point.

Nevertheless, incomplete and limited though they may be, I think the results can be regarded as a very useful preliminary step. I think it does cover a wide area of the subject and brings out a number of vital issues worth discussion.

Again, to venture a personal opinion, I do not think it is the task of an Association such as ours to offer solutions or suggest desirable methods, etc. What is suitable for Uruguay may not be useful to the Netherlands. Each country has its own special conditions and problems and will best evolve its own ideas and reforms. What we can usefully do is to collect information of what is being done in various countries and to stimulate discussion.

Perhaps a brief résumé may be worth making of the main points which did emerge.

It is clear that while there is almost complete unanimity in feeling that the art-schools have a necessary place, a majority of artists also desire serious changes. There is also now emerging the idea of a University-type art-training (as against the older type of art-school) in which the student is to enlarge his cultural background through a "Liberal Arts" education; this is bound to be the subject of keen controversy. As to the actual content of the training, the study of abstract design (or composition) and the use of new techniques is generally accepted, though with various reservations. There is almost complete unanimity as to the value of direct study from nature (with reservations against merely imitating appearances). A large majority also favours the introduction of a general preliminary course in the early stage of training—to develop all-round sensibility, etc., before proceeding to specialize.

Other interesting points brought out in many of the answers are worth noting:

1. The desirability of keeping students well in touch with contemporary architectural achievements and to relate painting and sculpture to them.

2. To keep in touch with new technological developments—materials and processes—and, in general, to ensure that the student has every opportunity to learn the use of his materials. There was great emphasis that schools should equip a student for his "métier."

3. Emphasis on need to preserve students’ individuality: this was repeated over and over again.

4. The virtues of “ateliers libres” and small groups working together.

5. General favor to the value of “philosophical” discussions in schools.

6. Need to recruit good practicing artists as teachers—with the strongly emphasized corollary that such artists should have ample opportunity to continue their own work actively, this being their strength as teachers.

7. Warning on the bad effect of recruiting too many students with danger of constant mediocrity: need for high standards of selection.

8. The highly interesting courses established in Peru and Uruguay.

9. The U.S.A. University Art-Department system.

10. The reforms recently introduced into the United Kingdom Schools of Art.

The last three points alone would provide ample material for further discussions!

CONCLUSION

Incomplete though the results may be, the questionnaire has, I think, done a very useful job of exploration. If we were hoping to make a serious contribution to the subject, the replies constitute a very good point of departure for a more