

## SUMMARY

M. van Emde Boas

The findings of our first attempt to discuss terminology and most of the observations made can be summarized as follows: A problem of terminology does exist, but a type of rational dictionary, even if desirable, would require tremendous time and work and would be out-of-date on completion, for the nature of our terminology is as dynamic as the plastic arts we have to describe, analyse and evaluate through its use.

The terminological problem arises in the first place from the vague and imprecise use of the terms.

~~To~~<sup>To</sup> outline once more the problem under discussion, I give an example from our daily work. What, in fact, does the term abstract art signify? Basically, to abstract means to sort out and to eliminate, and therefore every painting is an abstraction. The opposite idea, namely concrete, is no easier to define. How was what we call abstract art born? Not from one day to the other but by the increasingly extensive elimination of details painters tried to get down to the very essence of their subject. But some painters consciously refused reality, the recognisable world, as a point of departure. Therefore, those artists are not abstract but, on the contrary, are bringing into being a new form of construction making use of purely formal elements, either geometrical or amorphous. But what artist can completely detach himself from the visual and intellectual impressions he has received during his lifetime?

The most extreme of abstract artists demand that we, the public, suppress our faculty of appreciation through the association of ideas. Thus the term composition agrees more closely with the constructive elements of that form of art. There is no completely satisfactory alternative for the word "abstract". "Non-figurative" is too closely linked with the idea of the human figure.

"Without subject" or "without content" are still more dubious as terms, for it is impossible to imagine a true work of art which has no other aim but form for form's sake.

Abstract art is more and more ~~ht~~ hesitant to accept what in theatrical decoration is called illusionism. The optical illusion has become a true negation of art. If, however, there is still some need for it, it is the purpose of photography to satisfy that need. Imitation without interpretation has never been art and we can therefore leave it outside our reflections and our terminology. The term "bastard abstract" used by Hammacher for artists who, in his opinion, have achieved an equivocal fusion of the schools that have already become weak - more particularly the expressionists - takes the place of a reasonable and deliberate judgment, without taking into account the innumerable stages between imitation consciously searching for illusion and the point where everything stemming from reality is discarded. The protagonists of abstract art too easily incline to consider every reminder of the outside world as the proof of a lack of artistic invention.

Mutual Proposal of the Dutch Section :

The Section recommends the formation of either a committee or a working party which, with the assistance of the national sections, will make a thorough study of the terms most commonly used by art critics. Because of the proverbial clarity of the French language, Paris seems to us to be the ideal situation for the office of such a committee.