

NOTE: These documents have
been compiled by the permanent
bureau of the Congress of Art
Critics and sponsored by Unesco.

AC/Conf.1/SR 1,2,3,4,5,6,7 -

PARIS, 12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Reports of Meetings

held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e,

from 21 to 26 June 1948

NOTE: These documents have been
compiled by the permanent bureau
of the Congress of Art Critics and
revised by Unesco.

AC/Conf. 1/Sk. 1
PARIS, 12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Report of the First Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e.
on Monday, 21 June 1948 at 10.0 a.m.

Present:

<u>Chairman:</u>	M.P. PIEPENS (Belgium)
<u>Vice-Chairmen:</u>	Signor VENTURI (Italy) M. Jean CASSOU (France) Dr. Herbert READ (United Kingdom) Mr. James Johnson STEENEY (United States of America) Dr. NEDESKY (Czechoslovakia)
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. Denys SUTTON (United Kingdom)
<u>Members:</u>	M. COGNAT (Syndicat des Professionnels de la Presse Artistique Française) M. DALLOZ (French Ministry of Education) Mme. S. Gille DELAFON, Secrétaire-Général du Congrès

Unesco Secretariat: M. Jean THOMAS (Assistant Director-General)
Mr. P. BELLEV (Acting Head of Arts and Letters
Section)
Mr. H.H. AZEVEDO (Arts and Letters Section)
M. Henri HELL (Arts and Letters Section)
Mr. B. LARDERA (Arts and Letters Section)

The CHAIRMAN opened the session and gave the floor to M. Cogniat.

M. COGNAT who welcomed members on behalf of the Syndicat de la Presse Artistique Française, observed that it was the first time that art critics from many different countries had met to find common means of action. He was glad to see a larger number of members than had been expected. They had come together from thirty countries in an atmosphere of confidence, hope and cordiality, which he hoped their discussions would confirm. Now that the Congress was assembled, the task of the Organizing Committee was ended, but it was glad to have been able to arrange the meeting in a hall symbolical of the material and spiritual support of an international Organization: Unesco asked for nothing in exchange for its facilities and wished the Congress every success in its work.

M. Jean THOMAS, the Assistant Director-General of Unesco welcomed members to Unesco House on behalf of the Director-General, who was absent on a tour of Eastern and Central Europe.

He said that an indirect, but one of the most essential tasks of Unesco was to encourage the creation of international professional organizations, and it was therefore glad to be able to contribute modestly to the success of the meeting, by supplying a room and technical assistance: he hoped that the plans made by the Organizing Committee would enable the meeting to form a permanent international association of Art Critics.

International life at the present time was disappointing in many ways, but it was a sign of hope for the future that men of all intellectual training were ready to meet together and discuss their common problems. June was indeed the month of a great deal of international activity in the field of the Arts:

the International Council of Museums (I.C.O.M.) was holding its first General Conference at Unesco House on Monday, 23 June. I.C.O.M. was independent of Unesco, but close bonds of friendship and collaboration existed between the two Organizations. On the same day, also, the first Conference of the International Theatre Institute was opening in Prague. The idea of an international theatre institute had been instigated by Unesco, but the I.T.I. was about to start an independent existence. During the last and present week, an International Copyright Conference was being held in Brussels. Unesco was very happy to see so much activity in the field of the Arts, which could lead to greater mutual understanding between nations.

M. Thomas went on to outline Unesco's art programme.

In conclusion, the Assistant Director-General hoped that the Art Critics would give Unesco advice on its art projects: he again wished the meeting every success and hoped that it would result in fruitful collaboration in the future.

The CHAIRMAN had felt that it was a great honour and responsibility when he had accepted the Chairmanship of the Organizing Committee of the First Congress: he was glad, at the present time, to be able to share that responsibility with all those who had responded to the appeal of the Committee, of France and of Paris. Paris, with its rich past and its encouragement of all new work, remained the capital of living Art; it was therefore fitting that the first Congress of Art Critics should pay a tribute to Paris by meeting there. Baudelaire had said that the shape of a city changed more quickly than the hearts of men; the love of artists for Paris increased steadily with the years. He thanked M. Cogniat and Mme. Gille Delafon for all their preliminary work,

without which the Congress would have remained a mere project. He also thanked Mr. Denys Sutton for his help, and members of the Cercle des Echanges Artistiques who had organized a programme of entertainment. He was certain that members were glad to be the guests of Unesco and proud of the importance which it attached to the Congress. He thanked M. Thomas for his welcome and comprehension of the problems that faced the Congress. Under the aegis of Unesco, they had met to improve international, professional relations and to obtain a better understanding of their rights and duties.

Unesco represented and encouraged the spirit of democratic freedom; thus art critics were ready to collaborate with the Organization with gratitude and goodwill. The present meeting must achieve certain practical results and, as M. Thomas had said, it was hoped to establish a permanent international organization to continue the work of the Congress, which was only a preparatory and experimental body. Legal advisers were present to help in the establishment of the permanent body.

He expressed thanks to the five Vice-Chairmen and was glad that they could share with him the honour and the responsibilities.

Finally, the Chairman said a few words on the rôle of Art Critics in society. The Critic's first duty was to speak the truth and to be sincere with himself, paying no heed to fashion and being unswayed by passions: he must have a clear and severe idea of his duty and give his own honest opinion with courage. Freedom of criticism was less a right than a duty, and not a passive duty. The Fascist and Nazi régimes, by forbidding art criticism, had done harm from which art was still suffering: this was a proof that art criticism was opposed to Nazism. Therefore, while urging members to respect each other's

opinions, he expressed the hope that honest criticism would be furthered by the meeting, and he proposed that the first motion of the Congress should be the following:

"Art critics of twenty-five nations, at a meeting in Paris at Unesco House, proclaim their solemn attachment to freedom of opinion and expression, and, in full knowledge of their rights and duties towards society their faithfulness to beauty and truth, their admiration for France and their gratitude to Paris for its reception."

Approved.

On behalf of the French Minister of Education, M. DALLOZ welcomed members to Paris. His task was simplified by the statements made by M. Cogniat, M. Thomas and the Chairman: he and his fellow-countrymen had been deeply moved by the Chairman's tribute to France and to Paris. He thought it unnecessary to stress further the great rôle which art critics could play in promoting the cause of truth, liberty and justice. He hoped the meeting would be very successful and that bonds of friendship would be created between members: all friendship between members of different nations increased the chances of peace.

The opening speeches terminated, M. GOGNIAT proposed that the Congress should start its work: the first task was to elect a bureau to conduct the meeting. He proposed that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman should be asked to continue as Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Congress, and that Mr. Denys Sutton should be requested to act as Rapporteur.

A vote was taken by show of hands and the proposal was adopted.

On behalf of the Organizing Committee, the CHAIRMAN thanked the meeting for the confidence shown in it. He was sure the Vice-Chairmen would show themselves worthy of the honour, and he himself would do his best.

The CHAIRMAN added that the Chairman of the International Council of Museums invited all members to attend the opening meeting of I.C.O.M., on Monday 28 June.

(The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.)

PARIS, 12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Report of the Second Meeting,
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber
Paris, on 21 June 1948 at 2.30 p.m.

Present:

Chairman: M.P. FIERENS - later Mr. J.J. SWEENEY

Vice-Chairmen: M. VENTURI (Italy)
M. Jean CASLOU (France)
Dr. Herbert READ (United Kingdom)
Mr. J.J. SWEENEY (United States of America)
M. NESEETZKY (Czechoslovakia)

Rapporteur: Mr. Denys Sutton (United Kingdom)

Members: M. COGNAT, of the Syndicat des Professionnels de la
Presse Artistique.
M. DALLOZ, of the French Ministry of Education.
Mme. S. Gille DELAFON, Secrétaire-Générale du Congrès

Observers: M. Jean THOMAS, Assistant Director-General.
Mr. P. BELLET, Head of Arts and Letters Section.
Mr. M.H. AZEVEDO
Mr. H. HELL

The CHAIRMAN suggested sending a telegram of sympathy to the
B B Congress being held at Florence. He gave up the Chair
to M. J.J. Sweeney, formerly Director of the New York Museum of Modern Art.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Cogniat and Mme. Gille Delafon for his
nomination as Vice-Chairman. He was grateful for the privilege of introduc-
ing the important project which should reinforce the bonds between Europe and
America. He gave a brief review of American artistic life just before and
during the war and referred to the beneficial influence of the artists who had
had to take refuge in America. He felt sure of being able to bring back to the

M. PIERARD (Belgium) recalled that one of the principal aims of the Congress was to increase the means of international exchange.

Latin-American artists, such as Mexican and Uruguayan painters, were not sufficiently known, nor the Russian ones, and he hoped that some of their Art treasures would be lent to Western exhibitions. He mentioned the Italo-Belgian initiative of sending to Italy a painting by Veronese, belonging to a ceiling decoration, in exchange for a portrait by van der Weyden which the Italians had returned to Brussels.

Mr. BRAAT (Netherlands) read a communication concerning artistic activities in Holland and stressed that small countries were often great in their contributions to the Arts. He urged the abolition of currency controls and other barriers to the free flow of information and to travel.

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion, which he hoped would be spontaneous.

NAHRI Bey (Egypt) recalled his presence at the Unesco Conference two years ago. Then and now he expressed the wish that his country could recover a universally known work of art, whose location was at present unknown - the bust of Queen Nephertiti.

Mr. REMALD (United States), speaking of exchanges, did not think the Italo-Belgian experiment was the right angle of approach to the question. In his opinion Italian pictures should be sent to Belgium and Belgian ones to Italy.

M. PIERARD thought the problem was very delicate and might easily become political. The time to speak of artistic reparations had not yet come. He had simply wished to give a particular individual example and was against generalization at present.

M. CAYEUX (France) drew attention to the existing general problem of knowing whether a work of Art belonged to the country where it had been conceived or to the country where it was located. He had no wish to touch upon the political aspects of the questions, but reminded the Meeting of the circulation of mobile exhibitions which showed that it was the duty of owners to share their treasures.

The CHAIRMAN held that the ownership or trusteeship of works of Art was a key point for discussion.

Mr. MCGREEVY (Ire) was doubtful whether the question was within the terms of reference of the Congress.

M. SAULNIER (France) thought the question of location was secondary. The main problem was to facilitate travel, thus enabling people to go and see works of Art for themselves. A motion recommending to governments the abolition of hindrances in that connexion would be very desirable. He did not think that the problem of the trusteeship of works of Art was the business of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to Mr. McGreevy, stressed that the afternoon's discussion was not aesthetic but technical, therefore the point was relevant. He asked M. Saulnier to present his motion in writing on Saturday morning.

M. PIERARD expressed the wish that Unesco would take in consideration all the views which had been stated.

Mr. BELLET (Unesco) explained that Unesco was not concerned with reparations and restorations but with the exchange of works of art the knowledge of which was hindered by customs restrictions. He asked for assistance in having the restrictions abolished and assured the Meeting that Unesco would give serious consideration to all the resolutions which the Congress might adopt.

M. BLUM (France) drew attention to artistic fakes and to the legal problems involved. Modern scientific methods of faking were almost impossible to detect and, in an attempt to defend the artistic patrimony of Nations, scientific laboratories had been created. However, final decisions by qualified critics were still the best criterion of genuineness and M. Blum asked if the critics were ready to assume that responsibility. He proposed the creation in each country of a file containing all possible information - such as ordinary and X-ray photographs, etc. - and that the files should be made available to all experts.

Mme. ADHEMAR (France) stressed the importance of collaboration between Art critics and Museums. On behalf of the "Centre de Documentation Française" of the Louvre she asked the critics' help in making it more widely known. The creation of a Centre of Dissemination would be very desirable.

M. DRUCKER, referring to the compilation of catalogues, emphasized the importance of good translations, the standardization of

terminology and abbreviations. He advocated the use of the metric system for the measurement of pictures and for weighing of other works of Art. He spoke of Unesco's essential rôle as a clearing-house for information and hoped a Calendar of Exhibitions would be created to bring harmony into the existing chaos.

Mr. RUBIN (Denmark) suggested the setting up of discussion groups under the aegis of Unesco to help find solutions for practical problems.

The CHAIRMAN declared that the purpose of the Congress was to bring out new ideas; all would be welcome. Motions should be presented in writing on the following Saturday morning.

M. COGNAT (France) explained that the Congress was designed as an inventory of ideas and people. Groups would be set up as soon as possible in the coming months. Meanwhile he proposed the creation of a Documentation Bureau as an embryo of the future Organization.

The CHAIRMAN declared that the Steering Committee of the Congress accepted the motion and suggested a vote on it without waiting for Saturday.

M. RUBIN explained that his idea was that groups should start work, say for one hour a day, during the Session of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the afternoons were free for that kind of work. M. Cognat's motion was carried unanimously.

M. COURTHION (Switzerland) agreed with the formation of national bodies which would supply the Documentation Bureau with information, but he

stressed the importance of excluding political considerations and of avoiding governmental channels.

II. COGNILIT insisted on the fact that all the members of the Congress were present as individuals and not as representatives of their countries or governments.

The Meeting rose at 5 p.m.

PARIS, 12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Record of the Third Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e
on Tuesday, 22 June 1948 at 10.0 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: M.P. FIERENS (Belgium)
Later: M. NEBETZKI (Czechoslovakia)

Vice-Chairmen: M. Jean CASSOU (France)
Signor L. VENTURI (Italy)
Dr. Herbert READ (United Kingdom)
Mr. J.J. SWEENEY (United States of America)

Rapporteur: Mr. Denys SUTTON (United Kingdom)

Unesco Secretariat: Mr. P. BELLE (Acting Head of Arts and Letters
Section)

The RAPPOREUR announced the agenda for the meeting was to consist of an address by M. Nebetzki, the reading of certain communications, a discussion of authors' rights, and contracts between authors and publishers.

M. FIERENS thanked M. Nebetzki for having come especially from Prague to attend the meeting, in replacement of M. Vanek, who had been prevented from coming. He also thanked him for agreeing to take the chair at the present meeting.

Mr. W. GEORGE recalled that M. Nebetzki had introduced French painting of the 19th and 20th centuries into Prague Museum 25 years previously.

The CHAIRMAN thanked members for the honour they had done him in appointing him as Chairman, and he also thanked the French representatives and the Organizing Committee for their warm welcome to Paris. He spoke of the cultural bonds between Czechoslovakia and France and expressed his desire to see solidarity in all fields re-established in Europe. He added that it was important to lay emphasis on the moral mission of Art.

M. DRUCKER read a report on the "Extension of copyright to quotations made for commercial ends".

M. COGNAT considered that the report was too technical to discuss at the present meeting. He recalled that the Congress's first task was to establish a permanent international art critics' organization, which, when created, could appoint a technical commission to take up questions such as those mentioned by M. Drucker.

Mr. BELLIN observed that Unesco had a Copyright Bureau which would be very glad to have the co-operation of the technical commission to which M. Cogniat had referred. If the Unesco Bureau had a precise paper from that commission, it would be able to attack the problem on the proper level.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the permanent art critics' organization would be happy to have Unesco's support and, as soon as it was formed, information would be collected on questions of copyright, for transmission to Unesco.

M. PAUBLAT, Director of the Art Museum at Boulogne s/mer, pointed out that art critics in the past had written only for a certain class of reader, and not for the general public. This was regrettable, as the general public in the French Provinces

was taking an increasing interest in Art and was anxious to understand it. For them, Art was a form of relaxation and, in his own museum, he had organized small meetings twice a month to which many people came to take part in informal and spontaneous discussions.

M. Jean CASSOU, returning to the question of publications and copyright pointed out that publishers considered art critics and historians as a category of writers apart, and charged especially heavily for the publication of books on art. In his opinion, therefore, the Congress might undertake the task of drawing up a standard contract for artistic writings and translations, and endeavour to get it accepted by publishers in all countries. Up to the present, translators had had no editorial status and it was important that they should be included in the contract. He suggested submitting the question to the Brussels Copyright Conference and to Unesco, and also contacting the French Professional Association of Literary and Scientific Translators and the "Syndicat des Editeurs".

Mr. SWEENEY proposed that the Bureau of the Congress should communicate as soon as possible with the Authors' Guild in the United States, which had already created a commission to establish a standard contract. Seconded by M. CASSOU.

Agreed.

M. PILLEMENT, Chairman of the Professional Association of Literary and Scientific Translators, agreed with what M. Cassou had said and was willing to place at the disposal of the Bureau the standard contract already drawn up by his Association.

The RAPPORTEUR submitted that the question should be dealt with

AC/Conf. 1/SR.3 - page 4
12 August 1948

by the technical commission of the permanent organization, when it was formed, and therefore requested members to transmit suggestions to the Bureau in writing. These could be studied during the year and handed over to the commission as soon as it was created.

M. COGNAT referred to the question of the right of reproduction of contemporary works of art. The Brussels Conference was considering the extension of such rights which, at present, were only applied in certain countries. Rights should be established for artists similar to those of authors: that is to say, an author received royalties on the publication of his poems, or on an isolated poem, but quotations from his work were free of charge. How much more, therefore, should the published reproduction of a picture be free of charge, since it was only an imitation and, unlike a quoted text, did not give the form and substance of the original. Publishers found that photography of subjects with popular appeal, such as sporting events or music-hall turns, were far more advantageous than articles on painting or sculpture with reproductions for which rights had to be paid, and it was therefore difficult for art critics to get their articles accepted. Hence the artists themselves were harmed, as their works were not given publicity and their small profit on rights was an illusion. M. Cogniat therefore proposed that the Congress express the desire that Art and Artists should be defended against illusory profits. Agreed.

M. MORLAND fully agreed that reproductions of illustrations should be free, as they had already been sold by the artist to the publisher and the artist had thereby given his authority for reproduction.

M. COURTHION observed that many societies prevented young art critics from working by exacting over-heavy rights: an example was the "Syndicat de la

Propriété Artistique". He wondered whether the various art associations could not be made to accept the principle that the agreement of a living artist to the reproduction of his work corresponded to exemption from rights.

M. André BLUM recalled that the "Société des Gens de Lettres" had for many years been negotiating for the establishment of a contract such as that mentioned by M. Cassou, and therefore, instead of preparing a new contract, he suggested that a statement might be added to the contract of the Société des Gens de Lettres, concerning the reduction of reproduction rights. He did not think it was for Unesco or any other international organization to attempt to control reproduction rights or copyright: the task should be left to the professional organizations in each country to protect authors of works of art and art critics.

M. BERNARD quoted the example of a newspaper in Charleroi which had published an article praising an artist and reproducing one of his pictures; the artist had sued the paper for reproducing his picture and had demanded 70 francs 40 centimes as reproduction rights. The suit was still in process, and the editor of the paper intended to defend himself by arguing that an article on a work of art published in a paper should be equivalent to an article on a book, and therefore, free of charge.

Mr. NELKEN gave certain details on the reproduction of European works of art in Latin America. The richer magazines and journals were not interested in publishing articles on works of art, but a quantity of small reviews did so and these would certainly be unable to continue if they had to pay any rights.

M. COGNIAF feared that there were indeed rights to be paid and certain French associations were starting lawsuits to recover rights: Latin America had so far been beyond their scope, but it was part of their programme to recover the rights from Latin American reviews in the future. He therefore thought the Congress should launch a campaign with artists, their associations and publishers. Personally he was prepared to refuse to reproduce contemporary works of art in his paper until they were exempt from rights: this would show artists clearly their position vis-à-vis their associations, which often took most of the money on rights, giving the artists themselves very little. He stressed the need for immediate and energetic action, before legal procedure became too far advanced.

Mr. REMAID said that the French Copyright Association could not sue Latin American or American Reviews for rights, since America had not adhered to the Berne Convention. In America, the copyright of a work belonged to the owner of a work of art. Therefore if an energetic campaign were not launched as M. Cogniat had suggested America could flood Europe with illustrations of French works of art far cheaper than those produced in Europe.

Dr. READ said that no trouble was encountered in the United Kingdom from artists or their associations, and certain trouble from French associations had so far been resisted; there was, however, a danger from the State: public museums and galleries now insisted on a charge of 7/6d. for every photograph taken of a work of art. This was absurd, as they were educational institutions, and it was therefore equivalent to a tax

on education.

Signor VENTURI said there were no reproduction rights in Italy.

M. COGNLAT proposed the following resolution:

"The International Congress of Art Critics draws the attention of artists and artists' associations to the danger of the present legislation on the reproduction of artistic works; the heavy burden thereby laid on papers and magazines goes against the interest of the artists whom the associations pretend to serve."

M. CAUTHIER observed that a distinction should be made between references to artistic works and facsimiles.

Mr. REMAUD suggested adding to the Resolution the words "in our publications" after "the reproduction of artistic works".

M. CASSOU agreed that it should be stressed that the resolution referred to illustrations in magazines and papers, and not to facsimiles. He proposed that the motion should be sent to the "Direction des Musées" and the "Direction des Bibliothèques" as it affected public collections. It was illogical to have to pay rights to an artist who was already sufficiently compensated by having his works displayed on an equal footing with old masters. Good publicity was in the interests of living artists, and exoneration from rights should therefore be claimed on the reproduction of publicly owned works of art.

The RAPPORTEUR proposed that the motion also be transmitted to the International Council of Museums. Agreed.

M. Cogniat's resolution was adopted.

(The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.)

12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Fourth Meeting held at Unesco House,
19 Avenue Kléber, Paris, on 23 June
1948 at 10 a.m.

Present:

<u>Chairman:</u>	M. P. PIERENS - later Dr. H. READ
<u>Members:</u>	M. J. CASSOU Sr. L. VENTURI M. NEBETZKY Mr. J. J. SWEENEY
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. Denys SUTTON
<u>Observer:</u>	Mr. P. BELLEW

Mr. SUTTON reminded the Meeting of the 3 p.m. visit to the Modern Art Museum, the television demonstration at 5 p.m., the subsequent visit to the Pavillon de Marsan and of the free debate on Aesthetics at 9 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN told the Meeting that new ground would be broken that morning namely Criticism and Aesthetics and that Dr. Herbert Read, the well-known poet and sociologist who had always been in the forefront of the fight for progress in Art, had accepted to preside over the morning's meeting.

The CHAIRMAN believed opinions could not be expressed in any one single manner as there were various modes of understanding and means of expression. The ways of Art, Religion and Science were different - the speaker mentioned Volterak's Modes of Resonance - and he pleaded

for tolerance and the acceptance of different points of view.

Signor VENTURI said that an exact definition of each word used was to the advantage of clear and precise thinking. Realism was the imitation of Nature. That empiricism could not, however, be followed passively. On the other hand all works of Art were abstractions of Nature. Many writers on aesthetics spoke of creation or invention instead of abstraction as the former did not have to refer to Man. Both realistic and abstract works possessed artistic value: it was simply a question of degree. and modern artists realized that affinity. Lines, forms and colours were the realities of a work of Art and as Leonardo da Vinci had said "if a blind man could suddenly see a picture, he would see trees, houses, people, etc. where an artist would only see lines, forms and colour". Architecture was the model of all abstract and concrete Arts. The highest aim of Aesthetics was to find the common basis of all Art and to free it from outside influence.

M. LHOE (France) thought too much importance was attached to arguments. He preferred 'non-representative' to 'abstract'. The arguments which must be refuted were (1) that Art must progress 'vertically'; (2) that it was time to claim for Painting the rights which belonged to Music; (3) that the representation of the outside world was out of date. The fact that some pictorial artists rebelled against the law of Gravitation was further reason why each Art should retain its specific character. The greatest musicians

always sought representation. The speaker asked for generosity towards modern artists since spiritualized works of Art must include common data to enable artists to communicate with the public.

M. ESTIENNE (France) thought reality was voluntary transposition which could be expressed only by going beyond visible reality. He compared "naive" Art and that which followed the "voix intérieure" and mentioned the abstractions, half abstractions, impalpables and intangibles discussed by Malcolm de Ch

M. COURTHION (Switzerland) spoke of figurative and non-figurative Art. He held that painters, sculptors and architects could not do without observation of the physical Universe. However that was not their final aim. He mentioned Fiedler's "spiritual optics" and emphasized that visual Arts had not a greater imitative importance than the others. Art was not temporal and therefore was not addressed to contemporaries, but tried to infuse universal love into its forms and colours.

The CHAIRMAN suggested fifteen minutes of open discussion before hearing the remaining communications.

M. DEGAND (France) was of the opinion that painters had as good a right to be abstract as architects. Three-dimensional Realism was very different from Abstraction which was a new conception of painting and was often ambiguous as regards "depth". as regards colour he thought that certain combinations were divorced

from reality. Abstract painting was intuitive and not imitative, i.e. it was similar to Music. Realist painters were not more understandable than abstract ones. The two modes of expression were not necessarily opposed.

M. DUVILLE (France) held that architecture was as representative as painting. He referred to fakes and their well-nigh impossible detection and declared that some fakers would have been hailed as great artists a couple of hundred years ago. He asked whether man was capable of enjoying a work of Art without instruction and advice, or was he a sexless Helot?

Mme. ULMANN insisted on the responsibility of critics towards the public.

Dr. NEBETZKY spoke about the Law of division of labour or the Law of specialization. Artists specialized in static or constructive types, poetized plastics, neo-forms or free poetic improvisations and "internal" realities or surrealism. In recent times an obvious amalgamation was taking place between realism and abstraction. Two tendencies made themselves felt; the domination of Nature by the spirit or divinatory Art which was more subjective and passive. In his opinion abstract Art was essential to ascertain the points of contact between Man and Nature.

M. Waldemar GEORGE (France) held that the surge of Abstract painting was not only a liberation from imitative Art

in which the divorce between Man and Nature was accomplished by the use of new calligrammes. Abstraction was a crisis of Civilization - but was it a progress? The speaker did not think so. The victory of Man over Nature was essential for Western progress. Art should be active realism, i.e. not a style but a mode of thought and a starting point for the effective control of Nature.

M. SERVVRANCKX (Belgium) praised M. George's trends although he disagreed fundamentally. Art was abstract not because it spurned figuration but because it sought freedom. It was a crisis against spiritual materialism. It was not the duty of initiates to be understood but to deepen their initiation. The Art of tomorrow would either be collective - or not exist. Abstract Art had rediscovered a thousands of years old tradition.

M. ZAHAR (France) agreed that some works of abstract art deserved admiration. However a picture was not a piece of canvas covered with lines and colours. Its immemorial definition was an immediately recognizable figuration of a subject. He feared that artists had ceased to be intuitive in order to become intellectual, which was not their rôle. The public was shy of Modern Art and Criticism because neither was understood. The small group of adepts gave only the illusion of a world clamour. Once upon a time the majority agreed with the aesthetes. To-day the most popular exhibitions were retrospective.

M. de MAEYER (Belgium) pleaded for irrealism, which was not a neologism, and asked for its generalization.

AC/Conf.1/SR 4 - page 6
12 August 1948

NAHRI Bey (Egypt) was against restricting the field of artistic investigation. The critical faculty should have no limits or frontiers; its motto should be "Sincerity". In Art the words "national" and "international" had no meaning and the latter should be replaced by "universal".

(The Meeting rose at 1 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Record of the Fifth Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16,
on Thursday, 24 June 1948 at 10.0 a.m.

Present:

Chairman: M. P. FIERENS (Belgium) later M. Lionello
VENTURI (Italy)

Vice-Chairmen: Mr. J.J. SWEENEY (United States of America)
M. Jean CASSOU (France)
M. NEDESKY (Czechoslovakia)
Dr. Herbert READ (United Kingdom)

Rapporteur: Mr. Denys SUTTON (United Kingdom)

Unesco Secretariat: Mr. P. BELLEF (Acting Head of Arts and Letters
Section)
Mr. Henri IELL (Arts and Letters Section)

M. FIERENS opened the discussion on artistic tendencies in different countries. He said how fortunate the meeting was to have as Chairman M. Lionello Venturi, whose work was a magnificent example and inspiration. M. Venturi had passed from art history to art criticism and was a great expert on Italian Renaissance Art. He also had a profound knowledge of the 19th Century French Art and his work on Cézanne was particularly outstanding; at the present time he devoted himself to the study of contemporary art. At a time of cruel dilemma, M. Venturi had shown his love for France, and had preferred exile to honours under a totalitarian régime. All those who loved Italy had suffered from being cut off from her when bad rulers had led her astray; they were happy to find her again in the person of M. Venturi, whose youthfulness of heart and mind inspired everyone with admiration and respect.

The CHAIRMAN was deeply moved by M. Fierens' words and he thanked him for his tribute: he was also grateful to his friend Raymond Cogniat for having asked him to represent Italian critics.

He recalled that the meeting was to discuss the nationalism and internationalism of art, and pointed out that in some respects art was contrary to nationalism, since a work of art of intrinsic value transcended all frontiers. He did not know if an international spirit

governed art criticism, but it was essential that it should do so: the internationalization of art criticism was the purpose for which the present Congress had been convened; he therefore imagined that the debates that morning would be less controversial than they had been the previous day, but all discussion was welcomed. He then called upon Mr. Chow Ling to make a statement.

Mr. CHOW LING said that the problem before Chinese artists was, whether to abandon their own traditions and follow Western ones, or whether they could hope for a conciliation of the two. To accomplish this, the differences had first to be realized: the first was one of technique, a Western canvas not being comparable to Chinese paper, which was a rebellious substance and similar to blotting paper, which made touching up impossible; preliminary mental work was therefore necessary. European canvas, on the other hand, was solid material which stood paint and brushes well and the artist could therefore touch up his painting as much as he pleased. The second difference was the aesthetic one, and here there was no question of Chinese artists abandoning their traditions to follow the West. The ideal solution was to blend the two arts, but for this, efforts would have to be made on both sides.

Mlle. BUCARELLI referred briefly to the artistic movements in the last forty years, which had influenced Italian Art. As regards present tendencies among the young generation of Italian artists, the most evident was that towards Abstract Art. Many young painters from 30 to 40 years had started from cubism, imitating nature, but simplifying it; some of the very young artists showed a tendency towards pure abstraction, endeavouring to create a new reality of their own. Many diverse personalities were involved in these movements. There was also an expressionist movement among certain artists, who aimed at constructive impressionism and had a refined and somewhat over-fastidious style. Other artists had reacted against the abstract and expressionist movements, and aimed at realism and truth; but the realist school lacked vitality. Mlle. Bucarelli did not, however, think that this movement would endure, in art there was no more backward only forward.

M. DELEVOY said a few words on the position in Belgium. After the liberation, the young painters had been surprised to find that their aspirations corresponded to those of young French artists who, like themselves, had concentrated their attention on colour and pictorial thought. Instead of turning round objects and representing their external appearance, they tried to penetrate into the spirit of the objects, representing not the outward form, but an internal vision. There was also a tendency to remain faithful to the Flemish expressionist tradition; after the liberation an attempt had been made to rescue art from sentimentality and to recover the discipline of the Flemish tradition. Subjective realism was perhaps the key-note of Belgium art at the present time.

M. CASSOU said that Art was a universal language and pointed out that French Art since the 19th Century had been universal. It represented a great spiritual adventure which called for contributions from all countries. French Art had always been the incarnation of humanism, possessing the faculty of attraction and expansion. The question was whether the young generation of artists was worthy of these traditions: many people thought so, and their belief was not an act of faith, but a belief inspired by an equal and constant vitality; the immediate artistic past in France was so rich and fruitful in its discoveries and suggestions that it inspired continuity. Many artistic revolutions had taken place since the 19th Century, each with a new conception of form, and it remained to be seen whether the creative rhythm could be maintained or not: new social conditions might transform art and make it less intellectual and complete.

M. Cassou stressed the fact that the French were rationalists and excelled in theoretic and speculative invention, appealing to the mind as well as to the senses. He also mentioned the value of French workmanship and technical knowledge, which was evident in the work of all French masters.

Mr. McGREEVY disagreed with the Chairman that Art was opposed to nationalism: nationalism, as he understood it, meant a love and understanding of one's country, represented in art. The great Irish painter Jack B. Yeats had said that he painted "out of affection", and although his work showed the influence of the French and Italian schools, his greatest paintings were inspired by the love of his native land. Mr. McGreevy stressed the fact that an artist used influences, and was not used by them. Yeats, in his youth, had been to Venice and had been influenced by Venetian artists and by French impressionists, but his subject matter was always taken from the Irish scene, or even from the Irish political scene. One of his greatest works was the painting of the young Flower Girl, throwing flowers on the spot where an Irish patriot had been killed in 1914; this picture was symbolic of the political aspirations of his country.

The most remarkable influence on Irish art at the present time was the influence of the Church: the art of genuinely original stained glass windows had been revived by Michael Healy, Harry Clerk and Miss Evie Holme, the latter being the leading stained-glass painter in Ireland at the present time. As regards sculpture, an artist who should be remembered was Lawrence Campbell, who was most renowned for his statue of a young man shot in the rebellion of 1916: Mr. McGreevy had seen no finer example of sculpture between Ireland and Budapest.

As far as architecture was concerned, a fine example was to be found in the aerodrome near Dublin, which presented an example of beautiful classical proportions.

There were also surrealists and expressionists in Ireland, but Mr. McGreevy could not say whether there was among them a figure of international rank.

The CHAIRMAN thought nationalism was always the root of imperialism. The love of one's country was not essential to be a nationalist. An artist should understand other countries and if Irish artists had felt the influence of other countries they had also felt their duty towards their own. He was sure that the supernational trend was the real spring-board of the best works of Art.

Mr. McGREEVY expressed the warmest praise for Signor Venturi's book on Giorgioni - one of the best works ever written.

M. COURTHION (Switzerland) gave an exposé of the position of Art and Criticism in his country. The problem of light, due to the 'continental' climate, made itself felt. A Basle painter, on seeing the Place de la Concorde for the first time, exclaimed: "Mais c'est déjà tout fait!". In Aesthetics, Switzerland had many important representatives such as Töpffer, Burckhardt and particularly Heinrich Wölfflin, whose book "Grundlage" would shortly be published in French. Wölfflin's essential factors were optic possibilities and he excelled in the analysis of the plastic qualities of works of Art. The speaker wished to pay homage to the great Henri Focillon of France to whom every one owed something. To retain the sense of quality, customs barriers could be abolished in the spirit pending their removal in fact.

Mr. SUTTON (Rapporteur) informed the Congress that M. Vincent Auriol, The President of the French Republic, would receive a delegation of its members on Friday at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. SWEENEY (United States) spoke of the artistic tendencies in his country. Before the war there had been a latent conflict between painters under European influence and those who might be described as chauvinist, jingoist or nationalist - the painters of the American Scene. During the war the States had been host to fifteen or twenty European painters who exerted a valuable effect on young American painters. The emulation of their methods and the rejection of ready made illusions gave a distinct promise of fresh modes of expression. As a result, chauvinism and jingoism were in eclipse. The speaker cited many examples of young artists with a new approach. Influence was being made use of, but was not using the men - as Mr. McGreevy had aptly put it. Since the war American artists had been relatively out of touch with their European colleagues and he looked confidently on their behalf to the lasting and productive results of the Congress.

Sra FASOLA (Italy) stressed that Art and Criticism were very closely allied. They were two aspects of spiritual life. She touched upon the problems which faced the critics if they wanted to fill their rôle in a really conscious manner and to understand their responsibilities.

Mr. MacINNES (United Kingdom) explained that modern English painting was fresh and innocent. It laid stress on external plastics; it was poetical, lyrical and not impressionist. The Anglo-Saxon

tendency was not to theorize. More interest was shown in the intrinsic value of an artist than in Form. He hoped for liberation from the badly digested French influence. However, it was important that foreign contributions to Art should be studied and made use of to enrich nationalist painting.

M. MICKO (Czechoslovakia) reviewed the history of Czech pictorial Art since 1880. He deplored the early death of Slaviček, the impressionist, described the two tendencies prevailing in his country - autochthonous or traditional and cosmopolitan or progressist - and mentioned the Czech Rissorgimento of Masaryk's epoch. Today, Czech artists continued to take a warm interest in what went on in Europe, particularly in the West.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the next Meeting would take place next day at 10 a.m. and the Meeting rose at 1 p.m.

AC/Conf.1/SR 6
PARIS, 12 August 1948

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary Report of the Sixth Meeting
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e,
on Friday, 25 June 1948 at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. Jean CASSOU (France)

M. LARDEA (Italy) said that shortly before the war in 1939 there had been signs of an awakening, a new burst of activity, in some impressionist experiments. In the contemporary period, Italian art was trying to regain its great tradition, not by repetition but by a true rejuvenation; the results of that freer, more lyrical and more abstract movement were already apparent and provided a proof of fresh activity and of a people's desire to regain its place in European culture.

The CHAIRMAN announced the agenda for the meeting: Art and Society. The reports to follow would therefore be concerned with more practical matters - the position of the artist and his companion, the art critic, in contemporary society.

M. LUZZATTO (Italy) raised the question of the existence of art criticism and its success. Truth was difficult to attain and the public could not be helped by the opinions expressed by the artists themselves (did not Stendhal say that an artist's judgment of a work was only "a commentary on his own style"?) but by the objective work of art critics, constituting a sort of international jury whose criticism was particularly effective as it was free from prejudice and hostility, since the judgment of foreigners, to some extent, represented that of posterity.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the current Congress was not entirely international; the criticism predominantly represented was that of Paris. It often happened that artists who had lived, or were living, beyond the Parisian sphere of influence, were not recognized in Paris for their own peculiar merits. Art had abandoned academic dogmatism but it was the duty of art to free itself from any form of dogmatism. The essence of a work of art was the force of a vision of the world which rose above the reality of every day and showed the triumph of the human spirit, free and rejoicing.

The CHAIRMAN wished to assure the meeting that Paris did not confuse universality with imperialism; the Paris School had proved that fact, moreover, by freely admitting foreign innovations.

M. W. GEORGE (France) added that, thanks to M. Jean Cassou, all the great foreign painters had been, or were to be, shown at the "Musée d'Art moderne" in Paris.

M. IELIEVRE (France) then introduced the question of "policy for art and government direction". While it might be admissible for militant criticism to demand the fullest freedom for the artist, the same was not necessarily true for historical criticism. The relations between Art and the State might be considered under three headings: liberty, patronage and a policy for art.

A work of art was not only part of a nation's heritage, to be enjoyed for itself alone, it was also a means of mass education. Arguments could be found for and against State direction in matters of art but, when all was said and done, it was realized that the good effects of such direction were in the reactions it provoked rather than in the works it inspired. Neither the historian nor the critic could disregard the question of government direction.

Mr. PACH (United States) arraigned the critics for being followers of opinion instead of being its leaders. There had been no unceasing flow of books about Picasso when he needed to be explained to the public and to be supported. The World had paid a heavy price for ignoring Renoir so long. More courage on the critics' part would have spared the World the atrocities perpetrated at the end of the 18th and at the beginning of the 19th Centuries. Continued homage to Masters was not proof of critical acumen. As Mr. McGroovy had admirably stated "Art criticism is a form of philosophy"; therein the critics found their defence. They proved their value above all by their writings on their contemporaries, a task they often relished so little as to leave really first class artists in obscurity. The condition to arrive at true Art was to "turn the corner"; that was where the critics' responsibility lay; he called on the critics for more humility as regards the past and for a realization of the magnificence of the tasks of the future.

Mr. SWEENEY (United States) agreed with Mr. Pachas to the lack of courage shown by the critics particularly where the younger generation was concerned. He had the greatest admiration for Mr. Pach, but, in all fairness to the New York Museum of Modern Art he thought it necessary to stress that it had tried to present to the public as wide a group of modern American artists as possible. Personal opinions should not serve as a criticism of that Institution.

Mme. NEIKEN (Spain) spoke on the tendencies of modern Spanish art. Spanish artists were to be found everywhere and that made it very difficult to know all their works. She mentioned Victorio Macio almost unknown outside Peru. She felt that the individual formula was obsolescent and truth too often ignored.

M. André CHASTEN (France) speaking of the rôle and meaning of Critique, held that in France there was a certain indifference concerning methods and relations with the history of Critique were very vague, mostly verbal. There was more unanimity in other countries. There could be no unity of language without a study of that history. Few critics had inspired a work of Art (with the exception of Appollinaire); their rôle began, in all humility and prudence and without dogmas, after

its creation.

RAJ ARAO (India) was glad that metaphysics were not forgotten in Europe. In India where it was believed that artists should help men to liberate themselves, two conflicting tendencies existed between the old traditional artists and the modern ones who were under the influence of Europe but, unfortunately, were ignorant of their own country's artistic contributions. The greatest Indian art critic, Ananda Humalsuoni, writing on the place of the critic in Society, said that he must forget his own personality and express the absolute.

M. DIEHL (France) thought the critics' efforts should be turned towards the public, not towards artists. Decorative Art was an important means of enlightening the public since there were no professors of the History of Art.

M. PICHARD (France) agreed entirely with M. Diehl. The most fascinating problem was that of Sacred Art which, nowadays, was entirely divorced from the people. In that Art individualism was insufficient. Religion was equally social as individual. The lack of culture of the contemporary masses was appalling and abstract Art - the manifestation of Man's individualism - should be more aware of its social mission.

Mr. McCULLOCH (Australia) explained that Art in his country was in its infancy, but all outside artistic activities had their echo in Australia. The Art centres were Sydney and Melbourne, which had one of the richest galleries in the World, and a periodical, the "Australian Artist" had a gratifying circulation. It could be said that Australian Art was "an eager and intelligent child".

Sr. BARITA (Brazil) stressed that during the present transitional epoch the variations of Art and Society were parallel.

(The Meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.)

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ART CRITICS

Summary report of the Seventh Meeting,
held at Unesco House, 19 Avenue Kléber, Paris 16e
on Saturday, 26 June 1948 at 10 a.m.

Chairman: M. Paul PIERRE (Belgium)

M. Georges CHARENSOL (France) pointed out that art criticism could not take the same form over the wireless as it did in a lecture theatre, or, still less, in the columns of a printed newspaper. Over the radio, the first necessity was to persuade the audience to listen and to hold their attention, when the vast majority of them were not in the least interested in art. What was necessary was to hold the listener by means of the radio and gradually induce him to take an interest in art. Television had an advantage over the wireless in that it was possible by that means to show reproductions of pictures; M. Charensol remarked that, as television developed, it would be advisable to exercise great caution in showing modern pictures which might easily baffle the public.

M. Louis CHERONNET (France) reverted to the contrast between abstract art and figurative art, saying that he would prefer an historical and scientific study of abstract art as a new phenomenon, to a discussion "for or against abstract art". Abstract expression was not the result of spontaneous generation; it would therefore be very useful to discover the true nature of abstract art. There were real and profound causes for impressionism and M. Cheronnet quoted some of them. He concluded by recommending that a small research office should be established in every country, to examine the origins of abstract art in the country in question and to report to the next Congress.

M. Daniel DUVILLE (France) considered that the fundamental reason for the appearance of non-realistic art was the lack of an appropriate medium, the deficiency of technique. The brain conceived quickly but the hand was slow in execution.

The CHAIRMAN was glad to see that, although the Congress had expressed diametrically opposed opinions on the subject of abstract art, it had displayed great equanimity and breadth of vision. M. Cheronnet's recommendation would certainly be considered by the Congress.

Mr. Frederick LEE (United Kingdom) stated that some broadcasting organizations made the critics' task in education impossible; Great Britain was fortunate in that the BBC gave a larger place to art than the newspapers, suffering from the shortage of paper, were able to do. The art critic speaking on the air should be, as it were, a perfect being combining the talents of the critic and the entertainer. With regard to television, there might be greater opportunities with that medium, which made possible black and white illustrations, but which, for the time

being, influenced only a very small number of rich people who, it could be said, were not necessarily sympathetic to art. It was necessary to devise a method of television which would allow of perfect synchronization between the talk and the accompanying illustration. The models which there would be a tendency to follow (book illustrations and lectures with slides) were generally shockingly inadequate. The ideal would be to evolve a method similar to that employed in good books for children, in which the text and the illustrations were perfectly explanatory of one another.

The CHAIRMAN was pleased to see that there was complete agreement between Mr. Laws and M. Charensol.

M. DELATOUR (France) wished to speak of educational television, which had originated in France and did not so far exist anywhere else. The fundamental part to be played by television was to bring current affairs into the home; it transmitted information but it could also entertain and therein constituted a valuable aid to the teacher.

The CHAIRMAN thanked M. Delatour for his remarks and the French Television Company for the valuable assistance it had given the Congress. He mentioned that M. Paul Haesaerts (Belgium) had offered to speak on the subject "Art criticism and the Cinema", but had had to leave to attend the Film Congress which was opening that day.

Mr. John REWALD (United States of America) said that, if the art critic might make a mistake, the art historian was equally subject to error, as his judgment depended largely on the documents provided by critics. Art criticism was a connecting link between works of art and their contemporary public; was it not desirable that criticism should also endeavour to form a link with the future and so pass down to posterity in the same way as the works of art, whose comprehension it facilitated. There was one field in which the art critic could not make mistakes but could provide the art historian with precise and most valuable data; it was the field of personal contacts with artists to whom the critic could gain access more easily than anyone else. Emile Zola's works of criticism were still read because they contained the opinions of the group of artists for whom he had acted as spokesman. As an art historian, therefore, Mr. Rewald was anxious that art critics should not merely interpret works of art but should also serve as the unbiassed mouth-piece of the artists they interviewed; the critic should give a direct reflection of the artist's message, rather than showing the artist in the light of his own temperament.

In that connexion, the CHAIRMAN mentioned a recommendation, which had just been submitted to him, that in every country cinematographic records should be set up to preserve pictures of artists, their studios etc.

M. DEGAND (France) wished to address the Congress on a question of vital importance for an art critic who wished criticism to be his real profession and not merely a side-line. The art critic's job was exhaust-

ing; he had to see all the exhibitions, constantly return to museums, pay repeated visits to artists and their studios, continually extend his general culture, review his opinions and find some "leisure time" for thought. However, he was treated with scant ceremony; he was badly paid and, on occasion, his pay was even forgotten, whereas administrative staff, printing workers, paper suppliers, etc., were always paid. A newspaper's first economy was to discharge its art critic, not to mention that a paper occasionally went so far as to eliminate the critic's personal views on tendencies which were somewhat new or revolutionary. The art critic could not live on air and yet he had an educational mission to fulfil; the public would take an interest in art only if they were told of it. The material means necessary to allow an art critic to devote himself to his profession should therefore be guaranteed and, for that reason, M. Degand submitted to the Congress a recommendation drawing the attention of the public and of the editors of publications to the educational mission which might be fulfilled by free-lance workers such as art critics, and to the lack of consideration with which they were too often treated. In conclusion, M. Degand expressed his regret that, at a Congress held in Paris, no account should have been given of the various tendencies currently manifest in the Paris School.

M. Aldemar GEORGE (France) paid tribute to his compatriot, M. Degand, who had not hesitated to give up his column in a certain newspaper rather than yield to the pressure exercised to induce him to change his line of conduct.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the unanimous applause of the Congress showed that all those attending it associated themselves with that tribute to M. Degand's integrity and honesty.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the first aim of the Congress was to set up an International Association of Art Critics, whose task it would be to organize the future Congresses. The Association would be a Federation of national organizations, but these did not exist everywhere. France possessed the Syndicat de la Presse Artistique Française, so ably guided by MM. Edouard Saradin and Cogniat. He asked the representatives of other countries to re-create national bodies. The Paris International Bureau would be their central body.

M. COGNAT stressed that, in order to be efficient, the Bureau should have a limited number of members. The Syndicat, mentioned by the Chairman, grouped all those who contributed to Art in France. His own smaller group was, so to speak, the steering Committee of the Syndicat and it was on that model that it was proposed to set up the International body. The Information Bureau would have a wide field of action embracing Universities, Art Schools, Museums, etc.

On behalf of MM. dos Santos and Benturi, the CHAIRMAN announced that the next Congress on the History of Art would be held in 1949 in Portugal, at Easter and that it would have a Contemporary Art Section.

M. FOUNDOUKIDIS (Greece) pointed out that in all associations there must be Statutes. He suggested that the Bureau of the Congress should undertake the task of framing them and that it should contact the International Council on the History of Art and the International Council of Museums. He proposed a formula to renew the powers of the Bureau, and to adjourn the Congress and not close it, for the purposes he had stated.

The CHAIRMAN, after consulting his colleagues, announced that the Bureau accepted the task of framing the Statutes. Every one was most grateful for Unesco's welcome and hoped that it would consent to remain in contact with the organizing Committee, which would, of course include M. Cogniat. He thanked the French Minister of Education for the interest he had shown in the Congress and welcomed his representative, M. Robert Rey, Director of Plastic Arts in the Ministry.

M. REY said he was extremely sorry to have been unable to attend the previous meetings. He had been charged by his eminent chief to bring his greetings and good wishes to the Congress. He felt some apprehension that, owing to the present material difficulties, Art critics would be solicited towards publicity - M. Waldemar George interjected "Never" at that point (applause). - He welcomed that protest and felt sure that the projected Association would help critics to retain their independence. Finally he wished to congratulate M. Cogniat and Mme. Gilles Delafon for the work they had accomplished in connexion with the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN thought M. Rey stated the most important function of the future Association and asked him to convey to his chief the thanks of the Congress.

Mr. BELLEW told the Meeting that the Director General of Unesco, Dr. Julian Huxley, whose great personal interest in Arts and Letters was well-known, greatly regretted not being able to congratulate the Congress in person on the excellent work they had accomplished. Unesco's help would always be most willingly given to the new Association.

The CHAIRMAN was happy to hear Unesco's voice at the closing stage of the Congress as it had been heard at its beginning through the Assistant Director, M. Jean Thomas' opening remarks. Since Unesco's and the Association's aims were in harmony, the ensuing action would certainly also tally. He suggested that if there were no observations on the motions he was about to read, they would be considered as adopted.

Motions I to X, by MM. Raymond Soriano, dos Santos, Jules Paublan, Pierre Courthion, Louis Cheronnet, André Blum, Charles Estienne, Denys Sutton and Leon Degand were unanimously adopted.

Motion XI (R. Soriano) was also unanimously adopted after the Chairman had pointed out that the U.S.S.R. had accepted the invitation to send representatives to the Congress and stressed that every one regretted their absence.

Motion XII, presented by Sr. L. Venturi was unanimously adopted.

The Motion adopted earlier by the Congress in order to be able to send it without delay to the Brussels Conference on Copyright, was unanimously ratified.

Motion XIII presented to the Bureau providing for yearly Congresses was also unanimously adopted.

Motion XIV, presented by Mme. Margarita Nelken, was gratefully noted, but practical difficulties precluded its acceptance. The meeting agreed with the Chairman that the next meeting place should be Paris.

M. PICARD received the Chairman's assurance that the question of an international Critic's Card had not been overlooked.

Mr. P. BELLET informed the Congress that the matter of the Card was receiving Unesco's attention at the present moment, not only for critics but also for Art students. He hoped for a concrete result before the next Congress.

The CHAIRMAN welcomed that declaration as another proof of Unesco's interest. He announced that M. Cogniat held himself at the disposal of any one wishing for any supplementary information. He hoped it would be possible to give wide dissemination to the communications which had been made. He thanked all present for their attendance and help, M. Cogniat and Mme. Gilles Delafon for the organizing work they had accomplished, the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur - Mr. Denys Sutton, whose task was only beginning - for their assistance and Unesco, Paris and France for their hospitality.

(The Meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.)