

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ART CRITICS

7th General Assembly

OXFORD - LONDON

3rd - 9th July 1955

Summary record

PRESENT :

President : Paul PIERENS (Belgium)

Vice-Presidents : Pierre COURTHION (Switzerland), Sir Herbert READ (United Kingdom), James-Johnson SWEENEY (U.S.A.)

General Secretary : Mme S. GILIE-DELAFON (France)

Treasurer : Walter KERN (Switzerland)

Members : Franz ROH (German Section President), Eric NEWTON (British Section President), H.L.C. JAFFE (Dutch Section President), Thomas Mc GREEVY (Irish Section President), Giulio Carlo ARGAN (Italian Section President), Grgo GAMULIN (Yugoslav Section President).

Hanns Theodor FLEMING (German Section Secretary), Robert L. DELEVOY (Belgian Section Secretary), Bernard DENVER (British Section Secretary), Pierre JEANNERAT (British Section Treasurer), L.P.J. BRAAT (Dutch Section Secretary), C. DOEIDMAN (Dutch Section Treasurer), James WHITE (Irish Section Secretary), George H. GRAY (Irish Section Treasurer), Georges PEILLEX (Swiss Section Secretary), Aleksa CELEBONOVIC (Yugoslav Section Secretary).

Carl LINFERT (Germany), Eduard TRIER (Germany), Alfred FRANKFURTER (U.S.A.), Hans ANKOWICZ von KIEHOVEN (Austria), Werner HOFFMANN (Austria), Michael AYRTON (United Kingdom), Michael MIDDLETON (United Kingdom), Richard GAINSBOROUGH (United Kingdom), J.P. HODIN (United Kingdom), Frederic LAWS (United Kingdom), Mrs. Wilma MOY-THOMAS (United Kingdom), José GUDIOL (Spain), Jean BOURET (France), Mme Agnès HUMBERT (France), Jacques IASSAIGNE (France), Claude ROGER-MARX (France), Jean LEYMARIE (France), Panalotis A. MICHELIS (Greece), Mme van EMDE BOAS (Netherlands), A.M. HANGLACHER (Netherlands), R.E. PENNING (Netherlands), Hans REDEKER (Netherlands), Charles WENTINCK (Netherlands), Françoise HENRY (Ireland), Rosario ASSUNTO (Italy), Gillo DORFLES (Italy), G.C. GHIGLIONE (Italy), Cesare GNUDI (Italy), Mario LABO (Italy), Attilio PODESTA (Italy), Giorgio VIGNI (Italy), Mme GIEDION-WEICKER (Switzerland), Zahir GUVEMLI (Turkey), S. KEMAL-YETKIN (Turkey), Mme Edith HOFFMANN (Free Section), Sandor TORDAY (Free Section).

New Members : Renilda van den BRANDEN (Belgium), Ernst GOLDSCHMIDT (Belgium), David CIEGHORN THOMSON (United Kingdom), F. PARKINSON (United Kingdom), Pierre ROUVE (United Kingdom), G.S. SANDINALIS (United Kingdom), Julius STARZYNSKI (Poland), S. LORENTZ (Poland).

Representative of UNESCO : M. CORREA de AZEVEDO.

Report

--

OPENING SESSION

Sunday, 3 July, at 6 p.m.

Mr. Eric NEWTON, chairman of the British Section, in welcoming Mr. Paul FIERENS, President of the International Association of Art Critics, and the members of the Association, said that he had the pleasant duty both of welcoming them and of introducing the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford who had paid them the honour of attending the opening of the Conference.

It was now two years since the British Section, at the Dublin Conference, had proposed that the 1955 General Conference be held in England and one year since the official invitation to hold the meeting at Oxford and London had been accepted at the time of the Istanbul Conference. 3 July, which seemed so far away, had now arrived and it was a pleasant task to extend the warm welcome of the British Section. During the intervening period, a programme had been drawn up which, it was hoped, would be interesting from the artistic point of view as well as typically British. During the preparatory year, Mme Gille-Delafon had been unsparing in her efforts. He hoped that the programme would be both informative and entertaining. The British Section was ready to lavish all its attention on its guests and he hoped that the British climate would facilitate their efforts.

During its centuries of existence, the famous University of Oxford had trained thousands of distinguished men. There was, however, no likelihood that it had ever received a confraternity of art critics and there was little doubt that both they and the Chancellor, who represented one of the most famous universities of the world, would derive some benefit from this contact.

Those present had doubtlessly noticed that the English language had a peculiar genius for inventing "nouns of assembly", for example one spoke of a flock of birds, a shoal of fish, a herd of cattle, a pride of lions. But no special appellation yet existed for a body of art critics.

He thanked the Vice-Chancellor for his presence and invited him to address this "jargon" of art critics, if he could be permitted to coin that new name.

Mr. W.H. SMITH, Principal of New College and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, thanked the Chairman and the members of AICA who were present. He reminded his listeners that it was a tradition of the University of Oxford to extend a welcome to all kinds of groups of specialists. At the moment a conference of musicologists was in progress and a congress of physicians had taken place shortly before. He felt that Mr. Newton had not been very kind in speaking of a "jargon" of critics and thought that it would have been more apt to use the word "catalogue". He hoped that the meeting of AICA would be interesting and that its members would profit from the semi-monastic life of the Oxford Colleges and the architectural beauties of the University.

Mr. Paul FIERENS (Belgium), President of AICA, expressed his satisfaction that the Seventh General Assembly was taking place in Oxford, one of the great centres of intellectual life, and that the International Association of Art Critics was the guest of Wadham College, the studious atmosphere of which would be propitious for its work. He had no more need than he had had at Paris, Venice, Amsterdam, Zurich, Dublin or Istanbul, where the preceding conferences had been held, to emphasise the Association's attachment to freedom of thought. In England they breathed the very air of independence in an atmosphere of dignity and highest courtesy. For the members of AICA, it was a precious thing to be able to afterwards, in thinking back on these meetings, to associate them with the landscapes and works of art revealed to them in their various travels.

From the foundation of the Association, Eric Newton, Chairman of the British Section, and Sir Herbert Read, Vice-President of the Association, had played an active role. For this meeting they had been honoured by the patronage of the Ministry of Education, museums, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and he wished, on behalf of the Association, to thank not only them but also UNESCO, which had never ceased to lend its support in organising these meetings.

The absence of Raymond Cogniat, one of the founders of the Association, due to illness, was to be deplored. On the other hand, there was reason for satisfaction because of the appearance of the "Bollettino AICA", for which the Italian Section, Lionello Venturi and Carlo Argan were to be congratulated. During the year, Mme Gille-Delafor had been unceasing in keeping the chairmen of the National Sections imbued with enthusiasm. Pierre Jeannerat, Secretary and Treasurer of the British Section, had taken the organisation of the Conference on his shoulders with a great deal of courage.

AICA worked for art and artists. It maintained excellent relations with the International Association of Plastic Arts and harboured no jealousy for the special assistance that UNESCO accorded to that body. The critics needed to maintain contact more than artists, whose work is best done in solitude. It was necessary for them to travel, to widen their experience both of contemporary art and that of the past.

But, even more, the great advantage of such international meetings was the bonds of friendship they created. In the course of a few years, AICA had become a large fraternity. Its members therefore had the feeling that they were working for the peace of the world.

COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, 4 July, at 9.45 a.m.

The PRESIDENT in opening the meeting, requested the chairmen of the National Sections to give the names of those members they wished to propose for full membership. Their candidacies would then be submitted to the vote of the committee members present.

The German Section proposed : Mr. G.F. HARTLAUB.

The Austrian Section : Messrs. Karl GARZAROLLI and Eckhart KNAB.

The Belgian Section : Mesdames Renilda van den BRANDEN and Francine LEGRAND, Messrs. Paul DAVAY and Ernst GOLDSCHMIDT.

The British Section : Mr. L. ALLOWAY, Sir Leigh ASHTON, Messrs. Stephen BONE, David CLOUGHORN-THOMSON, Mervyn LEVY, Denis MATHEWS, F. PARKINSON, Bryan ROBERTSON, Sir John ROTHENSTEIN, Messrs. Pierre ROUVE, G.S. SANDILANDS.

The French Section : Messrs. Pierre DESCARGUES, Georges HUISMAN, Léon MOUSSINAC and Joseph PICHARD.

The Irish Section : Miss K.M. MURPHY.

The Italian Section : Messrs. Gino BACCHETTI, Eugenio BATTISTI and Riccardo MUSATTI.

The Mexican Section : Messrs. Samuel RAMOS and Manuel TOUSSAINT.

The Swiss Section : Mr. Franz MEYER-CHAGALL.

The Turkish Section : Messrs. Cevat M. ALTAR, R. EPIKMAN and Fuad PEKIN.

The Yugoslav Section : Messrs. Otto BIHALGI-MERIN, Stele FRANCE, Babić LJUBO, Radoslav PUTAR and Miodraž B. PROTIC.

The Free Section : Mr. Vladimiro VANEK.

After scrutiny, all these candidates were accepted.

Mme S. GILLE-DELAFFON (France), General-Secretary, informed the meeting that two sections in the process of formation were ready to be submitted for the approval of the Committee. Delegates had been sent by the Section that had been formed in Poland.

The two Sections concerned were

- a Polish Section with 12 members, of which the bureau of 5 could immediately be admitted to full membership. These 5 were the following : Messrs. Julius STARZYNSKI, Z. KEPINSKI, Stanislas LORENTZ, J. BIALOSTOCKI and M. POREBSKI.

- a Portuguese Section with 5 full members : Messrs. Reynaldo Dos SANTOS, Luis REIS-SANTOS, Adriano GUSMAO, Diego de MACEDO and Armando VIEIRA SANTOS.

The two Sections were admitted after a show of hands.

Mr. CORREA de AZEVEDO, UNESCO representative, recommended that the establishment of Asiatic Sections be encouraged, thus promoting closer relations between East and West.

The PRESIDENT pointed out that Sections were being formed in various countries, namely South Africa, Canada, Cuba, India, Israel, the Lebanon, Sweden and Uruguay, and it was hoped that they would shortly be ready for admission.

The meeting rose at 10.45 a.m.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Monday, 4 July, at 10.45 a.m.

- - - - -

The PRESIDENT declared the General Assembly open and announced the admission of Full Members and National Sections that had just been agreed to by the Committee. He then announced that the examination of the Association's relationship with UNESCO, included on the agenda of the third session would take place during the second session, as Mr. Correa de Azevedo, the UNESCO representative, would not be able to attend the last session.

The Chairman proposed that a telegram be sent to Mr. Raymond COGNAT, expressing regret and wishing him improved health. This was unanimously agreed to. He then asked for a rapporteur to be appointed for the session.

On the proposal of Mr. Eric Newton, Chairman of the British Section, Mr J.P. HODIN was appointed rapporteur. The Chairman then called firstly on the General Secretary and then on the Treasurer of AICA to submit the Secretary's Report and Treasurer's Report for the current year.

In submitting her report, Mme S. GILIE-DELAFFON pointed out that the year for which the report was to be given was a short one, consisting only of the 8 months that had gone by since the Istanbul Conference, which was still fresh in the memory of all those who had had the opportunity of participating. The dominant impression for the year 1954-55 was that AICA had passed out of its infancy and had now reached full maturity. In fact, the Association in entering its seventh year was expanding continually in a harmonious atmosphere manifested by effective and relevant acts. The facts were there to prove this. There was an increasing number of Sections, the amount of work was expanding, the financial position was on a firmer basis and its authority was being increasingly asserted.

This was not merely vain self-congratulation. The moment that the keenness of its members showed signs of slackening would be the time to point out that they were shirking their obligations. At the moment, AICA was making its members conscious of themselves. They liked to meet each other and undertake mutual tasks. AICA was therefore fulfilling the aims laid down in its statutes and forming its *raison d'être* in a happy atmosphere. It was protecting their moral and professional interests, giving meaning to the rights of its members, and promoting international exchanges of art and information.

In doing so, the Association was participating in the most noble task offered to man in our time, art critics included, namely, bringing nations closer together.

She had reported that the number of Sections was increasing. At the 6th General Conference, held at Istanbul, three new Sections, those of Egypt, Spain and Yugoslavia, had been admitted, while the present Conference had just admitted two others, those of Poland and Portugal. This meant that AICA now had 25 Sections, while it could be expected that other Sections now being formed would be admitted in the future.

She had also announced that the tasks of AICA were increasing. There were the large international surveys entrusted to them by UNESCO, and the first task undertaken after the Amsterdam Conference of 1951 had been the establishment of a society for the protection of copyright, as necessary for writers on art as for artists, the foundation of the French Section. Two years ago, the collection of the Archives of Contemporary Art had been started. At the moment, three Sections were employed on that task. These were the American Section for Dadaism, the French Section for Cubism and the Italian Section for Futurism. The project seemed destined to expand a great deal as other sections had reported their intention of participating.

New activities were also being arranged. These were being undertaken in connection with a "Terminology of Art Criticism". In undertaking that task, AICA would be working even more for the greater advantage of art as, if the public were to be believed, the critics no longer succeeded in making themselves understood. If, as a beginning, they should succeed in reaching understanding among themselves, a first important step would have been taken. The Dutch Section had suggested that it should devote itself to this task, which would also be undertaken by the French and Italian sections. Finally, the Italian Section had succeeded in producing a bulletin and their success in that was a great encouragement to AICA.

These were only the practical tasks and took no account of the aesthetic studies made, the extent of which had already created a considerable impression on art circles. But AICA's projects did not stop there. Its aims included promoting information and international exchanges of art. For who should keep the world informed on the production of artists and organise international exhibitions? This was a task that AICA had several times considered carrying out. The extent of such an undertaking was such that they would not be able to devote themselves to it without UNESCO aid, since that body's tasks were educative and informative. In spite of its slender means, AICA had nevertheless fulfilled this aim by the distribution of 88,000 exhibition catalogues since its foundation.

Finally, she had reported that the Association's finances were on a sound basis. Members were now paying their subscriptions regularly, and this allowed the Association to meet its inevitable expenses. AICA's thanks were due to UNESCO as the comprehensive aid given by that organisation had enabled five international congresses and seven general assemblies to be held. Collaboration with that body had been extremely profitable and had both given art critics the opportunity of participating in the magnificent work of UNESCO and allowed the latter to back the efforts of those for whom art was the chief reason for existence. Consistent aid had also been given by Mr. Georges WILDENSTEIN, an honorary member of the Association.

One of the proofs that AICA was being recognised as an authoritative body was the number of cases in which its members were called upon as experts on international juries. Among those must be mentioned the committee of experts for colour reproductions, UNESCO catalogues, the committee of experts for UNESCO Headquarters, the jury for the Venice Biennial, the jury for the Sao Paulo Biennial, the jury for drawing up lists of insufficiently known artists, and finally the jury for a new international prize for artists, the most valuable that had yet been created and details of which would be announced in the near future.

The conclusion could therefore be drawn that AICA was on the right road to a successful future. The enthusiasm of its members must now be stimulated.

Mr. Walter KERN (Switzerland), Treasurer, stated that the past year had been a prosperous one, as their funds had never been so large. In September 1954, at the moment of the Istanbul Congress, there was a credit of 1,251.55 Swiss francs. To-day, after the deficit of the Secretariat in Paris amounting to 18,454 French francs had been covered, the Association still had a total of 1,944.57 Swiss francs in the bank. In the absence of auditors, the speaker wished to give some explanation on the method of bookkeeping employed. Every payment not going directly to the account of AICA at the Thurgovian Cantonal Bank was deposited to that account by the treasurer, and the members' contribution entered in the members' book. The balance of AICA's bank account was therefore the exact amount of the Association's credit. The treasurer's only expenses were therefore postages, deducted every six months, and generally in the neighbourhood of from 15 to 20 Swiss francs.

The accounts for the Paris Secretariat for 1954 were then approved as follows :

<u>Credit</u>	<u>Debit</u>	
Full membership subscriptions .. 54.000 (received in Paris) Membership admissions Istanbul . 138.000 (received in Paris) 1/2 UNESCO subvention 175.000 (paid in Paris)	1953 Balance 56.010 Expenses Secretariat 85.116 (including sending of catalogues) Conferences : - Balance Dublin Conference 34.481 - Istanbul Conference : Membership fees refunded 138.000 Duplicating, translations, postages <u>71.847</u> 244.326	
1/2 UNESCO subvention (paid in Istanbul) Turkish Pounds .. 1398.60 French francs 367.000	Indemnity to full members and rapporteurs : Turkish Pounds .. 1398.60 French francs 385.454	

Debit, 31 December 1954 : 18.454 French francs refunded by the Treasurer.

The reports were approved and the provisions of the budget retained without alteration.

The Chairman thanked the Secretary and Treasurer and observed that it was a pleasure to note that optimism reigned both on the secretarial and financial sides.

Because of the lecture on English Art to be given by Prof. T.S.R. Boose, the meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.

Second Session

Tuesday, 5 July, at 2.30 p.m.

- - - - -

In opening the session, the Chairman stated that the meeting would now proceed with the renewal of the committee, a task that he always found delicate. At the Istanbul Congress, it had been impossible to reach a solution mathematically and it had been decided to re-elect the committee as it stood. Such a subterfuge could not be employed on this occasion as the number of members had to be automatically increased by a number corresponding to the national sections that had just been admitted.

On the national level, no section had submitted any changes with regard to the two members each had to nominate. The Polish section, newly admitted, would be represented on the committee by the members present at the conference, namely Messrs. Julius STARZYNSKI and Stanislas LORENTZ, and the Portuguese Section by its two chairmen, Messrs. Reynaldo DOS SANTOS and Luis REIS-SANTOS.

On the international level, an equal number of members was to be elected. Consequently, the new committee would consist of 50 members. The retiring members were those elected in 1952. There were 16 of them, as follows : Mr. Antonio BENTO (Brazil), Mme Anne-Marie BRIZIO (Italy), Messrs. Bernard CHAMPIGNEULLE (France), André CHASTEL (France), C. DOELMAN (Netherlands), Pierre FRANCASTEL (France), Mme GIBDION-WEICKER (Switzerland), Messrs. W. Jos. de GRUYTER (Netherlands), A.H. HAMMA-CHER (Netherlands), Luc HAESAERTS (Belgium), Paul HAESAERTS (Belgium), René HUYGHE (France), Jean LEYMARIE (France), Ludwig MUNZ (Austria), Mme NICCO-PASOLA (Italy), Mr. Rodolfo PALLUCCHINI (Italy).

The retiring members were all eligible for re-election, and the following members, whom he was happy to see were present, were also candidates : Mme Agnès HUMBERT (France), Messrs. Panafotis A. MICHELIS (Greece) and Claude ROGER-MARX (France).

If all these candidates were accepted, the committee would have one member too many. The Chairman therefore announced that a ballot would have to be taken.

Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE (France) said that the Assembly had always tried to avoid that method of election. In taking into account that the French Section had been particularly favoured at the current session, he proposed that, to facilitate matters, they should abandon one of their seats on the committee and that André CHASTEL, who was one of the retiring members, would not then stand for re-election, although he would naturally submit his name for the following year. Such a solution would enable the whole list to be elected.

The Chairman thought it regrettable to accept the solution offered, especially since André CHASTEL was a credit to the Association and had many friends among its members.

After discussion, the proposal was finally accepted and the list of candidates elected en bloc.

The existing Bureau was retained on the general acclamation of those present.

LIST OF CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS

whose work deserves to be better known

The Chairman announced that work on the establishment of lists of "artists whose work deserves to be better known", as requested by UNESCO, would be begun. He called on the representative of UNESCO.

Mr. CORREA de AZEVEDO, of the UNESCO Arts and Letters Division, pointed out that the subvention that AICA would henceforth receive from UNESCO was for a task directly linked with that organisation's programme. In the field of the Plastic Arts, UNESCO was trying to obtain wider diffusion of art masterpieces by means of reproductions either in colour or in black and white. This had resulted in exhibitions which were highly successful and scores of which had taken place, enabling the inhabitants of countries where works of art were inaccessible to become familiar with those works which would better help them towards an improved understanding of art and its history, by means of reproductions selected by experts. With the same aim in view, a series of albums had also been brought out. Until then, these had mainly been reproductions of works to be found in art galleries, but the latest programme was giving attention to contemporary work in general. In the field of the plastic arts the choice was particularly difficult and it was for this reason that UNESCO had requested the aid of art critics to indicate which were the contemporary artists whose work was deserving of being better known, i.e. artists who were not known beyond their national frontiers. With this aim in view, a contract had been made with AICA with reference to the establishment of lists of artists that UNESCO could then have at its disposal for submission to art publishers. AICA was to nominate a committee of experts which would work in conjunction with UNESCO through the intermediary of its Secretariat and which would submit the lists before the end of the year.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. de Azevedo and assured him of the gratitude of the members of AICA for having obtained this subvention without which the Association would not be able to hold its assemblies and congresses. He then asked Mr. de Azevedo in what sense the term "contemporary artists" was to be understood.

Mr. CORREA de AZEVEDO observed that "lists of living artists" was meant and that, in the parallel programme for music, contemporary composers had been defined as those born after 1880. Nevertheless, the committee of experts should decide on a definition for itself.

The Chairman then reminded all the National Sections that they were to send to the Secretariat lists of proposed experts and artists. It should be clear that the experts should be chosen from among those members of AICA most qualified in the subject of modern art. Such a list of experts should be drawn up immediately.

A scrutiny of the lists sent by the National Sections would be made by the 15 experts composing the jury, i.e. Mr. Paul FIERENS, Sir Herbert READ, Messrs. Lionello VENTURI, J.J. SWEENEY, Will GROHMANN, Raymond COGNAT, Jean CASSOU, G.C. ARGAN, Pierre COURTHION, H.L.C. JAFFE, Umbro APOLLONIO, J. ROMERO-BREST, Mme C. GIEDION-WELCKER, Jean LEYMARIE, Rodolfo PALLUCCHINI.

The Chairman then dealt with the lists of artists. He reported that 18 lists had already been received and that others had been announced. Some included the names of six artists, others only a single name, as was the case with the Luxembourg list.

Mr. Alfred FRANKFURTER (U.S.A.) requested that, since AICA had been invited by UNESCO to choose a class of artists' works for reproduction and publication by that body, the choice should be finally approved by a committee appointed for that purpose. This should be done so that this new activity of AICA be executed with the desired dignity and quality.

Mr. CORREA de AZEVEDO emphasised that in cases involving young and unknown artists, the UNESCO Secretariat reserved the right of applying to the AICA Secretariat for information on these artists and their work.

After a short break, the session continued.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY (U.S.A.) pointed out that the list of experts was so composed that certain areas, such as Scandinavia, Spain and Portugal, were not represented.

After discussion, three additional members were appointed to the jury, namely, Messrs. J. GUDIOL (Spain), J. STARZYNSKI (Poland), N. BERK (Turkey). Other names were also proposed, but Mme GILLE-DELAPOIN observed that they had not been asked for a list of experts from a regional point of view, but for a jury consisting of the 15 members most qualified for their knowledge of modern art.

The Chairman then called on the Chairmen of the National Sections to submit their reports.

REPORTS OF THE CHAIRMEN OF NATIONAL SECTIONS

Mr. Franz ROH, chairman of the German Section, informed the meeting that, since the Istanbul Conference, the Section's activity had been directed towards closer co-operation with parallel bodies so as the better to resist growing reactionary tendencies. A general meeting of the Section, such as that which had been so successful at Darmstadt and Frankfurt during the preceding year, had not been held this year but one was anticipated in the autumn. Of the members of the Section, Messrs. Carl LINFERT, Will GROHMANN and Eduard TRIER had participated in the work of the German Arts Council which aimed at organising travelling exhibitions of contemporary German art in order to awaken public interest and develop a critical sense. It had also held exhibitions of contemporary German art abroad. Among the latter should be mentioned the important exhibition on non-figurative painting and sculpture in Germany, held at the Cercle Volney in Paris under the patronage of the Galerie

Drouin, of which Will GROHMANN and Carl LINFERT had been the organisers. Another exhibition of the same type, called the "ZEN-Group", had been held under the patronage of Mr. Werner HAPTMANN, Mme Juliana ROH and the speaker. The Section had also had the idea of sending one of its members as artistic adviser to the "Kulturverband der Deutschen Industrie", a German industrial organisation which bought contemporary works of art and gave prizes to young artists, but this plan had come to nothing. The increasing reaction against modern art had led to an official protest from the Section and individual protests from several of its members, in particular H. Th. FLEMING, when statues of Heiligei and Hartung, which had been put up in a new school, were withdrawn. The statues were still there. Another example of this reaction was at Kassel, where the plans of a modern architect, Mr. Scharoun, for the new theatre had first been accepted, but where, finally, the building had been entrusted to a conventional architect.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY, chairman of the American Section, reported that the Section's activity had been mainly concentrated on preparing an important project, which he would describe at the next session.

The Argentine section sent no report this year.

Mr. Otto BENESCH, chairman of the Austrian Section, reported that the members of his Section had concentrated mainly on art education through exhibitions and lectures. Mr. Ludwig MUNZ had organised an exhibition on European Art at the Museum of Applied Arts and, in conjunction with Messrs. GLUCK, NOVOTNY, BENESCH and KNAB, had demonstrated the historic continuity of the forms of modern art by means of the representation of its development. This exhibition was exceptionally successful and made a positive contribution towards helping the Viennese public overcome their ingrained prejudices against modern art. During the exhibition a series of lectures on topics connected with modern art was held. Among those taking part were Mme GLEDION-WEICKER and professors HAHN-LOSER, ROTEL, BENESCH and NOVOTNY. To make the artists of the second half of the 19th century better known to the Austrian public, another two exhibitions were organised, one on the Austrian landscape painters from Schindler to Klimt and another in memory of Cecil van Haanen. These were arranged by professors MUNZ and BENESCH. The work of an important impressionist, Wilhelm THONY, was introduced by GARZAROLLI and NOVOTNY. Books on the art of the 19th and 20th century were published by members. To make 20th century Austrian art better known abroad, Albertina had organised a travelling exhibition. Several members of the Section were also associated in the activities of the Society for the Development of Austrian Art and the Austrian Industrial Association.

In the absence of Mr. Charles BERNARD, chairman of the Belgian Section, Mr. Paul FIERENS read the Belgian report. He informed the meeting that the membership of the national association was unchanged, i.e. 65 members, 20 of whom were full members of AICA and ten others associate members. The 1953-54 Prix de la Critique, which was a moral award decided following monthly selections, would only be attributed during the current year. Its task had been made more elastic in that it chose not only the best exhibition but the best exhibitions. Those exhibitions retained for final selection were the following :

October	:	Van Lint, Jespers, Tajéri
November	:	Magnelli, Jacobsen, Delahaut
December	:	None
January	:	Manessier, Duboscq, H. Bertrand, Doucet
February	:	Mendelson, Dorchy
March	:	Nicholson, Lismondi, Neerbergen
April	:	Alechinsky, Dewasne, Mortier
May	:	None

Apart from the competitive interest it had for the artists, this effort was a pretext for the group of critics to hold regular meetings. Finally, it enabled the general tendency of critical orientation to be observed. During their meetings, there were controversies on museum organisation and the origin of abstract art in Belgium. The Association also had to make a stand and initiate a press campaign on behalf of the service responsible for arranging exhibitions of Belgian art abroad as the result of a reactionary motion of the Royal Academy. The Belgian Association of Art Critics would be extremely happy to welcome the General Conference of AICA to Brussels in 1958, on the occasion of the first universal exhibition held since the war.

The Brazilian Section sent no report as its time was at present fully taken up in working for the Sao Paulo Biennial.

Mr. Eric NEWTON, chairman of the British Section, said that, contrary to what had happened in the case of the German and American Sections who had had to struggle against conservative and reactionary forces, the British Section was lucky enough to be able to deal with an official body, subsidised by the Government, namely "The ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN", which was on the side of progress and experiment in the field of the arts. The problems facing the British Section were financial, in a country which believed in art but refused to pay for it. The main occupation of the Section during the year had been the preparation of the General Conference in Oxford and London. It was for this reason that the annual British Critics Prize had not yet been given.

In the Absence of Mr. Walter SCHWARTZ, chairman of the Danish Section, Mr. Sigurd SCHULTZ, the Secretary of the Section, reported that an important campaign had been conducted by the Section against the State Broadcasting System, which had suppressed the art reports that had been a source of discontent in a society of backward views. After a controversy which lasted for more than two months and received wide publicity in the press, the Section obtained a statement from the State Broadcasting System, guaranteeing the independence and integrity of art critics. In addition, the Section had increased its circle of members, which from then on would include writers on art in general and art historians.

Mr. Bishr FARES, chairman of the Egyptian Section, and Mr. Osman R. ROSTEM could not attend the Conference, the latter for the reason that he had been asked by the Government to go to Nubia to arrange for the salvage of Egyptian monuments threatened through the construction of a barrage. It was reported that requests had been made to the Director-General of the Department of Antiquities and the Controller-General for the Fine Arts, so that the membership card of AICA would allow entry to museums.

Mr. J. GUDIOL, representing Mr. J. CANON AZNAR, chairman of the Spanish Section, absent, informed the meeting that the Section's main activity during the year had been the establishment of archives of Spanish art of the modern era. A publication had been begun in which there would henceforth be regular news on the activities of AICA both in Spain and abroad.

In the absence of Mr. Raymond COGNAT, chairman of the French Section, Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE read its report. Its activities had been restricted but, nevertheless, discussion on problems arising out of the establishment of the Association for the Protection of Copyright had continued. Useful contacts with the Association of the Plastic Arts had been maintained. Finally, he had to announce the preparations for an International Encyclopaedia of Contemporary Art which was being undertaken by Messrs. COGNAT and Waldemar GEORGE. The co-operation of AICA members would be sought.

The speaker then gave some information on the subject of copyright. The Association for its protection which had been formed in France now counted 500 artist-members. The Paris Courts had decided that any new mandate signed by the artist would annul previous mandates which, in most cases, did not exist. During the year that had just ended, the Association had received 2 million francs that had immediately been handed over to the artists, something which had until then never been done. The situation had improved for artists for, because of this fact, the Association was compelled to function in a more regular way. It was of little use to critics, who had demonstrated their impartiality in trying the experiment. When the experiment had proved itself in France, it could be extended to other countries, particularly Belgium, where the bodies concerned were still founded on the old bases. Also to be regularised were certain problems connected with the right to sue, which differed in France and other countries where the laws were dissimilar and do not allow of any exchanges of rights for reproductions.

Mr. Tony SPITERIS, representing Mr. Demetre EVANGHELIDES, chairman of the Greek Section, reported that members of the Section had met during the year and that, following approaches made to the Athens School of Fine Arts, they had succeeded in arranging for free residence for members of other sections who wished to visit Greece. They would be assured of lodgings in the School's summer resorts at Hydra, Mycene, Delphi and Rhodes, and could obtain a reduction of 20 to 35 % on Greek ships if they applied to the Secretariat of the Greek Section. A project for an annual critics prize for a Greek artist had been examined, and at the General Meeting the foundation of an international critics prize, to be judged by an international committee, had been suggested.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE, chairman of the Dutch Section, announced that Mr. Gérard KNUTTEL had been made Honorary President of the Section. An attempt to establish a critics prize had failed, but further attempts would be made. The study of the terminology of art criticism, which had been entrusted to the Section after Mr. KNUTTEL had given them the idea, had been conducted by Mme Van ENDE BOAS, Mr. REDECKER and the speaker. The Section regretted to announce two cases of plagiarism, one of which had resulted in a resignation. The Section was trying to obtain a seat on the Art Council and also to find a solution to the problem of lodgings for foreign colleagues.

Mr. Thomas McGREEVY, chairman of the Irish Section, informed the meeting that he, and the members of his Section, had decided to distribute to artists the catalogues and art books sent to them. The society "Living Art in Ireland" would help to carry out this plan and also in the annual exhibition. By using its influence with the Combarle Ealaion (Arts Council), the Section was able to obtain the financial assistance for a student of art history, with a scholarship in Rome and anxious to study modern art in Paris, which would enable her to remain there for six months. In their capacity as lecturers, several members were able to note the interest in art manifested in the country and the foundation of a publication to guide and develop this tendency was being envisaged.

In the absence of Mr. C.G. ARGAN, chairman of the Italian Section, Mr. Rosario ASSUNTO explained that the Section's activity had been mainly concentrated on the archives of contemporary art, the publication of a bulletin and the professional status of the art critic. Another effort, namely courses on contemporary art in the classical secondary schools of the principal Italian cities, had had to be momentarily abandoned. This was also the case for the projected international competition of art critics.

Mr. ARGAN, the chairman, would himself give a report on the work done in connection with the archives at the third session.

Thanks to the publishers "Comunita", who took care of publication and diffusion, the publication of the Bulletin had been rendered possible. This Bulletin appeared quarterly and, apart from AICA news, published scientific or critical articles. The Bulletin was at the disposal of the Secretary-General and the different national sections, and invited the technical and professional co-operation of all members. In publishing the Bulletin, as in all its activities, the Italian Section intended to work as an integral part of AICA.

The study of the definition of the art critic from the professional, legal and economic angle (working contract, expert opinion, legal advice, the establishment of a professional register of art critics) was being conducted by the committee appointed at the National Conference held in Rome in 1954, and including Messrs. CIARIETTA, MALTESE, MASELLI and VENTUROLI. The Section was also concerning itself in the relationship between art critics and tourist services, as the great art exhibitions were usually organised by tourist authorities. The next National Conference, which would take place in Turin during September, would go into this question. Finally, the Section worked together with various associations on the cultural level.

Although the Section was not rich, it received support from a large number of art-loving bodies and individuals. Among these were the Office of the Director for Cultural Relations in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Chief Commissariat for Tourist Travel, the Office of the Director for Antiquities and Fine Arts, the publishers Comunita, the Olivetti Company and Advocate Riecardo Gualino. The Section was now busy with the preparatory work of organising the next AICA Conference, which would take place in Naples and Sicily in 1957.

The Japanese Section sent no report and its prolonged silence was deplored.

Mr. Joseph FUNCK, chairman of the Luxembourg Section, and Mr. J.E. MULIER, secretary, reported that the Art Critics Prize had not been given as no exhibition of a Luxembourg artist had been considered sufficiently important. Catalogues of exhibitions had been sent to the Secretariat.

Mr. J.J. CRESPO de la SERNA, vice-chairman of the Mexican Section, informed the meeting of his intention to examine the position of all members of his Section in the near future, with regard to payment of their subscriptions. Two new members had been proposed during the current year. The Vice-President maintained constant contact with the Secretariat.

Mr. Pierre COURTHION, chairman of the Swiss Section, said that lack of means had prevented his Section from extending its activities as it would have wished. But through its active Secretary, Georges PEILLEX, its chief preoccupation was to make its existence known to the authorities. Several letters had been exchanged with the Federal Counsellor in order that the Section might participate in the juries organised by the Federal Commission for the Fine Arts. The choice of works shown in the Swiss Pavilion at the last Venice Biennial made the urgency of this co-operation comprehensible. Nevertheless, the authorities continued to ignore the assistance of the Section and to refuse all travel subsidies for its members, while most of the other sections of AICA received such help from their governments. Mr. Alfred SCHEIDEGGER, treasurer of the Section, hoped to be able to interest industrial circles in the establishment of a critics prize to be attributed to a Swiss artist. Finally, the Section would propose that the General Conferences of AICA be held in Paris.

The Czech Section continued to remain silent. The Secretariat, however, was happy to have renewed contact with Mr. Jira KOTALIK.

In the absence of Mr. Nouroullah BERK, chairman of the Turkish Section, Mr. S. KEMAL YETKIN first thanked the Chairman, Secretary-General and members of AICA who had participated in the Istanbul Conference of the previous year, and said that the art circles in his country still entertained a vivid memory of the conference. The main activity of the Section, until the present, referred to the press. It had been crowned with success and the increasing prominence given to the arts in the daily and periodical press, as well as the increasing number of publications on ancient and modern art, could be observed. In addition, a step forward had been taken in organising artists' exhibitions. A campaign in favour of moral art had been conducted and the speaker had proposed to the National Assembly the passing of a law on the percentage to be set aside for the arts in the official buildings to be constructed. Private enterprise had been the first to subscribe. The difficulty in finding funds had unfortunately prevented any participation in the Biennials of Venice and Sao Paulo. On the other hand, they would participate in exhibitions organised under the aegis of UNESCO, and an exhibition of contemporary Turkish painting was contemplated for 1956.

Mr. Grgo GAMULIN, Chairman of the Yugoslav Section, reported that Yugoslav art critics, henceforward members of the AICA Section, were trying to consolidate their organisation and increase their activity. At the plenary session of the Section, held at Zagreb, reports on the state of art criticism in the various centres of the Federated Republics had been submitted. The choice of full members and associate members for submission to AICA had been carried out with great care. Several

art centres existed in the country, the most important of which were Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, and the number of 13 members of which the Section consisted was not excessive. The situation was peculiar because of the fact that those who ordered works of art, such as businesses, factories, workers co-operatives, were not always individuals whose taste had been developed. In order to avoid a lowering in the standard, an increase in the number of members and the undertaking of more intense critical activity was being considered. This had led the Section to recognise the need of founding a professional body which would enable their scattered forces to come together. A review which would constitute the nucleus of this collaboration was also being considered. The Section, where widely differing opinions united by the same love of art came together, believed in the possibility of setting up archives of contemporary art. It was at the moment busy in establishing contacts with other national sections of AICA and, with this aim in view, had proposed an exchange of lecturers with the Italian Section, an exchange that it would like to see extended to include other sections.

Mr. Julius STARZYNSKI, chairman of the Polish Section, gave a few explanations on the Section that had just been admitted. It included 12 members, among which were the editors-in-chief of reviews. There were three reviews in Poland, one of which dealt with contemporary art and the others with the history of art and the theories of art respectively. The Section, in co-operation with these reviews, aimed chiefly at making known to the public and young artists the problems of contemporary art throughout the world. An international exhibition of the graphic arts would take place in Warsaw during the coming year, by means of which the Section hoped to make all the tendencies of modern art known to the public.

The Chairman thanked the Chairmen of the various National Sections and closed the meeting.

Third Session

Wednesday, 6 July, at 9 a.m.

- - - - -

The Chairman, after opening the session, announced that Mr. SWEENEY wished to make an announcement.

Mr J.J. SWEENEY informed the meeting of a far-reaching project of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, which was at the moment looking into the establishment of a prize for artists, the amount of which would be particularly high.

In the first place, the project envisaged the giving of national prizes by the national sections and then an international prize, the jury for which would consist of members of AICA, ICOM and AIAP. The Guggenheim Foundation Prize could only be given to a living artist and for a recent work. The essential aim of the prize, which would be attributed every two years, was the encouragement of art. Nevertheless, the plan must remain secret until the final details of its workings had been completed, and the speaker requested the audience to make no communication to the press on the subject.

Mr. Sweeney's announcement then gave rise to a number of questions from those present.

The Chairman expressed the feelings of AICA on the subject of the proposal that Mr. Sweeney had just made, thanking him and promising him the wholehearted co-operation of the Association's members. In addition, he asked him to inform the generous donors of the prize of their enthusiasm and desire to co-operate in this splendid project.

The meeting was then thrown open to members wishing to submit various proposals to the Conference.

Mr. J.P. HODIN (Great Britain) pointed out that there were several artists of value who were now living, of their own free will or as a result of various political circumstances, in countries of which they were not natives. Whether they were naturalised in their adopted countries or not, such artists were never represented in international exhibitions such as the Biennial of Venice, Sao Paulo, Antwerp (Middelheim), the Triennial of Milan, etc., as such manifestations received works that were usually selected from a national point of view. He felt that AICA could undertake the necessary action and get in touch with the exhibitions referred to, in order to give such artists the opportunity of showing their works. A selection committee could be appointed to choose such artists. National Sections would be asked to draw up a list of artists of value living under such conditions.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE (Netherlands) observed that AICA, in the same way as UNESCO and the Association the Plastic Arts, should concern itself with the protection of works of art. He therefore proposed that the following resolution be adopted :

The General Conference of the International Association of Art Critics, conscious of its responsibility towards works of art both of the past and of the present, alarmed by the facts recently made public on the use, even experimental, of atomic bombs, appealing to the conscience of the world, recommends that all countries ratify the Hague Convention on the protection of monuments and works of art, and that the members of AICA keep a watch over the protection of such works in their countries.

The two motions with regard to displaced artists and the protection of works of art were adopted.

The Chairman, passing to the next item on the agenda, brought up the question of "The Terminology of Art Criticism" that had been proposed by Mr. Gérard KNUITEL, chairman of the Dutch Section.

Mme Magda Van EDME BOAS (Netherlands) read an important paper on the subject. (Her paper has been published separately).

The Chairman thanked Mme Van EDME BOAS for the considerable task she had carried out, which could serve as a basis to the general survey to be undertaken. He thought that everyone agreed that a Dictionary of Comparative Terminology be drawn up. The task was an extremely important one. Mr. J. ROJERO BREST (Argentine) had proposed a subject that was somewhat similar and should be informed. At the moment, the task was merely to distribute the work to be done among the National Sections.

M. Claude ROGER-MARX (France) drew the meeting's attention to the importance and urgency of this task. As an example, he quoted terms at present constantly used, such as "reactionary art", "progressive art", "advance art", "conservative art", "traditional art", "non-traditional art", terms that could not be defined, as no one was able to say to what these terms really referred. Vagueness in defining one's terms led to confusion.

The Chairman proposed that, for the study of this problem, every country should bring suggestions to the next Assembly in 1956 which, generally speaking, would be responsible for preparing the work of the 1957 Congress.

The next item, viz. Art and Education, an exchange of practical experiences, was then discussed.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE proposed that the various sections exchange their practical experiences in this field which experts sometimes called "Education through Art" and sometimes "Education to Art".

The Chairman, after announcing that the study of contacts between publishers and writers on art would be postponed to the next meeting because of Mr. R. COGNAT's absence, came to the next question, viz. the establishment of a Translators Institute in Switzerland.

Mr. Pierre COURTHION (Switzerland) pointed out that this would not be an institute, but a clearing house (maison commune), as Mr. Walter KERN had described, where information on translators would be centralised, every section naming the translators it recommended.

The Chairman then called on those members who had been delegated to submit a report on the Archives of Contemporary Art.

Mr. G.C. ARGAN (Italy) informed the meeting that work on the Archives of Contemporary Art on the subject of Futurism had continued during the year. Psychological difficulties had been encountered, often raised by what was to be classified under Futurism. Apart from such difficulties, the task was on the way to developing favourably as the Italian Section had obtained a Government subvention, 200,000 lire from the Office of the Director of University Education, as the task was being undertaken with the aid of the Italian universities. The University of Rome had been delegated with examining and undertaking research for the Archives of Futurism, and this was the best possible guarantee of a scientific job of work. 50 % of the documentation had up to now been collected. There still remained some research to be carried out in foreign libraries possessing material on the subject, and for this purpose the Secretariat would be asked to appeal for the assistance of the members of the various sections.

Moreover, archives on the Turin painters had been undertaken. This was a group of six painters who had worked in Turin between 1928 and 1933. Mlle A.M. BRIZIO, who was a professor at the University of Turin, had been delegated with the organisation of research in the three universities on the trends in painting in Turin after the First World War. Financial aid, which was remitted to the university colleges, was received from Mr. GUALINO, an industrialist of that city. In Italy, therefore, the work on the Archives of Contemporary Art was being done by the universities, through the initiative and with the aid of AICA. Assistance in undertaking the compilation of the Archives of Contemporary Architecture in Italy was still expected from prominent citizens of Milan, especially those connected with the Triennial. It was perhaps more important to undertake the compilation of architectural archives, as architecture is a difficult subject for criticism, and information on it was rarer. For this, too, the help of their foreign colleagues would be necessary, but it was expected that they would give their aid with the same enthusiasm that they would be sure of finding in Italy.

The Chairman congratulated Mr. ARGAN for the remarkable progress he had achieved for the Archives of Contemporary Art in Italy, to which new chapters had been added after that on Futurism.

Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE, representing Mr. Pierre FRANCASTEL (France), absent, submitted the report on the Archives of Contemporary Art that had been begun in France. The subject of these was Cubism. A thesis on the history of Cubism, submitted by Mr. Guy HARASQUE, would be accepted by the Sorbonne and be published in 1956. Research on the expansion of Cubism after 1920 would be carried on later. In addition, the publication of Robert Delaunay's papers, edited by Mr. FRANCASTEL, was ready and would also appear in 1956. The documentation and photography of these two publications would be sent to the Library of Art and Archaeology in Paris, where they could then be consulted.

Mr. José GUDIOL requested that AICA should get some agreement on the way in which the archives were to be organised. A line of conduct should be determined, so that all sections would be able to participate in the work, research centres should be set up in the various countries, to be managed by AICA and where all documentation on modern artists of the country concerned would be collected. Those particularly interested in the establishment of these Archives should meet. At Barcelona, the Amatler and Madeira Institutes had been founded, where negatives of all important works shown everywhere were kept. A total of 30,000 negatives per annum was collected. If the same was done in every country, such national selections, put at the service of the public, would constitute a source of the highest importance for art students, critics and teachers.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY stated that the American Section had continued with the work it had undertaken for the compilation of the archives of the Dadaist movement from 1915 to 1921. The task was being carried out by the study secretaries of the Guggenheim Museum and the Philadelphia Art Gallery where, thanks to the recent gift of a collection, were to be found extremely valuable documents on the artists Marcel Duchamp, Picabia and others, who worked in the United States during the First World War.

Mr. Julius STARZYNSKI (Poland) stated that the Polish Section and the Warsaw National Arts Institute had already undertaken to compile archives of contemporary art, mainly on the Formist movement. It would be most important for AICA to take an interest in promoting relationships among the archives of different countries. It would be equally interesting to be able to arrange the work methodically and to encourage the exchange of communications among the various countries on the initiative of AICA.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE said that the Dutch Section was contemplating the commencement of the archives of the Stijl Group.

Mr. Robert DELEVOY (Belgium) informed the meeting that the Belgian Section intended undertaking the compilation of the archives of Flemish Expressionism.

Mr. Pierre COURTHION thought it would be useful if AICA were to draw up a list of already existing archives of contemporary art.

The Chairman, in conclusion, said that AICA would like to be able to establish large institutes such as those mentioned but that, until then, AICA, through lack of means, had only had the possibility of accepting the assistance of organisations such as the Italian universities, the Institut des Hautes-Etudes of the Sorbonne, the Guggenheim Museum, for constituting the Archives of Contemporary Art.

The Chairman then examined the proposals that had been made for the future meetings of AICA. The proposal of the Italian Section to hold the 1957 Congress in Naples and Sicily had already been accepted to the satisfaction of all. For the 1956 General Assembly the offer of Dubrovnik by the Yugoslav Section had been greeted with great interest, and Aleksa CELEBONOVIC, the Secretary of that Section, would have the responsibility of looking into the possibilities of holding the meeting there.

The Chairman thanked members for the interest they had shown in the deliberations. He thanked the British Section for the perfect organisation of the meeting and singled out Mr. Eric NEWTON and Mr. Pierre JEANNERAT for the special thanks of AICA.