

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ART CRITICS

8th General Assembly

DUBROVNIK

Fine Arts Gallery

10 - 15 September 1956

PRESENT :

President : Paul PIERENS (Belgium)

Vice-President : Sir Herbert READ (United Kingdom), James-Johnson SWEENEY (U.S.A.),
Leonello VENTURI (Italy).

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

Regional Secretary : Nouroullah HERK (Turkey)

Members : Grgo GAMULIN (Yougoslavian Section President), H.L.C. JAFFE (Dutch Section President), Eric NEWTON (British Section President), Franz ROH (German Section President), Juliusz STARZYNSKI (Polish Section President).

Antonio BENTO (Brazilian Sect. Treas.), Aleksa CELEBONOVIC (Yougoslavian Sect. Secr.),
Cornelius DOELMAN (Dutch Sect. Treas.), Hans Theodor FIEMMING (German Sect. Secr.),
Georges PEILLEX (Swiss Sect. Secr.), Tony P. SPITERIS (Greek Sect. Secr.).

Umbro APOLLONIO (Italy), Rosario ASSUNTO (Italy), Oto BIHALJI-MERIN (Yougoslavy),
David CIEGHORN-THOMSON (United Kingdom), Gillo DORFIES (Italy), Mme Magde Van EMDE BOAS
(Netherlands), Refik EPIKMAN (Turkey), Pierre FRANCASTEL (France), Giulio Cesare GHIGLIONE
(Italy), Ernst GOLDSCHMIDT (Belgium), Mme Agnès HUMBERT (France), Jiri KOTALIK (Czechos-
lovakia), Zoran KRZISNIK (Yougoslavy), Jacques LASSAIGNE (France), Jean LEYMARIE (France),
Giuseppe MARCHIORI (Italy), Michelangelo MASCIOTTA (Italy), Mme Giusta NICCO-FASOLA
(Italy), Mieczyslaw POKEBSKI (Poland), Miodrag PROTIC (Yougoslavy), Radoslav PUTAR
(Yougoslavy), Hans REDEKER (Netherlands), France STEIE (Yougoslavy), Sandor TORDAY (Free
Section), Pavle VASIC (Yougoslavy), Charles WENTINCK (Netherlands).

New Members : Dimitrije BASICEVIC (Yougoslavy), Vaclav FORMANEK (Czechoslovakia),
Miodrag KOLARIC (Yougoslavy), Lucéjean MENASE (Yougoslavy), Guido PEROCCO (Italy).

Observer : Victor LAZAREFF (USSR)

Representative of UNESCO : Michel DARD

Representative of the National Commission of YFPR for UNESCO : Milovan MATIC

COMMITTEE MEETING

Mr Paul FIERENS (Belgium), president of AICA, in opening the meeting, requested the Presidents of the National Sections to give the names of those members they wished to propose for full membership. Their candidacies were then submitted to the vote of the Committee members present :

The German Section proposed : Messrs. Ulrich CONRADS, Wend FISCHER, Mme Juliane ROH.

The American Section : Messrs. Alfred H. BARR, Daniel CATTON RICH, S. Lane FAISON Jr., Lloyd GOODRICH, John BAUR, Eugene C. GOOSEN, Jules LANGSNER, Arthur MILLIER, Kenneth SAWYER, Henry SELDIS.

The Argentine Section : Messrs. Oliverio de ALLENDE, Vicente P. CARIDE, Eduardo BALLARI, Cordova ITURBURU, Ernest B. RODRIGUEZ, Blanca STABILE.

The Austrian Section : Messrs. Klaus DEMUS, Arnulf NEUWIRTH.

The Belgian Section : Mr. Olivier PICARD.

The Brazilian Section : Messrs. Maria BARRETO, Marc HERKOWITZ, Pedro MANUEL GHISLARDI, Lourival GOMES MACHADO, Michel KAMENKA, J. Simeo LEAL, Ibiapaba MARTINS, Jaime MAURICIO, Murilo MENDES, José Roberto TEIXEIRA LEITE.

The British Section : Mrs. Iris CONIAY, Messrs. L.R. S. LE ROUX and Terrance MULLALLY.

The Danish Section : Messrs. Erik FISCHER, Haavard ROSTRUP.

The French Section : Messrs. Jean ADHEMAR, René Domergue, Frank ELGAR, Roland PIETRI.

The Irish Section : Mr. BRIAN O'DOHERTY.

The Italian Section : Messrs. Silvio BRANSI, Enzo CARLI, Bruno MOLAJOLI, Guido FEROCO, Alberto SARTORIS, Mme Henriette Van DAM Van ISSELT.

The Japanese Section : Messrs. Atsuo IMAIZUMI, Michiaki KAWAKITA.

The Polish Section : Messrs. Tadeusz DOBROWOLSKI, Aleksander WOJCIECHOWSKI.

The Swiss Section : Messrs. Wolfgang HESSENICH, Hans CURJEL, Maria NETTER, Werner SCHMAIENRACH, Adolf Max VOGT.

The Czech Section : Messrs. Vaclav FORMANEK, Jaromir NEUMANN, Dusan SINDELAR.

The Turkish Section : Mr. Cemal TOLLU.

The Yugoslav Section : Messrs. Dimitrije BASICEVIC, Miodrag KOJARIC, Lucijan MENASE.

Mr. Werner HOFMANN (Austria), having resigned the Austrian Section, was candidate to join the Free Section.

After scrutiny, all these candidacies were accepted.

Mme S. GILIE-DELAFFON (France), General Secretary, informed the meeting that 8 National Sections in the process of formation asked for the approval of the Committee.

Those Sections were :

- a Canadian Section with 7 full members : Messrs. Martin BALDWIN, Donald William BUCHANAN, Thomas R. Mac DONALD, Paul DUVAL, Colin D. GRAHAM, Rodolphe de REPENTIGNY, John STEEGMAN, of which the other members would be possibly admitted to be Associate.

- a Chilean Section with 5 full members : Messrs. Antonio ROMERA, Ricardo HENDIS, Darío CARMONA, Víctor CARVACHO, Pedro LABOWITZ.

- a Colombian Section with 5 full members also : Messrs. Clemente AIRO, Walter ENGEL, Gabriel Giraldo JARAMILLO, Jaime TELLO, Enrique WHITE.

- an Indian Section with 11 full members : Messrs. N.C. MENTA, V.S. AGRAVAL, Abany C. BANERJEE, O.C. GANGOLI, Karl KHANDALAWALLA, Rai KRISHNADAS, M.C. MOTICHANDRA, Milk RAJ ANAND, M.S. RANDHAWA, C. SIVARAMAMURTHI, D.B. TATA, of which the other members would be possibly admitted to be Associate.

- an Israeli Section with 2 full members : Messrs. HAIM GAMZU and Yeshurun KESHEH.

- a Lebanese Section with 5 full members : Messrs. Charles AJMOUN, Marcel ZAHAR, Charles CORM, Fouad HADDAD, Victor HAKIM.

- an Uruguayan Section with 6 full members : Messrs. Jose Pedro ARGUL, Fernando GARCIA ESTEBAN, Nelso DI MAGGIO, Florio PAPPAGNOLLI, Celina ROLLERI LOPEZ, and Mr. Eduardo VERNAZZA.

- a Swedish Section with 2 full members : Messrs. Sten KARLING and Oscar REUTERSVAERD.

The eight Sections were admitted.

Mme S. GILIE-DELAFFON pointed out that 107 new full members had been just admitted and that, from the creation, no other General Assembly had accepted such an important number of full members.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Opening Session

Mr. Grgo GAMULIN (Yugoslavia), President of the Yugoslav section, welcomed the members of the Association to Yugoslavia on behalf of both the Section and of the Yugoslav public, for whom art was an integral part of cultural life. He welcomed them particularly on behalf of the artists of the country, who were those directly affected by the activity of the critic. He had felt that the best way of welcoming the delegates was to exhibit the works of the country's contemporary artists who would thus, through their spiritual presence, pay their tribute to the Assembly.

AICA meetings offered an excellent opportunity for the exchange of knowledge. The information obtained on the spot was extremely useful in contributing to the completion of the general picture reflecting the situation and universally desired development of the contemporary creative genius.

Universality, which had always been a constituent of expression in the visual arts, facilitated the mutual exchanges so necessary at present. In that way, national values could assert themselves in the art critic's world and in his objective judgment. The city of Dubrovnik exemplified the fact that, even in the past, art had known no frontiers. Not only the city, but the whole of the coast, had always been the scene of historic meetings between East and West. The members of the section were happy to be able to welcome their colleagues and hoped that their labours would be both pleasant and successful.

Mr. Ivan SULJAK, President of the People's Committee of the city of Dubrovnik, then welcomed the delegates on behalf of both the city and himself. He said that it was a great honour for him to be present at the opening session of the 8th General Assembly of AICA. The ancient city was continuing its glorious tradition of international activity. Important conferences had been held there, international problems had been discussed and the social and cultural developments of a great many nations had encountered an audience extremely eager to learn more about them. Thus Dubrovnik was making its contribution to the great ideal aimed at by all the nations of the world, the ideal of a lasting peace.

He had great pleasure in welcoming the art critics to a city which had inherited a rich artistic legacy and was the centre of an important cultural tradition. They would have the opportunity of making the acquaintance of the ancient fort of Lovrijenec, the old palaces executed by known and unknown medieval artists, the work of the master Miho and the Andrijić brothers, the painters of the Dubrovnik school, Hansik and Bozidarevic, and the present generation of Dubrovnik artists.

He hoped that their stay would be an agreeable one and that their labours would be crowned with success. He had done all in his power for the achievement of that end.

Mr. Oto BIHALJI-MERIN (Yugoslavia), in welcoming the delegates on behalf of the Commission for Foreign Cultural Relations, referred particularly to the guests coming from abroad, among whom were to be found the names of the most distinguished art critics. Contacts among the men of different countries contributed to their reaching greater mutual understanding, and the same was true for artists and art critics who, in interpreting the styles and works of a particular period, were playing their part, whether consciously or not, in the evolution of the world.

The historic periods of the past were marked by a continuous succession of construction and devastation and cities had been destroyed one after another through the demonic spirit of man. If not for the remaining art treasures, nothing of the past would remain. The interpretation of the world from the various aspects of physics, psychology, philosophy and art made it evident that these were the only truly human fields. To interpret it in that way was also the aim of the new Yugoslavia, which was in the process of building a society based on cooperation and the personal initiative of socialism and humanism.

The Commission for foreign Cultural Relations therefore had great pleasure in welcoming the art critics and hoped that their labours in the very old and very youthful Dubrovnik would be crowned with success.

Mr. Paul FIERENS, the President of the International Association of Art Critics, then thanked the previous speakers. Dubrovnik, which had seemed to the art critics a happy choice, surpassed, with its sunshine and its flowers, the expectations of all who were seeing it for the first time. The charm of the town and the kindness of its people were compelling the critics to make strenuous efforts to remind themselves that they had come there, not for a holiday, but to work. He was happy to add Dubrovnik to the seven cities that had until then been the theatre of the Congresses and General Assemblies of the International Association of Art Critics, namely, Paris, Venice, Amsterdam, Zurich, Dublin, Istanbul and Oxford. A great deal could be expected of the setting in which the 8th General Assembly was opening. There was no doubt that the meetings would be marked by good humour, optimism and courtesy.

The members of the Yugoslav section had arranged a splendid programme in which working sessions alternated pleasantly with receptions and outings. Special thanks were due to Mr. Gamulin, president of the section, and his extremely active secretary, Mr. Celebonovic, as well as to Mr. Milovan Matic, of the Yugoslav National Commission for Unesco, for the amount of work he had done.

UNESCO, which had encouraged the foundation and supported the activities of AICA, had always contributed the most heartening assistance. The Association was proud of the confidence accorded it by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and was happy to collaborate in its work. In Mr. Michel DARD, head of the Arts and Letters Division of Unesco, the art critics had an ally, whose suggestions would be received with interest. Mr. DARD was asked to assure the Director-General of the devotion of the Art Critics to the UNESCO ideals of peace, intellectual progress and international cooperation.

There was a very full programme before the Assembly. In addition to administrative questions, it would have to examine various projects such as "The Terminology of Art Criticism" and the "Archives of Contemporary Art". Finally, the last meeting would have to make preparations for the next Congress of the Association, to be held in Naples and Sicily in 1957. The Italian Section, one of the most generous and active of the Association, would certainly succeed in organizing a Congress that would be a milestone in the history of the AICA. The efforts of the President of the Italian section, Mr. Argan, should be supported and the topics to be examined at the coming congress carefully prepared.

Since Mr. Sweeney, President of the American section, had informed the Oxford General Assembly of the great project of the Solomon Guggenheim Foundation, AICA appeared to have taken on a new lease of life. Together with the International Council of Museums and the International Association of the Plastic Arts, it had become associated in a large-scale project to which, with the support of the national associations, it had enthusiastically responded. Although new sections had at that time been admitted, the indispensable guarantees had been demanded from them, for AICA was bound to maintain the intellectual and moral level that would better serve the interests of art and art criticism. The organization of the Guggenheim Prize had entailed the establishment of a liaison committee on which AICA was represented by its Secretary-General, Mme Gille-Delafon. She had shown the same devotion to that task as she had to AICA and the President took the opportunity of recognizing the fact that AICA owed her a debt it could never repay.

Thanks to a tremendous show of good will and because its activities answered the needs of international contact characterizing the present time, the Association was expanding regularly. There was a steady increase in the number of its sections and its members. That increase raised new problems for the Association, obvious and reassuring problems, such as the increased amount of work with which the Secretariat was faced and the threat of seeing the general assemblies transformed into small congresses.

AICA was happy to have accepted the invitation of the Yugoslav section, a section as youthful and full of vigour as Yugoslav art itself. Added to the pleasure of being at Dubrovnik was that of being among colleagues. The AICA meetings would be fully justifiable if they did nothing else than strengthen the bonds of friendship and reciprocal good faith among the art critics of the different countries. For friendship and good faith were the foundation of AICA relations as it was to be hoped they might be that of all international relationships. The President concluded by quoting the words employed by the President of the Yugoslav Section in the preface to the Assembly programme :

"The idea of liberty is an integral part of the conceptions of art to which we all aspire; it is inseparably linked with the idea of equality that we want to bring out once again here. It is on these principles that our Association is based and all our efforts are aimed at becoming better acquainted with the various nations and their art and to bridge the distances that unfortunately still keep them apart".

The official visitors then left the hall and the session was resumed after a short break.

The PRESIDENT then gave information on the admission of new full members that had been decided at the meeting on the Committee. A total of 107 new full members, belonging to 8 new sections, had been admitted.

Aleksa Celebonovic, secretary of the Yugoslav section, was then elected rapporteur-general of the Congress.

Mme S. GILIE-DELAFFON submitted the progress report. After referring to the warm and friendly welcome given by the British section at the Oxford General Assembly, she said that the preceding report had underlined the steady growth of the Association. It had, however, not come anywhere near anticipating the expansion that had since taken place. 8 new national sections and 64 full members had been admitted, the total number of new memberships being 107. These were unprecedented figures for AICA, the figures for its previous years of existence having been the following :

1950	:	27	members	and	2	new	sections
1951	:	24	"				
1952	:	43	"	"	3	new	sections
1953	:	29	"	"	1	"	"
1954	:	25	"	"	3	"	"
1955	:	48	"	"	2	"	"

The average for the above was 33 new members annually, and the number of sections admitted each year numbered either 1, 2 or 3. 1956 was therefore an exceptional year.

This exceptional development was not the result of chance. A benevolent genius had contributed to the fact that the expansion achieved in one year corresponded to the usual increase for a three-year period. The unexpected and benevolent auxiliary had been the Guggenheim Prize. In organizing that great international competition, in which every section of AICA participated, on the initiative of the president of the American section, the Guggenheim Foundation had, apart from awakening the interest of the entire world of art and the existing sections of the AICA, encouraged the formation of other sections. The result was that AICA, which had formerly numbered 25 sections, now had 33, embracing 408 full members apart from the associate members, the number of whom showed a continual increase for every section.

The Secretary-General then proceeded to report on the Association's activities for 1955-1956.

The year had once again been marked by the anxiety of national sections to carry out the tasks that had been undertaken. It was first of all necessary to mention the Archives of Contemporary Art, work on which had already been started by 7 sections, those of Belgium, France, Holland, Italy, Poland, Spain and the U.S.A. They had worked with a great deal of good will and very limited means, that the Association was hopeful would show a large and new increase, if UNESCO would agree to its request. The national sections had also been anxious to undertake other tasks they considered necessary, such as the investigation into the Terminology of Art Criticism and a survey relating to the translation into several languages of worth-while books on art. During the year under review, the Netherlands section had particularly distinguished through its keenness in tackling urgent tasks.

In addition, the large number of sections (Belgian, British, Netherlands, Italian, etc.) that met regularly, thereby both benefiting art and strengthening the links among colleagues, had to be congratulated. After several years of silence, the Japanese had reappeared on the scene, showing renewed vigour and including a large membership. Contact with the Secretariat was maintained through regular correspondence, enabling AICA to be compared to a large family, one of the great art families.

She believed that AICA had accomplished its tasks during the year, particularly that entrusted to it by UNESCO, with reference to the establishment of lists of artists to be considered both for the selection of future reproductions and for the purpose of decorating the Headquarters building in Paris. AICA had also contributed to the promotion of closer East-West relations, one of UNESCO's major concerns. Unesco would find cause for satisfaction through the admission of Indian, Israeli and Lebanese sections on the one hand, and of Canadian, Chilean, Colombian and Uruguayan sections on the other.

Finally, the secretariat, after trying to carry out the different requests of the General Assembly, in particular with regard to the despatch of its resolutions to

Embassies and important international exhibitions, devoted its activity to the establishment of new sections and to the Guggenheim Prize, in addition to preparing for the General Assembly. While it would willingly have undertaken other tasks, there had been no time. The lack of time, which it was difficult to overcome with the means at the secretariat's disposal, would only increase with the growth of the Association. Therefore the establishment of an executive committee, or any other body with the same objectives, as had been proposed by the President of the French section, would be enthusiastically supported by the secretariat.

For the report to be complete, mention had still to be made of the sending of catalogues, which numbered 10,189 over the year. Specially worthy of mention were the particularly generous contributions of catalogues by the Italian, Netherlands and Yugoslav sections, in addition to the regular and frequent supply received through the conscientiousness of one of the Brazilian members. She was happy to mention that all members had received copies of the AICA "Bollettino" brought out by the Italian section.

In conclusion, she reminded members that Mr. Georges Wildenstein, an honorary member of the Association, had continued his voluntary aid to the Association, for which he had been heartily thanked.

The PRESIDENT said that Mme Gille-Delafon's report had given a clear picture of the activities of the Association, activities she had taken to her heart. He assured her that ways of lightening her task would be examined and that it was anticipated that an Executive committee of some other form of executive body would be established to help her in her outstanding work, for which she was deserving of their thanks.

Mr. Walter KERN (Switzerland), the Treasurer-General, submitted a financial report. He stated that the Dublin General Assembly's decision in 1953, to the effect that a treasurer be appointed for every national section, who would annually send members subscriptions to the Treasurer-General, in a lump sum, had considerably lightened his task and he thanked section treasurers for their cooperation. He also stated that almost all national sections were up-to-date with their payments, although there were still a few who were behind. The latter would be named at the next Assembly, unless, as he hoped, they were up-to-date by then.

Cash on hand at the Thurgovian Cantonal Bank amounted to :

Swiss francs	1,621.38
French francs	21,000.00

The following had been deducted from those amounts :

a payment of 625,65 Swiss fr. to the Secretariat;
a payment of 25,600 liras to the Italian section;
sundry expenses of the Treasurer-General amounting to 96,20 Swiss fr.

Some subscriptions had already been paid in directly to the Secretariat. Mme Gille-Delafon sent him an annual account of these.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT OF THE PARIS SECRETARIAT FOR THE YEAR 1955

<u>CREDIT</u>		<u>DEBIT</u>	
Full-membership sub- scriptions :		1954 Balance	18,454 F.
French section	31,000	General expenditure :	
Other sections	<u>30,000</u>	Stamps, stationary, duplicating	78,560
	61,000 F.	Transport, miscella- neous	5,100
Transfers by treasurer	107,875 "	Catalogues	<u>31,348</u>
UNESCO Subvention :			115,008 "
received at Secretariat	175,000 "	5th Congress at Istanbul, a/c closed	54,200 "
" " Oxford :		7th General Assembly, Oxford . . .	226,201 "
£ 178.II.5d.		Disbursements to full members £ 178.II.5d.	
		Disbursements to full members, Oxford (AICA funds)	24,000 "
	343,875 F.		437,863 F.

BALANCE

437,863

343,875

Debit balance as at 31 December 1955 ... 93,988 French francs

Contribution by M. G. WILDENSTEIN, honorary member :

Secretariat 481,000 French francs

Premises, telephone.

First Working Session

Monday, 11 September at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDENT, after declaring the session open, welcomed Mr. Michel DARD, Unesco representative, who had just arrived and Mr. Victor LASAREFF, whom he invited to attend the meeting as USSR observer, at the same time expressing the hope that his attendance would only be the beginning of USSR cooperation.

He said that, according to the agenda, the next item was the renewal of the committee, but that the admittance of new members that had just taken place made that operation almost impossible. AICA now had 33 national sections and the committee would henceforth have to comprise 66 members chosen by the sections and 66 elected by the Assembly, a total of 132 members. He thought that number too large for a committee and therefore proposed that the election be postponed. As the agenda for the following session included an item referring to the examination of the rules of procedure, he suggested that the question of the election could be examined then. He suggested as a likely possibility that a single member be chosen by each section and an equal number elected. He therefore asked the Assembly to approve the present committee's being maintained in its functions until the following General Assembly to be held in Naples in 1957, with the addition of 8 new members; or one for each of the new sections.

His proposal was adopted.

He then informed the meeting that the meeting of presidents that had preceded the Assembly had proposed that the number of vice-presidents of the Bureau be increased as the various member countries of AICA were not sufficiently represented. In addition their election could be held more frequently. He hoped that Mr. Grgo GAMULIN would be immediately elected as vice-president of the Bureau as his cooperation would be most valuable, if the way in which the Dubrovnik General Assembly was organized was any indication. The statutes as constituted at that time limited the number of vice-presidents to 6 but that number could be changed when the question of amending the constitution was examined in the near future. He called for nominations for election of three vice-presidents, to be ratified by the 1957 Naples Assembly.

After the meeting had approved the suggestion, the election was proceeded with. The following result was obtained :

- Mr. Grgo GAMULIN (Yugoslavia)	36 votes (elected)
- Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE (Netherlands)	29 " (elected)
- Mr. Julius STARZYNSKI (Poland)	23 " (elected)
- Mr. Will GROHMANN (Germany)	16
- Mr. Antonio BENTO (Brazil)	10
- Mr. Tony SPITERIS (Greece)	8
- Mr. Nurullah BERK (Turkey)	6

The PRESIDENT reminded the meeting that he had already called for the election of the president, but that his proposal had not yet been approved.

Continuing with the agenda, he informed the meeting that, in accordance with the contract entered into with Unesco for the year, the question of establishing a list of living artists whose work was worthy of being given world-wide prominence, as requested by that organization, would be examined by a special committee in the intervals between the Assembly's working sessions.

12 experts would be chosen from those present to draw up the final list after having made a selection from the lists already received.

In calling upon Mr. Michel DARD, the President assured him of the goodwill of AICA's members and requested him to inform the meeting of what Unesco expected from the Association in the future.

Mr. Michel DARD (Head of the Division of Arts and Letters of Unesco) thanked the President and assured the critics of his pleasure at being among them as their association did not suffer from an excess of professional pride. He pointed out that Unesco was concerned neither with questions of creation nor with those of criticism, but with those connected with the expansion of general and vocational education. It was for that reason that Unesco's main efforts in the past had been concentrated on the diffusion on an international level of the best coloured reproductions. In that direction, Unesco had been helped by the remarkable technical progress made. The Organization had also published catalogues of the best existing reproductions of paintings prior to 1860, and from 1860 to the present. A number of art critics had been invited to advise, in particular Lionello Venturi. The appearance of this catalogues had stimulated competition and certain countries had made efforts to publish reproductions of their works of art. 150 travelling exhibitions had been organized. These had been taken to 65 countries and shown in the most outlying districts, in villages and at meetings of workers who would have never had any chance of seeing the originals. Some of the exhibitions, such as the Iranian one in preparation, consisted of new reproductions that had been ordered and would make the art of Asian, African or Latin American countries, where few originals existed, better known. Moreover, a series of albums has been prepared, in which appeared reproductions of little-known works, such as Yugoslav frescoes, the art of Ceylon, Russian ikons, etc ... which would be published shortly. The art film, one of the most important forms of artistic diffusion, was also included in the programme. Art critics had an important part to play in connection with these various activities; it was their task to teach the public to see, and Unesco could not but cooperate very closely with them.

Art critics had already helped Unesco, through their publications and through their encouragement of the creative ideal. Every year, Unesco prizes were distributed at the great international exhibitions, and list of artists had been drawn up for submission to publishers for the purpose of selecting works for reproduction. In the future it would be for the Art Critics Association to make such proposals. He hoped that the present subvention would be increased. Projects submitted would be examined with interest.

Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE (France), on behalf of the French section, urged that the whole question of AICA's relations with Unesco be re-examined with a view to their being developed to the best advantage. Until the present, the financial aid given by Unesco had always been extremely restricted, especially when compared with that granted

to other similar bodies such as the International Association for the Plastic Arts, ICOM and the International Theatre Institute. This was due to the fact that while the latter organizations had been set up on the initiative of Unesco, the art critics had succeeded in establishing a workable organization independently. They were in a way the victims of their own success. Nevertheless, the question was not merely one of existence. AICA could not retain its better element unless it offered them the possibility of extending their activity. Unesco had therefore been asked to examine the problem thoroughly and to enter into permanent cooperation with the various sections of the AICA.

Unesco aid could take three forms :

1/ The establishment of Archives. The establishment of archives of contemporary art had already been undertaken by a number of national sections. The standardisation of methods would be examined at the next congress. The effective cooperation of all countries could be obtained if Unesco were to effectively give its blessing to that undertaking. The French section had already submitted to the Director of the Unesco Division of Arts and Letters a report with particular reference to the preservation of press articles to which it attached particular importance.

2/ Travel fellowships. Although Unesco provided research workers with prizes and travel fellowships, the art critics had never benefited from those advantages. The European art critic experienced the greatest difficulty in paying the costs of visiting the more important exhibitions referring to his particular field. Moreover, it was impossible for him to study Far Eastern Art, although he would be able, as the result of such a voyage, to share the information obtained with all his colleagues. The French Minister of Education, in his recent project for educational reform, laid great stress on the importance of art education.

3/ Documentation on the art of little-known countries. Acquaintance with the artistic life of various countries was usually restricted to Europe and North America. We were ignorant of the present state of art in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and contented ourselves with the field of Western Art. In the event of Unesco's accepting to assist AICA, a country to be set aside for special study could be chosen annually. Documentation as extensive as possible on the state of art in that country would be collected and distributed to all the national sections. The preliminary efforts would be concentrated on the Far-East as critics needed knowledge on the present state of art in China, Japan, Pakistan and Ceylon, which knowledge would be impossible to obtain at their own expense.

The PRESIDENT observed that, among the suggestions just made, there had been a particularly important one, namely the collection of documentation on the art of little-known countries. Were Unesco to accept the project, the question would be to find the best way of obtaining it. He thought that a task of the kind ought to begin with an Asiatic country, as closer East-West relations was one of Unesco's prime considerations. If the country chosen were India, the task of the newly-admitted Indian section would be to collect documentation.

Jacques LASSAIGNE thought that the first stage would be to consult the national section of the country chosen. He would recommend that documentation be checked on the spot by a special delegate. For such a task AICA might possibly appoint one of its younger members, capable of examining a question efficiently, and would have to obtain Unesco aid for the realisation of the project.

Mr. Michel DARD thought the suggestion interesting and expressed the opinion that it might possibly be executed under a contract within the framework of the Unesco programme. He agreed with M. Lassaigue that it would be better not to entrust the task solely to a national section as they were concerned with documentation designed for international consumption: a check kept by a Western art critic would therefore establish the human contact necessary. There was also the question of granting a fellowship to the member invited to cooperate in working on the documentation. He thought that the project might be terminated by the award of an AICA prize which would to some degree round off the assembling of documentation and which might be attributed to one of the leading artists of the country. The prize might take the form of reproducing some of his works and publishing the reproductions.

The PRESIDENT thanked Mr. Dard for his suggestion, which he felt to be most interesting. At the same time he expressed the hope that the award of such a fellowship would not prevent other fellowships or prizes being granted to art critics for other specific tasks.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE (Netherlands) said that the Unesco delegate's proposal might be extremely valuable. In order to promote greater international understanding, however, it would be even more valuable to invite delegates of those nations to themselves present the art of their countries during meetings of the Assembly.

The PRESIDENT then called on Mr. J.J. Sweeney to report on the Guggenheim Foundation Prize.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY (U.S.A.) began by expressing the appreciation of Mr. Guggenheim, the Foundation and himself for the cooperation of the members of AICA. He was well aware that the lack of time had not permitted the project to be held under the most favourable conditions. The first competition could be considered as an experiment to be taken into account in the conduct of future prize competitions. The national and continental juries had not had enough time. He would welcome suggestions from national sections for improved procedure in the future. He hoped that the second prize would be awarded in 1958 and all arrangements made before the summer holidays.

The PRESIDENT expressed AICA's appreciation of the confidence placed in it by associating it with the distribution of the Guggenheim Prize. He said that if AICA had contributed some help, the Guggenheim Prize had also been of considerable assistance to AICA. It had resulted in the establishment of New National sections and given the Association a new lease of life.

He then turned to the following item of the agenda, the terminology of art criticism. He stated that the Italian and Netherlands sections had already begun work on the subject and that a report had been submitted by Mr. Claude ROGER-MARX. Nevertheless, Mr. Venturi had proposed the postponement of discussion until the next congress and the reports that should have been submitted would therefore be given then. Rapporteurs would have to be appointed and a report carefully prepared. Turning to the Archives of Contemporary Art, the President read the report of the Belgian section which was examining the question of Belgian Expressionism. A working party had been formed of which the members were, Mmes P.C. Legrand, and Edith Hoffman and Mr. Charles de Maeyer. This committee would be advised by Messrs Emile Langui, Andre de Ridder and Paul Haesaerts, who had been involved in the Expressionist movement. The Archives would be assembled at the Fine Arts Library of the Royal Museums, and the documentation already collected at the Museum would be made available. The Archives would include photographs, reproductions, exhibition and sales catalogues,

articles and private documents such as correspondence. The working party had started by establishing a list of material that could be used and photographs that could be preserved. A reference file had been started. Contact would be made with artists, art critics and amateurs who might possess documents. If the documents themselves could not be obtained, microfilms would be made.

It would be more practicable if the Sections were to use similar systems of filing and a standard format for microfilms. The sections that had undertaken the work of establishing the archives should maintain mutual contact.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY said that the U.S. section was continuing its compilation of the archives of the Dadaist movement in the U.S.A. and its connection with the same movement in Europe. A study of the documents in the Arensberg collection at Philadelphia and the Katherine Dpeir collection at Yale University had been undertaken, and a start made on those of the Arthur Jerome Eddy Collection in Chicago. Private documents would be examined and publications on the lines of those brought out by the Italian section were contemplated.

The PRESIDENT said that the French and Spanish sections were also working on the task and that the French section recommended the preservation of newspaper articles.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE pointed out that, following on the publication of his book on the Stijl group, it was still necessary to collect the documents in possession of the Group's members. That project needed financial backing and it would be necessary to interest a ministry in it.

Mr. Rosario ASSUNTO (Italy) reported that, under the enthusiastic encouragement of Mr. Argan, the Italian section was finishing its task and that the first volumes might be published at the end of the year. Substantial financial aid was expected from the Rome Quadriennale.

Mr. Julius STARZYNSKI (Poland) said that during the year his section had chiefly concerned itself with present-day art. The work already begun was progressing systematically at the National Art Institute. The names of 2000 artists of all countries had been collected. Forms were filled in by the artists and completed by the Institute's collaborators. The documentation included exhibition catalogues, press cuttings and photographic reproductions. The first publications would take the form of a series entitled "Contemporary Artists". Their publication would be made in conjunction with the editorial staff of "Przegląd Artystyczny", and its chief editor, Mr. Porebski.

Documentation concerning artistic events between 1944 and 1956 had also been collected.

The Polish section felt that the mutual undertaking of a dictionary of contemporary artists would be interesting. For that, the cooperation of various university centres was absolutely necessary. Research had been carried out on Formism, on the Abstract group of the inter-war period, etc. From the methodological angle, cooperation was most desirable. The 6th Congress at Naples might contribute to the elaboration of methods.

The PRESIDENT then turned to the next item of the agenda, the translation of worthwhile works.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE said that Mr. L.P.J. Braat, who had been put in charge of the survey, would appreciate the help of some of his colleagues.

Mr. Michel DARD said that the project might interest Unesco.

The PRESIDENT then referred to the protection of texts in international editions, after Dr. Franz ROH, president of the German section, had been asked for information. He expressed the opinion that, in the cases referred to, which opposed two publishers, there was no point in the AICA taking sides.

Mr. David CLEGHORN-THOMSON (Great Britain) informed the meeting of Mr. Pierre Jeannerat's suggestion, supported by the British section, for the publication of a news bulletin. Such a publication would not in any way compete with those already undertaken as it would contain neither articles nor discussions but only strictly useful information. It could be typewritten and sent only to AICA members. The information contained would be supplied by the various sections and submitted to the Secretariat.

He then made a private proposal with regard to the foundation by AICA of an "exchange community" on the international level, similar to the English "Gorgon Fellowship", which would enable an artist, painter or sculptor chosen by AICA to spend a year at a university, working among the students and teachers.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY, in welcoming the suggestion, said that the "Edward MacDowell Foundation" might undertake to pay the return trip where the U.S.A. was involved.

Second Working Session

Tuesday, 11 September at 4 p.m.

REPORTS OF PRESIDENTS OF THE NATIONAL SECTIONS

The PRESIDENT called on the sections in alphabetic order to report on the activities of the past year.

Dr. Franz ROH, president of the German section, expressed his regret at not having been able to hold a meeting of the section's members. A meeting was, however, anticipated for the beginning of the coming year, when the section would be in a position to offer the German public a programme dealing with contemporary art in which the members would participate by means of discussions and lectures. The Friends of Modern Art Society, of which he was one of the founders, had organized a series of lectures. The Society had formed branches at Baden-Baden, Dusseldorf and Lubeck. The situation with regard to modern art continued to improve in Germany, which was significant following the Hitler period. Nevertheless, the Society's members still had to fight against traces of reaction that still persisted, particularly among students. He expressed his thanks to Hans Flemming, who had given his services free as secretary of the section since its foundation. He regretted that the section was excluded from the Guggenheim Prize and an artists' committee qualified to join the International Association of the Plastic Arts had been formed, so that Germany might be allowed to compete, but no response had been received to the request made to the Association's representative in the United States.

Mr. J.J. SWEENEY expressed the regret of Mr. Guggenheim and himself. He then outlined the activities of the U.S. Section. It had continued its policy of protest against the restrictions of a political nature imposed in the field of creative art. In the past year, it had to defend an exhibition on "Sport in Art" held at Dallas, Texas, and afterwards banned. At its June meeting the section had drawn up an open letter in which it pointed out the mistake of confusing art with politics. In addition, the membership had shown a marked increase and a project for the holding of regular meetings had been adopted.

The PRESIDENT stated that the Argentine section, while it had not sent a report, had supplied information to the effect that it had been entirely reorganised, that Mr. Jorge Romero Brest had been elected president, and that 6 new members had been admitted. The Austrian section was not represented. At the request of Mr. Otto Benesch, its president, Mr. Fritz Novotny had submitted a report on the exhibitions held in the museums working with AICA.

The PRESIDENT then reported on the activities of the Belgian section, which had continued meeting monthly and, as previously, selecting the best exhibitions of the month.

The following choices had been made for 1955-1956 :

October	: Anne Bonnet, Pierre Ginette, Arnal.
November	: No choice.
December	: Roger Dudant.
January	: Miro, Herbin, Lismonde, Kerels.
February	: Lurçat, Caille, Fritz Winter.
March	: René Magritte, Jorn, Deyrolle.
April	: Léon Zack, Wallasse Ting.
May	: Gaston Bertrand, Reinhout d'Haese.
June-July	: Salvador Dali.

The Critics Prize for 1954 had been awarded to Ben Nicholson and for 1955 to Magnelli.

A very moving ceremony had marked the occasion of the 80th birthday of Charles Bernard, President of the Section.

Mr. Antonio BENTO, representing Mr. Sergio MULLIET, president of the Brazilian section, stated that the section, meeting at its headquarters in Rio de Janeiro, had appointed him to represent it at the Dubrovnik Assembly. The Foreign Affairs ministry had made a financial contribution to the cost of the trip. The section's chief activity had been in connection with the Guggenheim Prize. He had been a member of the national jury that had awarded the prize to Candido Portinari. The proposal of Mr. Quirino Campofiorito for the holding of a monthly study meeting on art and aesthetics had been accepted. Moreover, the speaker's proposal for the quarterly publication of a bulletin had been adopted. It would be published with the cooperation of the Documentation Service of the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Eric NEWTON, President of the British Section, said that the problem arising in Germany and the U.S.A., where the spirit of progress in art had to battle against that of reaction in politics did not exist in Britain. In England artists were not forced into politics and politicians were quite indifferent to the arts. In Great Britain, the Arts Council, a semi-official body, with far greater influence than the critics, had taken up the cudgels on behalf of modern art.

The British section was continuing to award annual prizes to its own critics. With regard to the Guggenheim Prize, it had taken the precaution of informing and inviting the artists and exhibiting organizations on the widest possible democratic basis. 250 canvases had been sent to London. The procedure might be considered difficult, but it ensured that artists capable of gaining the generous prize would not be overlooked.

Mr. Sigurd SCHULTZ, secretary of the Danish section, said that the Association of Danish Journalists (Journalistforbundet), an extremely important body, had projected the idea for an exhibition of life in Copenhagen from the 18th Century to the present. The Danish section had been put in charge of the organization and of selecting the pictures. The exhibition, held in the great hall of the Copenhagen City Hall, had been most successful. Parallel with the exhibition, an exhibition journal had been published, which contained the catalogue of the pictures on view and historical descriptions. The Danish section had also held a general meeting for the purpose of organizing the Guggenheim Prize.

Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE, in the absence of Mr. Raymond Cogniat, president of the French section, stated, on the latter's behalf, that the French report would be concerned with general matters chiefly. The Association was developing under extremely favourable conditions and the results obtained proved how effective its efforts were. Nevertheless, new problems regarding the organization of the Association and the forms taken by its activity, arose from that development.

The admission of new national sections made necessary an adjustment of the rules of procedure in order that the new members might be permitted to take part in the functioning of the Association. The aim ought to be in the direction of renovation and an increase in the size of the controlling organs. Relations with Unesco should also be re-examined and their scope widened. The bulletins and reviews founded had to be used in the most rational manner. Finally, the award of the Guggenheim Prize ought to increase the prestige of the AICA sections in every country. He felt that it would be wise to prepare a definite programme for the coming years immediately and to choose monthly one or two pictures worthy of being put forward for the next award of the Guggenheim Prize.

Those various proposals concerned AICA's immediate future and should be at once given special study by the General Assembly without, however, prejudicing other proposals that might strengthen the Association.

The financial means were still too limited. The secretariat was able to function owing to Mr. Georges Wildenstein's generosity; the premises, too, were made available by him. General Assemblies could not take place without Unesco aid, and the sending of catalogues, although the cost was borne by the French Government, could not be developed. The picture he had drawn was not as pessimistic as it seemed, but the aim was to dispel any illusions from member's minds.

Mr. Tony P. SPIERIS read the report of the president of the Greek section, Mr. Demetre Evangelides. The section had held several meetings for the examination of local questions, the Guggenheim Prize, in which connexion it undertook the organization and all the necessary steps designed to give the prize the importance it deserved, and the Unesco survey with reference to the compilation of a list of artists.

He reminded delegates that AICA members were invited to stay, without cost, at the summer holiday premises of the Fine Arts School at Hydra, Mycenae, Delphi or Rhodes, on application to the secretariat of the Greek section. Reductions could also be obtained on Greek ships. His section hoped that similar facilities would be offered by the other sections and that there would be an exchange of lecturers among them.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE, president of the Netherlands section, said that the section had met regularly almost every month. This had made it possible to discuss exhibitions that had sometimes been followed by lectures and lively discussion. Mr. H. Redeker had described his trip to Bulgaria; Dr. van Lutterveld, director of the Rijksmuseum, had been invited to discuss the subject: "Art Historian - Art Critic", and Ch. Wentinck had discussed the question relating to the doubling of the functions of creative artist and art critic - a phenomenon that had often appeared in the country in the last half-century. Full and associate members had been active in attacking the scandal of the so-called "copie-Fiehl", bad colour reproductions that had been put on the market as copies and with which Holland had been flooded. Protests had been sent to the press and contact made with the English section, as these disgraceful productions stemmed from England. A critic's prize, to be awarded during autumn, had been organized

and the section had been active with regard to the Guggenheim Prize. The main activity of the section, however, had been to study the question of terminology, on the suggestion of Mme v. Emde Boas. Members had made suggestions and a critical analysis, based on the work of the congress, had been drawn up. Finally, he announced that the Pierre Bayle Prize had been awarded to one of the section's members, Mr. Vriend, an honour that had gratified the entire section.

Mr. Thomas McGREEVY, president of the Irish section, said that the section had not been very active on the whole and that he particularly regretted his inability in starting the little bulletin that had been discussed at Oxford. The reason for that had been that the secretary, James White, had been in great demand on most art committees. He had been elected to the committee of the Dublin Modern Art Gallery by the Municipality and been elected secretary of the Society of the Friends of National Collections and of a committee that was organizing a large exhibition of art treasures of Irish private collections to be held in the spring of 1957. The Friends of National Collections, who were already in sympathy with contemporary art, would, through his participation, be strengthened. Finally, during winter and spring, James White had lectured on art in about twenty provincial counties in which the Irish Art Council had held a representative exhibition of the work of living Irish artists.

In the absence of Mr. G.C. Argan, president of the Italian section, Mr. Rosario ASSUNTO reported on the section's activities. He mentioned that Mme Gille-Delaforon had attended the General Assembly at Turin. Technical questions had been discussed and new associate members admitted. The committee for the investigation of the state of art criticism in Italy had then submitted the results of its work which would be published in the "Bollettino AICA". An improvement would be made in the distribution facilities of the Bollettino, carried out by the Milan publishers "Comunità". The 5th issue of the Bollettino would be devoted to the Dubrovnik Assembly. He quoted, as an example of co-operation among the different sections of AICA, the invitation extended to Mr. Gillo Dorfles to lecture on contemporary Italian art at Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana. An organizing committee for the Naples Congress had been appointed. Its members were Miss Palma Bucarelli, the secretary-general of the section, and Messrs. Bruno Molajoli, superintendant of the Naples Gallery, and Giorgio Vigni, superintendant of the Palermo Gallery. He himself was at the call of the administration for Fine Arts. He thanked the various ministries which had given their support to the section, in particular with regard to the publication of the archives of contemporary Italian art, and to the private individuals who had supported their efforts.

The PRESIDENT, since there was no report from the Japanese section, read out the lengthy list of names of the members of that section, beautifully printed, and also the statutes that offered proof that the section was extremely active.

Mr. Joseph-Emile MULIER, secretary of the Luxembourg section, said that, apart from the fact that lists of artists had been drawn up for Unesco, there was nothing important to mention.

Mr. J.J. CRESPO de la SERNA, president of the Mexican section, said that, while his members had been most active in their individual capacity, the section itself had not been very active during the past year. However, the members were fully aware of their international obligations and a majority of them hoped that the time lost would be made up by the establishment of a programme for the near future.

A crisis had arisen in the section but it was expected that it would soon be over. A purge could be expected that would particularly affect those members who were

too far behind with their subscriptions. On the other hand there was a possibility that the section might be increased by a number of talented young critics who might become associate members.

Mr. Julius STARZYNSKI, president of the Polish section, said that the activities of the Polish members of AICA were closely linked with those of the National Art Institute and the Warsaw National Museum. He also emphasized the fact that the country's three periodicals devoted to the plastic arts were edited by section members. These were "Art and Criticism", devoted to questions of theory, of which he was editor-in-chief; the Art History Bulletin, specializing in the art of the past, the editor-in-chief of which was Mr. Stanislas Lorentz; the "Art Review", devoted to contemporary art, the editor-in-chief of which was Mr. M. Porebski. Members had been in charge of important exhibitions on the occasion of which they had had the pleasure of welcoming to Warsaw representatives of three AICA sections, namely Mr. G.C. Argan, Mr. Otto Benesch and Mr. H.L.C. Jaffe. Section members had also been made responsible for the arrangement of the pavilion of the Venice Biennale and had constituted the Polish jury for the Guggenheim Prize.

Polish members were of the opinion that a mutual scientific research programme for AICA should exist. The possibility of exchanging experiences and standardizing the methods used in the field of scientific documentation related to contemporary art should also exist. On their side, the Polish section had devoted special attention to the problem of the beginnings of modern art and national movements throughout the world.

Mr. Georges FEILLEUX, secretary of the Swiss section, informed the meeting that he had been asked to apologize for the absence, due to illness, of the president, Mr. Pierre Courthion. Because of the projects coming to fruition - a prize given by the Swiss section and the award of the national Guggenheim Prize -, Mr. Courthion had felt that it would be preferable for the president of the section to be in Switzerland itself, for which reason he had resigned. The section had therefore met in August and he was happy to be able to give the results of the election that then took place :

President : Mr. Gotthard JEDLIČKA
Vice-President : Mr. Walter KERN.

Mr. Franz Meyer had been chosen to represent the section on the jury for the Guggenheim Prize.

He added that the changes made in the section's direction had some validity on the national level as the section had never considered that it was being supported by official bodies. As Mr. Jedlicka lived in Switzerland, he would certainly have greater facilities in making the necessary contacts. He reported also that an attempt had been made to have AICA members included on the jury of certain exhibitions. Finally, Mr. Scheidegger had drawn up provisional statutes for a critics' prize to be submitted to important individuals.

Mr. Jiri KOTALIK, representing Mr. Miroslav Mlicko, president of the Czech section, reminded the meeting that a member of the section, Mr. Matejcek, had presided at the meeting at which AICA was founded. After a lull, the activity of the section had recommenced on a national scale. The critics had chiefly examined the sense and the tasks of art in society, with the aim of bringing art closer to the masses. They were collaborating with schools, the radio and television, and, in

addition, with the artists themselves. In the absence of the last-mentioned form of collaboration, there would be the danger that criticism would become scholastic. Three sections were to be established in the Union, or Syndicate, of Art and Artists, viz., artists, art craftsmen, and art critics and historians. The Government would award three annual prizes of 5,000 crowns, which would enable critics to become acquainted with foreign art. The critics had three basic tasks: their professional task, documentation, publications, etc ... and the methodology, terminology and derivation of texts.

Mr. Nurullah BERK, president of the Turkish section, once more reminded the meeting that Turkish activity was concentrated on publication more in newspapers and reviews than in de luxe editions. The section was happy to announce that the "Turkish AICA Bulletin" had come into being; it would be published every two months and distributed free. An effort was being made to bring contemporary Turkish art before the public. Turkey's participation at the Venice Biennale, and the fact that various reviews would devote space to Turkish art, was of particular importance for the section.

The problem of the artist's relationship with the State was no nearer solution and the 150 pictures selected by a competent jury for decorating the new palace of the National Assembly had almost all been rejected by a group of parliamentarians and replaced by pictures of an inferior standard.

Mr. Grgo GAMULIN, president of the Yugoslav section, said that the task delegated to the section for the year, namely the preparation of the General Assembly, had been fulfilled. The section had held two plenary meetings and organized an exhibition of contemporary Yugoslav painting to coincide with the AICA Assembly. Members had also hoped to exhibit a number of neo-primitives. In addition, the lectures given by Gillo Dörries, a member of the Italian section, were worthy of mention. He thought that this type of contact ought to be more frequent.

Mr. Aleksa CRIEBONOVIC (Yugoslavia) pointed out that the reports submitted by section presidents too often dealt with the individual activity of the members of the section, i.e. the every-day activities of art critics, such as the organization of exhibitions, the publication of books, etc. In actual fact, their reports, while dealing with the activity of members either individually or together, should be more concerned with activities relevant to AICA. The distinction was an important one and detracted from the importance of some reports that paid no attention to it.

ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT informed the Assembly of various administrative proposals, with particular reference to that proposed by Mr. Raymond Cogniat with regard to the establishment of an executive council. It was clear that administrative reorganization was necessary on account of the Association's growing importance. The secretariat, which until now had been the sole responsibility of Mme Gille-Delafor, could no longer cope with its tasks. Nevertheless, he did not consider that the establishment of an executive council would be the best solution and would prefer a more flexible solution. He called on Mr. Jacques Lassaigue to explain the proposals already submitted to the Assembly by Mr. Cogniat.

Mr. Jacques LASSAIGNE said that AICA's founders in general and Mr. Cogniat in particular had wanted, from the beginning, a stable administration in order to allow the Association to take shape. The pioneering period had now passed; the development of the Association should not be blocked and new members should be enabled to participate therein. The proposal was to increase the number of vice-presidents to 9, elected for 3 years, and a third of whom to retire before every general assembly. An assistant secretary-general would be appointed, whose task would be to keep a check on working committees. These committees together would form the executive council. The following committees could be immediately provided for : a rules committee, a membership committee, an archives committee, a terminology committee, and a congress committee.

The PRESIDENT stressed the important part played until then by the Meeting of Presidents. The presidents had proved most efficient, but the committee's activity had been carried out very much behind the scenes.

Mr. Georges PEILLEX (Switzerland), on behalf of his delegation, observed that the classification of members into full and associate members appeared pointless.

The PRESIDENT said that opinion on that subject was divided, some sections having a large number of associate members and others being unwilling to accept them. Section presidents had been given complete freedom to decide for themselves; the question could, however, be re-examined by the Rules Committee.

Third Working Session

Friday, 14 September - 10 a.m

The PRESIDENT stated that the session would be entirely devoted to the preparations of the 1957 Congress to be held in Naples, for which the Italian section had been good enough to shoulder the responsibility. He called on Mr. Lionello Venturi.

Mr. Lionello VENTURI (Italy) said that he would like to explain the project conceived of by the organiser, Mr. Giulio Carlo Argan, president of the Italian section. The Congress would last for one week and include an inaugural session, three working sessions and a day set aside for the General Assembly. The closing sessions might take place in Palermo and be followed by an organized tour of Sicily.

With regard to the topics to be discussed, it was Mr. Argan's plan to classify the various topics proposed or already submitted into two or three broad general topics. The topic for one of the sessions might be "The Artist and the Ideas of his Time"; another might be "The Importance of Forms in Everyday Life". The various contradictory reports would give rise to such arguments as one expected at a congress. The first session would be set aside for minor topics, for which suggestions would be welcomed; a place might be found there for the topic: "The terminology of Art Criticism" which, in the speaker's opinion, would prepare the way for the compilation of the historical dictionary of art terms.

In order that valuable discussion might ensue, it was absolutely necessary that reports be sent to the secretariat two months before the Congress, so that they could be distributed to participants in good time.

The President, after thanking Mr. Venturi, called on Mr. Francastel.

Mr. Pierre FRANCASTEL (France) said that the subject he had already suggested, namely "Is Cubism the Style of the 20th Century"?, was the result of an interview he had had with Mr. Argan with regard to the problem of broadening the traditional horizon of the Congress and focussing attention on an art form that no congress had yet tackled, namely architecture. The idea had been to base the argument on modern architecture. The opportunity would have been offered of calling on new men, but these preliminary proposals hardly appeared to fit in with those that had just been made. He felt that the two topics referred to by Mr. Venturi overlapped, and asked if it would not be possible to reserve one session for the discussion of a more concrete topic, a discussion that would be less in the field of ideas than a kind of survey on the concrete features of contemporary architecture.

Mr. Lionello VENTURI thought that the idea of architecture, with which art critics did usually not concern themselves, was most important. He suggested that the first session be devoted to it and that the discussion on terminology might take place on another day. The title to be given could perhaps be: "The origin of

modern architecture in the various countries". He still believed that the two topics he had referred to previously differed greatly in that the first was a historic problem, while the other had special reference to the subjection of formal values.

Mr. Gillo DORFLES (Italy) said that he approved Mr. Francastel's proposal with regard to architecture. He thought that it might also be interesting to examine another neglected topic, namely industrial art, and not forgetting all those new forms, about the artistic validity of which there was some doubt. No exact methodology yet existed for those forms. He thought that architecture and the other arts born of industrial civilization might profitably be introduced into the wider theme dealing with forms and daily life.

Mr. H.L.C. JAFFE drew the meeting's attention to the fact that the exhibition in Brussels, where the 1958 General Assembly was to take place, would be an ideal setting for tackling the problem of modern architecture, because of its modern pavilions.

The PRESIDENT thought that it might safely be left to the Italian section to decide on the topics for discussion.

As the various items of the agenda had now been treated, it remained for him to express the Association's thanks to the Yugoslav section. The Assembly had been an extremely important one at which members had become aware that AICA had reached a turning-point in its history and that it had expanded considerably. While the Assembly had passed off without incident, it must have required a great deal of work on the part of the organisers. The task of the Yugoslav section had been a difficult one, successfully carried out in an atmosphere of grace and beauty, of which Dubrovnik was a splendid example. Delegates would always remember the warmth of Yugoslavia's welcome.

The President then declared the General Assembly at an end and closed the session.