



association internationale des critiques d'art
international association of art critics
asociacion internacional de criticos de arte
11 rue berryer 75008 paris téléphone (1) 42.56.17.53

lettre d'information

FEBRUARY 89

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

11 February 1989

Paris - 11 rue Berryer - 75008

Present :

Nora ARADI (Hungary)
Alexander BASSIN (Yugoslavia)
Christian CHAMBERT (Sweden)
Sam CHERSON (Puerto Rico)
Freddy DE VREE (Belgium)
DJANBERIDSE (U.S.S.R.)
Fernande DUCHATEAU MEURIS (Belgium)
Peter FEIST (G.D.R.)
J.A. FRANCA (Portugal)
GORIAINOV (U.S.S.R.)
Léone de la GRANDVILLE (France)
Hans Jorg HEUSSER (Switzerland)
Liam KELLY (Ireland)
Jan KRIZ (Czechoslovakia)
Pedro LABOWITZ (Chile)
Hélène LASSALLE (France)
Julie LAWSON (U.K.)
Jacques LEENHARDT (France)
Silvano LORA (Dominican Republic)
Jacques MEURIS (Belgium)
MOROZOV (U.S.S.R.)
Belgica RODRIGUEZ (Venezuela)
Olga SCHMEDLING (Norway)
Slavka SVERAKOVA (free section)
M. VAN JOLE (Belgium)
Dolf WELLING (The Netherlands)
YAKIMOVICH (U.S.S.R.)

Absent :

René BERGER (France)
Bruce CAMPBELL (Ireland)
Virgil HAMMOCK (Canada)

The session was opened at 14:30 by the President, Belgica RODRIGUEZ.

The President stated that the next meeting had been arranged during the Buenos Aires Congress and asked all members present to give their names.

Belgica RODRIGUEZ announced that Silvano LORA of the Dominican Republic represented the President of the Dominican section, and Samuel CHERSON the newly created Puerto Rican section. The presence of Jan KRIZ was warranted by the report he was to present to the Council members with regard to the Czechoslovakian section.

Hélène LASSALLE, outgoing Secretary General, introduced Léone de la GRANDVILLE, acting Secretary General, and attested to the seriousness of her commitment and to her activities since last November.

The President announced the agenda.

1. Follow-up of decisions of the Buenos Aires Congress

a) Léone de la GRANDVILLE and Hélène LASSALLE explained the confusion at IAPA since the "forced" departure of André Parinaud. The lack of leadership and the deplorable financial situation of the Association made it necessary to suspend all projects for cooperation. The Bureau of IAAC would therefore remain for the present at rue Berryer. Léone de la GRANDVILLE will contact other NGOs.

b) Discussion of the duties of Léone de la GRANDVILLE at the International Bureau of IAAC

c) Jacques MEURIS reopened the debate on the problem of membership fees and explained again his proposal to establish a payment system based on the methods of the World Bank. Three categories could be envisaged in accordance with the economic possibilities of the different sections: payments of 100 %, 75 %, or 50 %. However, Jacques MEURIS had not continued his investigations concerning the moral decision he thought such a classification represented. This objection was rejected; the membership card attested to the equality of all members. Several other solutions were envisaged to ensure that all sections, including the most disadvantaged, could contribute to IAAC. Hélène LASSALLE evoked the situation of the members of the Polish section: Since they did not receive vignettes, they were challenged by their government. Following several discussions, Hans Jorg HEUSSER concluded that Jacques MEURIS' proposal was the

most viable and asked him to write a resolution on the subject and present it at the next session of the Administrative Council. Belgica RODRIGUEZ hoped that the section presidents would receive it prior to the Administrative Council of the Moscow Congress by June or July at the latest.

d) With regard to the IAACCR Bulletin:

Hans Jorg HEUSSER announced the future publication of the IAACCR Bulletin which, thanks to the participation of the Soviet section, promised to be remarkable. He emphasized the significance of this type of bulletin for the prestige and intellectual quality of the association and the importance of its distribution. He had envisaged distributing the Bulletin free of charge to all IAAC members, but this project was no longer possible in view of the financial damage caused by the successive defections of the Portuguese, Spanish and Argentinian sections. Following a proposal by Samuel CHERSON, a study had been carried out: Assuming the Association continued to receive a subsidy from Unesco, the Bulletin could be distributed twice a year, including mailing expenses, at five dollars per issue to IAAC members. Following discussion, Jacques MEURIS was requested to prepare a detailed plan by June on methods of payment of subscriptions: one alternative would allow for the mailing of the IAACCR Bulletin at five dollars, and the other excluding this type of mailing.

e) Discussion of the conditions of the contract to be established for the organization of future congresses

Samuel CHERSON announced the main points of the comprehensive regulations he had prepared (see attached document). Since the statutes are quite vague concerning congresses, this document, though it was unanimously praised as remarkable, seemed too long and detailed to be discussed publicly. Olga SCHMEDLING and Jacques LEENHARDT proposed that certain points be clarified and that a contract be established between the host section and IAAC by Samuel CHERSON, which should be sent to all section presidents and the Bureau of IAAC by Samuel CHERSON, in the three official languages, together with an request for approval or suggestions. It will then be discussed during the Administrative Council in Moscow and, subsequently, the main points of the regulations will be presented to the General Assembly.

Slavka SVERAKOVA requested that the documents be sent to everyone in June 1989 and that the format be larger than that used for this meeting.

2. Reports of the President, the Secretary-General and the Vice-President, Hélène LASSALLE (see annex)

a) Proposal by Léone de la GRANDVILLE, Secretary-General:

The proposed theme and the idea of a prize were rejected. An exhibition on a more specific theme, however, could be envisaged, such as photography of works of art or the use of photography in works of art, which would thus concern IAAC more directly. Jacques MEURIS offered to cooperate with Léone de la GRANDVILLE if an exhibition was conceived along these lines. The participation of national sections would be required as foreseen.

b) Report of the Treasurer:

The Treasurer had not considered it necessary to prepare a detailed report at this time. According to his estimates, the situation of IAAC, while not prosperous, was stable.

* credit : \$11,056 - checking account
Approximately \$17,000 frozen in reserve
(separate from the financial plan)

* debit : \$9,000 due to IAACCR (debt carried over from one year to the next)

Collection of membership fees therefore remained indispensable to the survival of the Association, and programmes of action or trips that might be necessary could not be financed at present.

Jacques MEURIS concluded by requesting a slight increase in funds allocated for his expenses, i.e., \$1,200 per month instead of \$900 and \$500 for per diem. His request was accepted.

3. Organisation of the September 1989 Congress :

a) Mr. MOROZOV announced the programme of the Congress and distributed the Soviet Section's letter of invitation (see attached document). He requested members to confirm their participation as soon as possible. A detailed programme was to be sent to members in the near future.

b) The project for an exhibition of art books and catalogues was accepted, but this year it would consist only of a presentation of works chosen by art critics, who would also arrange for their shipment to U.S.S.R. There would not be a prize this year.

c) Belgica RODRIGUEZ announced on behalf of Virgil HAMMOCK the fortunate conjuncture of the forthcoming Congress in Montreal, which Virgil HAMMOCK will discuss at the Moscow Congress, and Phyllis TUCHMAN announced that in principle a congress will be organized in Los Angeles in 1991.

4. IAAC projects and programmes for 1989
(see agenda)

a) The presentation of art books and catalogues in the U.S.S.R. should be a precursor of an IAAC prize which would not necessarily be linked in the future to an exposition.

b) Vladimir GORIAINOV, following discussions, suggested that initially each section send only one book (not catalogues) edited in the course of the last three years. It was agreed that a commission would be named during the Administrative Council in Moscow to study the possibilities of going beyond this preliminary phase.

c) With regard to the Festival of Art Films and the symposium to be organized on this occasion, Jacques LEENHARDT requested that Mr. Leopoldo MALEK be invited to the Rennes conference to be held in May 1989 and that a member of the Commission "The Image of Art, the Art of the Image" could in turn be invited to San Francisco.

Julie LAWSON pointed out that it would also be desirable to invite Mr. John RUSSEL TAYLOR, an IAAC member specializing in art films.

5. Discussion of regional secretariats

There was a general consensus that before establishing regional secretariats it would be necessary to initiate preliminary regional operations on a trial basis and evaluate the results.

Hélène LASSALLE evoked the situation of Europe in 1992 and the importance that regrouping would then assume.

It was agreed to await the forthcoming Council to engage in in-depth discussions on this subject.

a) Comments by Silvano LORA:

Silvano LORA informed the Administrative Council of the exhibition of "Engravings in the Caribbean" organized by the Dominican section. This exhibition would be of special interest

since it was in the programme of the celebration of the bicentennial of the french revolution. It would be followed by a symposium on the theme "Races, cultures, identities". Silvano LORA hoped that the national sections could in turn assume responsibility for this exhibition.

Belgica RODRIGUEZ suggested that the dominican section address a formal request to the national sections in this regard.

B) Comments by Jan KRIZ :

Jan KRIZ took the floor. He had attended this session to inform the members of the Administrative Council of the situation of the Czech section. On this occasion, he thanked the International Bureau for having continued to send them all information concerning IAAC, in spite of non-payment by members of the Czech section; this moral support had been invaluable. At the time of the meeting, the Artists' Union had accepted certain members of the IAAC and a committee was to be created to restore the authority of the Association. As all members of the Czechoslovakia section, despite various complications, have carried on their professional activities throughout these last twenty years, their statut must be rightfully upheld.

Jacques LEEHNARDT summarized the foregoing discussion, reflecting the general sentiment, and emphasized the importance of giving official support to the effort to re-establish the Czech section.

Hans Jorg HEUSER noted that when the President of the Austrian Section had presented his proposal for a congress in Vienna, an excursion to Czechoslovakia had been included. This would seem to be an ideal occasion for IAAC to resume contact with the Czech section.

Following a proposal by Léone de la GRANDVILLE, a motion was approved in favour of the continued membership of the Czech members in the new section.

c) Léone de la GRANDVILLE obtained the agreement of the Treasurer for the purchase of a telefax, and would make enquiries.

The session was adjourned at 19:30.

AICA

association internationale des critiques d'art
international association of art critics
asociacion internacional de criticos de arte

11 rue berryer 75008 paris téléphone (1) 42.56.17.53

SECRETARY GENERAL'S REPORT
on the occasion of B.M. 11/02/1989

Léone de la GRANDVILLE
General secretary

Before informing you of the activities of our office since last november, I wish to thank Hélène LASSALLE for her friendly help which made it easier for me to take up my duties; and I also wish to thank Fabienne LE CORVEC in whom I found an excellent associate.

We have already apologized for our mail delay, due to an interminable postal strike. It allowed us at least to save money, because we put the reports of the Congress in one dispatch. If you agree, we'll proceed in the same way, in december 1989.

At the request of our chair-woman, who through Mr MALEMPRE, NGO's unit chief has hopes of a change of category, we sent UNESCO a report concerning AICA's activities during the last five years. A Letter accompanied the report, asking for our promotion to category A. We hope of course for a favorable decision, though our geographical extension still seems insufficient, in spite of the recent formation of certain sections.

I reply to UNESCO's questionnaire concerning our participation in the world decade of culturel developement, we have proposed two projects : " the Africain Biennal" apparently now on the right way, and the "New technics Researches", whose international Symposium, in Rennes, next may, will be one of its first developement.

Foreseing the preparation of the sexennial report on NGO's contribution made to the implementation of UNESCO's objectives and programmes, we sent a second more specific report on AICA's principal Activities from 1983 to 1988, destined to underline the range of our various activities.

Moreover, I've been in touch with Egypte's cultural attache, Mr Francis YOUSSEF, so as to resume the dialogue Mr President FRANCA started, concerning the creation of an Egyptian Cultural Minister, who is expected in Paris this month. I've also met Mr Brahim ALLAOUI of the Arabian world Institute, who is quite open to the idea of forming a Moroccan section, even an Algerian and Tunisian sections.



The drawing up of these different reports has highly delayed the counting we had begun of the members and full members. It's a long and fastidious job, but it will be done at our end.

Finally, I always have in my mind that we must find sure and easily workable projects this year, so as to satisfy UNESCO's wishes and uphold AICA's high reputation.

In short, I'll do my best to carry out the task that Hélène had so well achieved during her mandate.

Before informing you of the activities of our office since last November, I wish to thank Hélène LASALLE for her friendly help which made it easier for me to take up my duties; and I also wish to thank Fabienne LE CORVET in whom I found an excellent associate.

We have already apologized for our mail delay, due to an interminable postal strike. It allowed us at least to save money, because we put the reports of the Congress in one dispatch. If you agree, we'll proceed in the same way. In December 1989.

At the request of our chair-woman, who through Mr MALINBERG, NGO's unit chief has hopes of a change of category, we sent UNESCO a report concerning AICA's activities during the last five years. A letter accompanied the report, asking for our promotion to category A. We hope of course for a favorable decision, though our geographical extension still seems insufficient, in spite of the recent formation of certain sections.

I reply to UNESCO's questionnaire concerning our participation in the world decade of cultural development. We have proposed two projects: "the African Biennial" apparently now on the right way, and the "New Technical Researches", whose international Symposium, in Rennes, next May, will be one of its first developments.

Forecasting the preparation of the biennial report on NGO's contribution made to the implementation of UNESCO's objectives and programmes, we sent a second more specific report on AICA's principal activities from 1983 to 1988, designed to underline the range of our various activities.

Moreover, I've been in touch with Egypte's cultural attaché, Mr Francis YOUSSEF, so as to resume the dialogue Mr President FRANCA started, concerning the creation of an Egyptian Cultural Minister, who is expected in Paris this month. I've also met Mr Brahim ALLAOUI of the Arabian world Institute, who is quite open to the idea of forming a Moroccan section, even an Algerian and Tunisian sections.

AICA

association internationale des critiques d'art
international association of art critics
asociación internacional de críticos de arte

11 rue berryer 75008 paris téléphone (1) 42.56.17.53

MEMMORANDUM ON AICA INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Hélène LASSALLE
Vice-president

I have been requested by the members of the Board of Director who attended our last meeting in Buenos Aires in octobre 1988 to write a Memorandum about our conference.

The problem is much larger, I think, that our concern about the mere Buenos Aires congress.

For sure, the last conference did not fulfill AICA traditionnal requirements and rules. Nevertheless we had to deal with the same problem in the past. According to our rules, the section in charge of the international conference must keep in touch with the Secretary General to prepare the meeting. It was not the case in 1988. Argentinian officials talked to the President only. Belgica RODRIGUEZ had to pass on informations and questions to the other Bureau members and vice-versa, which made everything very difficult, subject to misunderstandings.

The secretary general tried to get personally in touch with Buenos Aires, anyway, through repeted phone calls, cables and letters. Washington and Buenos Aires promised us everything, Brussels and Paris requested in termes of administrative and financial supports : xerox machine, secretary, translation, paid trips and accomodation for the 5 members of the Bureau plus the administrative secretary. We never could discuss intellectual matters, most unfortunately.

When we came to the delicate problem of "who would pay for what" alas! I got lost in the most desperating chaos in spite of my many calls in every direction, Washington, Buenos Aires, Brussels, and even Lausanne, in order to try to coordinate contradictory conversations. Finally everyone made a decision of one's own, the worst possible solution considering our financial situation. In Buenos Aires the result was a friendly meeting, without any administrative framing. No xerox machine, no translation; AICA had to pay for some trips and stays. The symposium was divided into two parts. At night we could listen to famous speakers who were personally invited by Mr GLUSBERG

for his Jornadas de la critica while the afternoons were devoted to AICA speakers who volunteered their cooperation.

Informations had come so haphazardly over the preparatory months that a few members only did participate in AICA meetings: 17 attended the meetings of the Board of Directors, 30 the General Assembly. No argentinian critic came. In short, we had an interesting experience in Buenos Aires but hardly linked to AICA activities.

This is not new. In 1987, Madrid officials did about the same. They did not speak neither to the international president nor to the secretary general. We sent letters, we mandated go betweens, we kept hanging on the phone. No way.

As a result, a bunch of spanish invited speakers, and desorganised debates with haphazardly selected international speakers who volunteered and who were given the floor at the very last minute. No visit to artist's studios or art galleries (which was not the case in Buenos Aires) even though spanish art is at the center of the internal art scene today. Let's look further back. Athens 1984. Dan HAULICA and Raoul Jean MOULIN made the trip to Athens where they met Ministries and officials. For internal reasons, the conference turned out a pure chaos. Art dealers and artists were expecting us. We were stuck in a dark room, engrossed in endless and hopeless discussions. Our Greek friends keep a bitter memory of our meeting, the art critics felt terribly frustrated.

It seems to me that those failures are mostly due to personnal conflicts within a section (or a region) or to a lack of interest in a decision which is considered by national members as their president's personal idea.

This last phenomenon was obvious at SOPHIA-ANTIPOLIS, where we had such a hard time handling the meeting with no help at all from the French critics; it was a disaster in Madrid and Buenos Aires.

May I remind you that an international conference is not a one man project. It concerns our Association as a whole. There is not other way, so far, to get sponsors and official supports. The Bureau has neither means nor time to raise funds and to set up meetings. When a section proposes its country for an international conference, that means that that section accepts to be in charge, that year, of the most valuable contribution to our international look in terms of intellectual production.

Then they are the ones who must realize our first aim: cultural interacting and promoting the arts in each country. The inviting section is responsible for the entire Association, and, in that respect, must cooperate with the central "too" the Association, has elected to rule the organisation, namely the international Bureau... as long as the Bureau itself maintains its internal unity. As for me, I still feel grateful to the Brussels organisers in 1985 when we all worked together, national and international officials as well, for the

conference which was a success. This has not been the case every year.

Athens, Madrid, Buenos Aires, may be other cities before, which I have not heard of : debates insisted mostly in internal fighting, far from the artistic discussions which we should have. During all those years we have been exclusively talking about mailing delays, by-laws and rules, how to vote, fullmembership, fees, in violent and passionate discussions. How could we interest critics or sponsors all over the world with such pointless controversies?

AICA faithful supporters have an exceptional gift for polemic psychodramas. Passions explode over minute details, expressing desires of powers. What powers? Those powers rule nothing, create nothing.

Our UNESCO partners, who are our major financial sources, have been bitterly critical, lately. They disapprove of our lack of cultural aims, our promises and proposals which never come to realization. They are tired of hearing of our personal conflicts and fights. They no longer trust us.

I must say that I got tired, also, of spending time and energy in projects which always fail. Not long after I joined the AICA Bureau , Dr UHLITZSCH died, and his remarkable Environnement Commission disappeared with him. A dozain of project has been proposed afterwards.

- José Augusto FRANCA's bio-bibliographical dictionnary. UNESCO withdrew the funds. We did not have enough material to publish anyway.

- Slides of latin america art, the project died for the same reasons.

- The commission on new techniques was called Image de l'art/art de l'image, when it was created in 1982 . I remember a short attempt to organize a few meetings in 1986. Then nothing. It seems that the commission is working hard these days with a symposium to be held next may.

- What about the international network of shcolars and art critics inquiring on Art critics in France, Switzerland, URSS and USA? Some are still working, I know, slowly I must say, other ones have gone to sleep, no result so far, after 7 or 8 years.

- No AICARC publication for the last years.

- We sent out xeroxes of new adresses twice to Latin America. Shall we have a directory, and when? But do we need one? Piles of 1985 directories are still in our Paris office, untouched and out of date.

- The Inter Biennale Bulletin has been buried without words.

conference which was a success. This has not been the case.
- Our documentation Center for Africa, Asia and Latin-
America has been postponed sine die.

Athens, Madrid, Buenos Aires may be other cities before.
- The African Biennale is more a ghost than anything else.
Still in the air. We keep hope anyway.

During all those years we have been exclusively talking
Our Association logo should be "manana", "to morow we'll be
great" I dare add "how"? Why, then, should we be so resentful
against our Buenos Aires conference while we should tackle the
matter of the problematic future of our association as a whole.

AICA faithful supporters have an exceptional gift for
polemic psychodrama. Passions explode over minute details.
expressing desires of powers. What powers? Those powers rule
nothing, create nothing.

Our UNESCO partners, who are our major financial sources,
have been bitterly critical, lately. They disapprove of our
lack of cultural aims, our promises and proposals which never
come to realization. They are tired of hearing of our personal
conflicts and fights. They no longer trust us.

I must say that I got tired, also, of spending time and
energy in projects which always fail. Not long after I joined
the AICA Bureau, Dr. UHLIRICH died, and his responsibilities
Environment Commission disappeared with him. A domain of
project has been proposed afterwards.

- José Augusto FRANCA's bio-bibliographical dictionary.
UNESCO withdrew the funds. We did not have enough material to
publish anyway.

- Riders of latin america art, the project died for the
same reasons.

- The commission on new techniques was called Image de
l'art de l'image, when it was created in 1982. I remember
a short attempt to organize a few meetings in 1986. Then
nothing. It seems that the commission is working hard these
days with a symposium to be held next year.

- What about the international network of scholars and art
critics existing on art critics in France, Switzerland, USSR
and USA? Some are still working. I know, slowly I must say,
other ones have gone to sleep, no result so far, after 7 or 8
years.

- No AICARC publication for the last years.

- We sent out indexes of new addresses twice to Latin
America. Shall we have a directory, and when? But do we need
one? Files of 1982 directories are still in our Paris office.
untouched and out of date.

- The Inter Biennale Bulletin has been buried without
words.