

was cultivated by the serious practice of drawing from nature not only in the first stages but all through the artist's life. In his view, the artist could not do without the lesson of nature even if he turned his back on it later.

Professor André WILLEQUET of Belgium said he would like to summarise three points which had been discussed and to add a fourth as his own personal contribution. Agreeing with Mr. Aujame that the teacher must be modest, he thought that he must not be taken in by fine words; he should restore the love of craft to a place of honour and give his pupils a concern for the physical well-being of their work.

The whole of reality surrounding the artist should be invoked since it is through contact with reality that man becomes aware of himself. The final point concerned the importance of architecture for the student who should study problems in relation to architectural projects.

Mr. KESTELMAN (U.K.) mentioned that he was not opposed to the most fantastic experiments but since we had allowed ourselves a free licence to laugh at the academic, why should we not also laugh at the solemnities of the self-styled *avant-garde* who also were capable of a good many imbecile remarks.

The CHAIRMAN felt we must not insist that students spend a lot of time drawing but it would be completely wrong to deprive them of the opportunity if they wished to go and draw seriously. The very different threshold of the arts which the student now had, called for a somewhat humble accommodation on the part of the teacher to the student's point of view.

Professor MONTANARINI (Italy) spoke on the subject of reality and drawing from nature; he said the idea was insufficiently clear or precise. It must be asked what does nature or reality in art mean from the point of view of contemporary culture. It was not reality which made art; art took what it needed from reality, and the laws of harmony which interested us must be sought for in nature. Objective reality in itself was not art. Since Cézanne, art had shown us a new concept of reality; cubism and constructivism were new ways of seeing and representing the world; we had to attempt to study this reality which could not be called objective but simply artistic reality.

Value-Judgements

The discussion was now directed to the question: should the art teacher use value-judgements? and secondly, should the emphasis be on creativeness or is the training to be mainly directed to the acquisition of knowledge and of techniques?

Both these questions, the CHAIRMAN said, were proposed by Mrs. Ostrower of Brazil who thought that the significance of the visual form given to space in the context of the Renaissance, being part of our cultural inheritance, should be taught, but that the system itself should be taught only to those who would afterwards need to use it.

Concerning value-judgements, she asked whether there were some criteria or principles, constant in the art of the past and still applicable to-day and if there were, whether these could be transmitted so as to provide an objective basis for value-judgements in art. She herself thought that there were such objective principles based on space configurations, further defined as experiences of space of which there were many, each age having its own which found its image in art. Among examples of different space experiences, Egyptian painting was described as two-dimensional space horizontally orientated and Pop art was mentioned as being based entirely on associational values without artistic validity; likewise. Optical art, she