

*the fact that a work which is no more than a simple play of line and colour is already marked out for condemnation, I say this because I sincerely believe it."*

*"I believe that any work of art which does not bear within itself a universe, using the word in a broad sense, has no validity : either an ancient religious universe of the old civilisations or a present-day religious universe or even, let us say, simply its own inner universe. Now even this inner universe has to be created."*

The history of art should be a platform for the active exchange of ideas in order to draw from it what was essential from the point of view of organisation and construction. *"It is equally important to remember that the history of art cannot live independently since its normal meaning implies the act of relating an event to its historical setting."*

He fervently wished that, for the sake of example, films on the sacred Hindu dances and on contemporary ballet for instance could be integrated to form a comparative body of knowledge so that, to take modern painting before 1910, we should see, on a simple chronological basis, how it unites the transformation of jazz with the contribution of Stravinsky, the researches of Kandinsky and coincides with the publication of Freud and Bergson. Then suddenly everything becomes clear. *"Obviously I should not ask artists to read all this but simply to be given some commentary on it after which it is up to them to make an effort to understand. So they will discover that Art History is not just supplementary theory but provides a means of integration and thus a source of life and human intercommunication, of mutual aid between artists over the centuries. What must be restored to us once again is the living past of these centuries so that we can discover the growth and the ascending line of a new life."*

Mr. KESTELMAN thanked Prof. Rudel for what he described as a very brilliant talk with which he found himself very deeply sympathetic. As the Chairman, he wanted to talk less perhaps on the history of art than on the programme of liberal studies.

The idea of a broad cultural background for an artist was an excellent one; the artist should have a good general grasp of what went on in society and have a certain grasp of ideas. The real problem was to what extent this could be harnessed to the main studies to which the student was devoting himself passionately, to such a difficult and all-absorbing study as art.

A concentration on so-called ideas could bring about one of the most obnoxious contemporary phenomena, the forming of views largely by the ear and not by the eye. He would prefer to see one or two subjects studied in depth, thus providing the student with a method to be applied in other directions as and when he wished. To force a student into a multitude of academic subjects was pedagogism run mad, in his opinion. Another danger was that the teaching of art history tended to be taught in schools of art as though the students were to become art historians.

Mr. DAS GUPTA added his comments referring to the history of Indian sculpture, saying that we should never allow knowledge to take the upper hand and kill the instinctive art within us. Mrs. OSTROWER wished to compliment Prof. Rudel on what he said; she thought that art history, taught that way, could be taught by an artist or an art historian who, at the same time, was very much of an artist. Professor SHAW expressed his sympathy with some of the cautions uttered by Mr. de Saumarez and Mr. Kestelman; the marriage between liberal education and the fine arts, in the training of the artist, was a difficult one but he thought it called for adjustment rather than divorce. This adjustment was already taking place in the