

United States because artists had been complaining about this situation. There were many problems in the modern world and man had better worry with his head about them. Students had to be aware of the issues and thinking processes in other disciplines, rather than cold facts. Studio work should come first and too much verbal work should be avoided, as well as rigidity of programme; if art education was about the concepts, issues and ideas of our time rather than skills and techniques only, he thought it could be a very fine liberal discipline. There was not one way only of educating the artist; he was, in fact, all for self-education. It was an excellent thing that professional artists were now on the Campus throughout the United States. Professor PAULUCCI said that in academies in Italy and, he thought everywhere else where there was a painting master and an art historian, there was a need to seek some way of bringing the two forms of teaching together, so that there should be agreement. He proposed also that art history should be taught from modern art backwards.

Professor RUDEL, said the function of an art historian was not to give an opinion on the value of a work, but first of all to explain it and, consequently, even if it were bad, that did not matter; he should explain the intentions of the artist, if he had the capacity, without adding too much of his own. That would simplify things a great deal. Secondly, there was a project which Prof. André Chastel wished to propose to the Minister whereby art historians would require a certificate of practical training in a school of fine art; it seemed to the speaker that a reform in the way of understanding and seeing was required of art historians.

The CHAIRMAN said he thought Prof. Paulucci had put his finger on a very important point; it required great self-control on the part of the historian not to offer his views, art historians being as egotistical as painters.

Mrs. OSTROWER referred to difficulties experienced in teaching art theory from modern art backwards: one of these was the idea which formed in the minds of her students that the whole history of art had certain predetermined goals.

Mr. AUJAME was in complete agreement with the first part of what Prof. Paulucci had said: in schools of art the ideas of the art historian and those of the other teachers had to be harmonized. On the second part, that is, beginning art history with modern art, he did not agree, because it was not necessary to know whether to begin with ancient or modern art, it could well be taken in "slices." What was necessary was to propose to students a subject for meditation—culture for the artist was nothing but a means of thinking further ahead and more deeply. The art historian could not run a course for the needs of each individual artist but the teacher of painting could do this. As for modern art, he went further and said it was extremely difficult and dangerous to frame a course on modern history—it should be approached as closely as possible to the present and it was absolutely necessary to give to pupils very exact ideas about what had just come before, but, in doing so, more than anywhere, one had to refrain from making any judgement of value since what counts in an art in progress is that it neglects or destroys what has just come before.

The Chairman suggested to Mr. Aujame that it would be useful to propose some ideas for future activity. The endeavour to get harmony between artists and art historians in teaching could be a very clear resolution.

He then invited Mr. Hogben, the representative of the International Council of Museums, to speak.