

said, had no form, orientation in space, nothing by which we could recognise any dimension in space. These were value-judgements. Many artists in Europe and the United States had told her that there were no principles, that nothing could be compared or judged and she thought that this attitude of complete relativity was a very interesting one which could be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN thanked Mrs. Ostrower and went on to say that it always made him a little suspicious when a universal criterion was offered as a value-judgement in art if immediately some forms of art were said not to be art because they did not agree with the particular value-judgement offered. He did not think that Pop art and Optical art could be summarily dismissed; in Optical art not only was there a feeling of movement but one of the interests it had was the slow revaluation of space that occurred when looking at the works. He was not certain that he understood Mrs. Ostrower's definition of space; to him it seemed that space had, as a minimum, three dimensions, and that he had always thought of two dimensions as area or surface, consequently he felt a little uncertain as to the criterion offered. In her reply, Mrs. OSTROWER said that art was not concerned with revealing one space only, but with space experiences which could have any number of dimensions.

Prof. SHAW (U.S.A.) thought perhaps that Mrs. Ostrower had one sort of space in mind.

Replying, Mrs. OSTROWER said she had not in mind any special space configuration as eternally given; such a space, she thought, did not exist.

Creativeness or the Acquisition of Techniques

Mr. Vojin STOJIC (Yugoslavia) said he would only speak on some principles used in the Belgrade Academy concerning the problem of so-called creativeness and techniques; in his school the two were indivisible. The emphasis was exclusively on individual teaching, and the aim was to uncover from the very beginning the creative potential or essential inclinations and affinities of the student. Interdependence of subjects was of primary importance; the student could decide as he continued whether his approach would be figurative or abstract, to quote possible extremes; in the third year he worked towards his individual preferences. The system of teaching called for great mutual co-operation, and the exchange of opinion on the part of teachers of all departments, who knew every student and his work personally.

The first condition for a real integration of art, he said, was not to divide it into pure art, and into arts which were minor, and the first concern was to give the student the idea that he was not at the school to learn techniques, but to use them in his search for the moment when the creative spark was struck and communication made possible.

Mr. George FULLARD (U.K.) pointed out that a danger of an enlightened art training was that it gave the student an artificial context without making it clear all the time that this was very different from the situation in which the painter or sculptor would find himself later. The purpose of any art training establishment was much wider than that of training the mind and skill of the young artist: it was essential to give him a context where he could be helped to emerge, with a confidence in his independence of judgement and separateness, together with the ability and temperament to survive.

For many years there had been talk of the marriage of sculpture and architecture, but in the speaker's experience, most of these marriages had been shot-gun weddings—London was full of the unfortunate offspring.