

NOTES AND DISCUSSION

Edmond Radar

ART CENTERS AND PARTICIPATION

*"Now, a symbol only exists because it is put
into circulation."*

Ferdinand de Saussure

*Les anagrammes*¹

The reconsideration of the museological institution, which emerged in the dispute of 1968, has already brought about two positive results. Museology, having been prevailed upon to surpass its narrowly specialized concerns, had then as its immediate aim the study of the conditions of collective participation in its undertakings. This is the first result, that henceforth no-one will dismiss, and which is in keeping with the upheaval of the concept of culture, in the sense signaled by Mikel Dufrenne: "The death of art," he writes, "aims at the return of presence... a presence tendered to the primitive perception... a subject united to the object in the immediacy of enjoyment."²

Under the pressure of popular needs, hardly entertained till now, it is a question of introducing the work of art into a plan infinitely broader than that of a science specializing in preservation. A much broader plan, in no way destructive of previous acquirements: the expansion to collective participation simply

¹ Jean Starobinski, *Les mots sous les mots. Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure, "Le Chemin,"* Paris, Gallimard, 1971, p. 16.

² Mikel Dufrenne, "Crise de l'art" in *Encyclopaedia Universalis* 1974, Paris, 1974, p. 160.

Translated by Rosanna and Paul Rowland

gives museological intentions a new dimension to discover. This revival is taking place under our gaze, however; by attempting to meet with daily life, the museological undertaking becomes the animating center of symbolic exchanges. And while sociology disseminates the idea of society as a complete symbolic system, work of an archeological, historical or aesthetic nature comes to resemble a semantically highly charged symbol and thence a privileged and collective tool of symbolic communication.

As the focus of collective participation, museological practice is thus called upon to develop a new function, i.e. that of deciphering the symbols connected with the cultural object and requiring an area expressly furnished to facilitate this. This is a second result, which has also been achieved in principle.

Hence this double evolution of museological practice: the evolution towards popular participation in the deciphering of the most elaborate tribal symbols; and the evolution towards the creation of spatial arrangements allowing this. Modern museology would thus keep in circulation symbols in which it is precisely the quality of the sign—which is always nothing but an aspect of the reading and interiorization of meanings—which determines future study and practice. In short, the crux of the museological problematic will henceforth be distinguished by the implementation of methods of communication, in the service of the symbolic object.

It will thus not be surprising that the thread of a reflection on the goals of a museology open to social participation still be provided by communication theory. For our part we would like to show that the whole problematic can be formulated according to it. It is therefore communication theory that will be found here, enriched, however, by Jakobson's linguistic commentary. The reason for this can be seen; in seeking to give an account of the process of producing poetry, Jakobson allows access to the symbolic order and to the aesthetic dimension by the use of models; to that same symbolic order, and to that same aesthetic dimension, which can be recognized as the aim of the project for a museology of collective participation, and for which a method of approach basically remains to be found.³

³ Roman Jakobson, *Essais de linguistique générale*, chap. 4, "Poétique," éd. de Minuit, Paris, 1963.

Art Centers and Participation

Finally, in redistributing the tasks of museology among the six functions of communication, the approach that we are attempting here does not betray any of the missions that the institution traditionally used to assign it: they are established in new relationships, and enhanced by collective participation.

Let us then state in a certain amount of detail the sequence governing these pages; the functions of message, of code, of reception, of contact, of reference, and of propagation; this sequence is not encompassed under one simple nomenclature, but tries to reform the project of collective participation according to the necessary structures of communication, following the model given to us by the theory of the same name.

Thus, the problems related to the contemplation and deciphering of the artifacts of civilization—documents, works of art, and products of human industry—underlie the museological intention: we shall see, to begin with, that communication theory will restore to it its constitutive dimensions through the notion of the message, enhanced with an *aesthetic* aim, as Jakobson well saw, from the moment we look to the symbolic quality of the sign.

Now, it is the man in the street who is invited to participate in this goal, but he is accustomed to the pure and simple intake of images; it is therefore necessary to readopt his limited language and direct it progressively towards the interiorization of signs. The museological project of participation extends in this way by careful steps to collective codes; a complex task which leads to the problem of semei-sociology in which, to take up Jakobson's lesson again, the *metalinguistic* function will provide the useful and honed conceptual tool.

Furthermore, the cultural revolution does not reside in the advent of mass communication, but in the willingness of individuals to intervene as cultural agents. The museological goal will encounter this need for authenticity in the interpretation of signs through the practice of participation defined according to the notion of reception, itself extended by the theory of linguistic communication to include its psychological overtones under the heading of the *conative* function.

And now behold the public at large standing before the artifacts of civilisation which are by no means insignificant, but which are on the contrary the object of an increasingly observed respect: those levels of extreme differentiation at which the signs are ex-

changed through a contact whose modulations will be predetermined by the *phatic* function.

Finally the innovations, in their turn, stem from the response to the signs by the Art Center director and his team; whose expressive or *emotional* function will constitute a fundamental analysis, in that personalized tone which returns to a conception of communication informed, as one finds Jakobson, by the inexhaustible rapport with a Poetic...

Such are the successive stages of our development and their reciprocal economy. Based upon the schema of communication, of which it is known that a mathematical formalisation is also possible, we have had in view a museological theory that is open to collective participation, and conceived, if not on a completely scientific basis, at least rational in each of its practical aspects. To demonstrate a willingness for collective participation, however generous and varied the enterprises might be, remains an undertaking which coherent thinking could take even further.

One last word on our method. The museological innovations to which we refer in the course of the essay are, for our part, tantamount to gestures of recognition towards the enlightened teams conducting them. They reinforce this theoretical approach through their patient, informed, and inventive activities which we are pleased—whatever the relevance of this study—to have the opportunity of bringing to our reader's attention.

AN AREA FOR READING AND DECIPHERING (AESTHETIC FUNCTION)

This museological policy is founded upon a clear message: there are objects which call for a special place and time for deciphering—observation, interiorisation—of the representation, and meditative participation; objects in the presence of which “man feels that he is the possessor of a psychical development,” in the words of Spengler⁴. For such objects a space for contemplation to facilitate this deciphering, this act of mental vigilance which constitutes its worth, is indeed necessary. That such objects exist is not in doubt: social life is identified by the invention and

⁴ Oswald Spengler. *Le déclin de l'Occident*, “Bibl. des Idées,” Gallimard, 1948, tome I, chap. IV, “Musique et plastique,” pp. 213-284.

Art Centers and Participation

interpretation of signs, its quality is indicated by this alone, and it is by this also that it is true that culture—as the sphere of the invention and interpretation of signs—stems essentially from a politic, and still more from the practice of social liberation.

An example can easily be given: that of oil-painting. Specifically an invention of Western Europe, an expression limited to a few centuries and absolutely original, it requires not only such care as will ensure its preservation, but it requires the most delicate handling, it awakens our dreams, it calls up the most adventurous speculations, and breeds contemplation. It is finally the equivalent, in the realm of visual perception, of vague correspondences of Western “chamber music” to pick up one of Spengler’s observations anew. As with a Beethoven quartet, the oil pointing of the West demands a protected area, an internal period in which to resonate. Breughel’s *Fall of Icarus*, in a recent arrangement by the *Musée d’Art Ancien*, received this reservation of space and time: on one of the vast walls of the hall dedicated to this painter there is this canvas alone.

Popular use of such space and time in which our experiences become amplified and deepened in waking life, demands a period of initiation. The challenge brought to museological practice is thus precisely to facilitate this access, to study scientifically and create the conditions for its full use.

The art of exposition is the specific object of study of a higher institute of learning in Warsaw: it is a fact that, within the framework of a policy of popular culture, the exhibition constitutes the primary tool of an initiation into—if not of participation in—the artifacts of civilisation.⁵

INITIALLY THE LANGUAGE OF THE GENERAL PUBLIC WILL BE USED (METALINGUISTIC FUNCTION)

Initially, the Art Center will speak to the public at large in its own language, it will share the code of a vision accustomed to industrially produced images; the man in the street will find, to welcome him and speak to him in the manner of his acquired habits, a “multi-media park”, in the phrase of Henri Van Lier, who writes about this: “What is the present? It is the creations

⁵ Henri Van Lier. “Invertir le musée?,” *Intermédiaire*, n. 5, 1975.

stemming from the present-day environment and from present-day means of production, which are silk-screen printing, photography, the Super-8, lightweight video, spotlighting arrays, the sound engineer's workbench, cinematography, the magnetoscope, the selector, the photoviewer, etc..."⁵ This is the conception still governing the creation of the set at Beaubourg, in Paris.

Linked up with a present of thus expanded horizons, the public at large will here be entertained, in the sense that Pascal gives the word, but not entirely; seduced by the token of the work of art, a closer viewing now awakens it from the endless narcissistic game of the mechanical production of images. The "multimedia park" constitutes at this moment no more than an intermediate area, having at its disposal only processes creating an opportunity for invention and the production of the signs which are the true goal of museology.

It is the same function, bound up with worldly conventions, that is to be expected from private viewings and cocktail parties, press communiques, public relations, and publicity; to disseminate information among a heedless public, and then to guide it in front of the works, inviting it to an experience, openly.

Current language draws the constant attention and interpretation of the Arts Center director. A mimetic and ludic phenomenon, fashion promulgates a respect, a sensitivity, a spontaneous state of communication that are assumed: it obtains the immediate hearing of the general public whose daily mythology it propagates; it is thus necessary to learn its vocabulary. A simple pedagogy by dialogue inspires learning, to "participate without committing oneself;" for fashion, beyond its use as a social index, is only the dissemination of the sign. Now, our "museology" aims, on the contrary, at participation in the invention of symbols, the interiorized expression of an innovatory output.

It is again in consideration of the dialogue to be concretely established with the general public, that touring exhibitions are mounted ever more frequently by the Arts Centers. This is not to follow the evolution of fashionable ideas and interests, but in order to enhance their aesthetic, moral, and philosophical implications by the effect of relationships, contrasts, and alienating effects; and finally to demonstrate that heroic quality of modern life which Baudelaire first pointed out.

Art Centers and Participation

URBAN AND REGIONAL COLLECTIVE PARTICIPATION (CONATIVE FUNCTION)

It is thus by the paths of active participation—be it by the deciphering and interiorization of symbols—that exhibition space avoids the assimilation/dissipation of signs, that is to say the vain stereotypes and repetitions of fashion, (without the latter, as we have seen, being the object of a puritanical exclusion: it acts as an antenna, as an instrument within the public's hearing, in its present state of neglect).

This is to repeat that this participation must be the object of a continual reappraisal. The direction of the museums—or rather we should say the “museogogy,” by virtue of the specific knowledge and skills required—has already provided some fairly well-known formulae. Let us mention a few.

An educational service, attached to the museological team, constantly monitors the scholastic syllabi of the various schools of the city or area, in relation to the Art Center's collection. The teachers are individually and regularly kept informed as to what they can use for the subjects they are teaching. Subsequently, when the study group visits the museum, it is in an enquiring frame of mind, with a growing personal interest. We have seen such a service in action at the *Barcelona Ethnological Museum*: the behavior of the children during the visit is serious and to the point, revealing a happy atmosphere in which can be seen the effects of class-room preparation. It goes without saying that the museum library is open to young researchers and, even better, that this library is well-used. Once set in motion, such a service goes on expanding: undertaking such a program provides the opportunity to organize workshops, lectures, and meetings for teachers, the various sections of the town's adult population, professional groups, employees, workers, unions, leisure groups, cultural activities, etc.

But the participatory element opens up still more varied activities for “museogogy.” Among others may be mentioned the demand among the public at large to take part in excavations, and in archeological trips conducted on the initiative of the Arts Center.

It then becomes a question of teams of volunteers who, under the guidance of the museogological unit, undergo a theoretical and

practical initiation. This principle is applied at the *Abbaye des Dunes* of St. Idesbald, in Belgium. The teams are international, and bring together students and adults from the whole world. The excavation site borders on the museum: this means that, during vacations this museological unit is caught up in a general wave of interest and interaction, an interest and interaction which rubs off onto the passing visitor, attracts him and holds him: The Museum of the *Abbaye des Dunes* receives more visitors than any other museum in Belgium, over a hundred and fifty thousand each year.

At a time when some see a contradiction between the tasks of preserving museums and developing them, we believe to have discovered, on the other hand, a compromise solution in the efforts at participation. There are others, even more ambitious. Here we are thinking, from a politico-cultural perspective, of the Arts Center's interest in those activities dedicated to the understanding and protection of nature. In this we are alluding specifically to a suggestion of Claude Lévi-Strauss, linking the Arts Center and "museological" unit to movements for the renovation or protection of ancient quarters, to the activities of those "numerous small biological or anthropological establishments," and natural parks and reserves with which the region serving the large modern city will shortly be encircled.⁶

Though utopian—and despite its reasonableness—one example has been noted in operation at the Bialowieza National Park, in Poland. There, a museological unit adjoins an ecological study establishment, and a tourist and hunting center. The ensemble functions in partnership, with positive results for each. The tourist lives in a climate of aesthetic and scientific curiosity, according to his inclinations; the erudite, while staying at the establishment, can relax from his work without leaving it; the hunter, always a predator, is allowed some conception of the ecological edifice which protects his game, and he is led to understand it and respect it.

More surprising, for the European public, is the exemplarily effective mode of participation current in the museological sector of the United States and Canada. Each year, the museums of the United States receive several million visitors: between 1965

⁶ Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale* II, Paris, Plon, 1973, p. 336.

Art Centers and Participation

and 1976, three hundred museums were founded there, according to official figures.⁷ The majority of these foundations are the result of private financing. Tax allowances, no doubt, partly explain this development: many of these institutions are barely concerned with anything more than folklore, although not entirely. A lesson can be drawn from this phenomenon: as with American museums, it is up to the European museums to share with the public at large their problems of administration, as well as those of the actual techniques of museographic conservation. This is another form of participation that will not be met by apathy if intelligently handled. The Picasso Museum and the Miro Foundation, both in Barcelona, and the Maeght Foundation at St. Paul de Vence, are all the outcome of semi-private, semi-communal ventures, and are genuinely successful. With regard to this, one can reckon upon the cultural and behavioral factors which explain this phenomenon in the United States and Canada: in the midst of the urban alienation of North America, the museological sector has become the point of reference for participation in the artifacts of civilization for individuals who, without them, would be submerged in the anonymous crowd, irretrievably lost in the transient flux of the mass-media.

No doubt the cities of Europe are less impersonal than those of the United States, and tourism has been less abandoned solely to consumption, but this advantage will decrease with the spread of the consumer society. The "museological" unit is tending to become a center for the critical realization of environmental problems, the possible rallying point for information, inquiries, studies, if not actions—concerning cultural, urban, and regional problems of the community served by that unit. The directors of the Art Centers are called upon, through contingency and the interdependence of plans, to support environmental protection groups, encourage their leaders, and to explain steps taken to safeguard the quality of life. They can do still better: loan out premises for meeting and assembly, make available first-hand information, and promote congresses of scientists for prompt investigations.

This is applicable to Europe. For the developing nations, these tasks are of the most pressing urgency, because additionally, in

⁷ Germain Bazin, "Muséologie" in *Encyclopaedia Universalis*, tome II, p. 450.

this very century we have the last opportunity to study primitive societies in the context of their original civilization. These are tasks of an urgent and specific nature which in their own right call for study that is of paramount concern to anthropology.⁸

APPROACH AND VISUAL STRATEGY (PHATIC FUNCTION)

The museological team thus applies itself to missions of assistance and facilitation concerning the viewing of exhibits. The museum's heritage, as understood henceforth, is not only confined to its custodianship, but also to its ability to stimulate the interpretative capacities of the urban community to which the team will feel itself tied by its very activity.

We have already referred several times to the word "museogogy;" now we think that we can distinguish a proper function for it: to make the museological domain a communications center for closely co-ordinated symbolic interaction. The Muses personify the faculties of the mind in its moments of greatness; it is right that the area which is dedicated to works so-produced, should be the arena where the exercise of the sensory and intellectual faculties should be endowed with a zealous scrupulousness.

The new Olympia Museum, opened in the summer of 1972, is manifestly instrumental to this plan. A screen of laurels and pines shields it from the parking area, a huge park of wasteland, hitherto undeveloped. The visitor is welcomed by a patio; it consists of some fifty to one hundred meters of footpaths, punctuated by slender columns supporting a concrete canopy; this passage advances at right-angles up to a flagged courtyard; greenery grows from between the stones; the cypresses, grouped in clumps, project their dark forms in the sheltered space. The visitor thus imperceptibly steps from the customary distraction of the holiday mood into a contemplative frame of mind. The materials are bold: whitewashed concrete, marble, and volcanic rock. Each part of the building is designed according to its function; welcoming, sheltering, and displaying certain important works for the enjoyment of the living. The effect is of clarity and simplicity; the visitor is captured solely by a specific spatial

⁸ Claude Lévi-Strauss, "Anthropology," in *Diogenes*, n. 90, 1975.

Art Centers and Participation

quality, objects of amusement fade away, the sensitivities are awakened. The buildings which shelter the collection are organized according to their function; the arrangement of open spaces into varied proportions, with calculated luminosity and acoustics. The exhibits are presented in various layouts—conforming to a visual strategy—according to each hall. The perspectives through which the objects are approached already presupposes a certain selectivity. The supports of the exhibits presented to the gaze are either transparent: glass, mirror, nylon, wire and steel-frame, or, on the other hand, unabashedly exposed: unfinished wood, rough stone, and steel. The exhibit stands out,

So that in Itself it is transformed by eternity.

There it stands, brought forth by the hand of man, terra-cotta, bronze or marble, in its fundamental originality, matter wrought by a gesture, cast by the will, proffered to other men. Thus we return from our errancy. We identify with the piece, with the creative adventure upon which man, since time immemorial, has embarked, with the Cosmos. The work of art proclaims itself as expression and symbol: it must be as comprehensible as possible. It is no longer a question, as it was in the palatial gallery, of a reputation to be embellished, or, as in the civic museum, of a collection to be preserved, but rather of an impression, a token, an instant of human activity through which the experience of our presence in the world, of the human condition and its power to create works, will be brought home to us all the more strongly. Thus our sensitivity and intelligence are challenged by an interpretative task in which our whole humanity is involved.

Again: space, layout, stands as transparent and light as possible, express such intentions and serve their ends. When it governs the museological area, the *design* proclaims itself in its rarest achievements: because here it is in the service of pure symbols, by which we mean objects which function symbolically, and which are only the media of the activity of the representative imagination, or symbolic activity. Documents, archives, and ancient objects, when concentrated upon with complete attention, soon become a focus for the emerging senses, for the awakened consciousness, and, consequently, of experience bordering on the limits of the self and the capacities of which it is conscious.

The collection of Etruscan art at the Villa Giulia, in Rome, is presented in this spirit. A most refined operation! The museum's furnishings are composed entirely of transparent glass cabinets: the stands, made of slender steel tubing, further accentuate the tone of unaffected display; standing out sharp and clear, is a single outline, drawn by the Etruscan sculptor, which escorts us from room to room; a single variation, wavering but unbroken, threading its way through the space of the noble palace!

Mediterranean museology is provided with excellent possibilities for natural light arrangements, in preference to artificial light. This is also exemplified in the design of the Miro Foundation in Barcelona by the architect Jose Luis Sert. Open to the public since 1974, this building houses several collections. Light enters by way of shafts which diffuse it throughout the open-plan exhibition spaces, without falling directly upon either the canvases or visitors. Elsewhere, the visitor is allowed a practically all-round view of the greenery outside and the panorama of the city, by means of a calculated fenestration which opens out onto a central patio and the surrounding gardens. Here, the transparency results not only from the museum furniture, as in the Villa Giulia, but from the very architectural conception itself. The partitions, in rough-cast concrete, are strongly linked, and yet on entering the museum the visitor never feels himself confined, but maintains a relationship with the city and the luxuriant vegetation of the Montjuic park. The viewing areas are screened by stonework that is confined to this function with such rigorous economy that the trip through seems to have been designed without any enclosures: like an avenue. Starting from simple modular elements—a variation upon parallelepiped areas—there is here a system capable of many and varied combinations. In brief, it consists of a simple vocabulary used with a complex grammar, which, at each moment of the journey, creates an impression of freedom that both enchants and relaxes. While perusing, one merely follows the inclinations of one's fancy.

The Juan Miro Foundation aims to be a "Center for the Study of Contemporary Art." It also functions as a facility suitable for travelling exhibitions, musical recitals, and experimental drama... Such are the uses of the spatial arrangements that it is possible for the architect to create.

Art Centers and Participation

Neither have the custodian functions of the museum been forgotten. The exhibition areas are flanked by an octagonal tower in which, from the basement to the second floor, are accommodated respectively a film and lecture hall, the administration, the stock-rooms, and finally a meeting hall and library expressly conceived as a work and study area, with a pleasant lounge connected with the gardens and the open-air by way of a glazed terrace.

Thus, simply through the amelioration of the conditions in which we approach a work of art, we see the development of a communicative process whose flexible logic, as in life itself, grows element by element in proportion to increased user-participation.

THE SOCIO-HISTORICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE ARTIFACTS OF CIVILIZATION (REFERENTIAL FUNCTION)

The associations from history, social and cultural life that attach to the exhibits, will be conserved in separate areas, in order not to undermine that moment in which the pure and original form is revealed, and so as not to divest the understanding of the symbol of its primal impact. Educational sub-displays are to be constituted of explanatory panels and photographic documents, with simple stages of approach. The *Artisanat et Traditions de France* Museum in the Bois de Boulogne, in Paris, provides an example of this: booths fitted with audio-visual equipment give a socio-historical commentary about the exhibits which the visitor has noticed during his passage through the show-cases, between which he has wandered as through so many alleyways. In this way, the instant of aesthetic perception and the understanding of the concrete elements of the exhibit remain undefiled by any intellectual prejudice at the moment of discovery, along the show cases—without, however, eliminating the historico-cultural associations as they are presented at the end of the visit.

Built at the edge of the Bois du Boulogne, the exhibition halls of this museum have no access to the Bois itself. Here, the desire to present works as symbols to be deciphered, and to exclude all other purposes from the visit other than this act of deciphering, has in our opinion been taken to excess. No doubt, the “museogogical” space will be arranged to present symbols to be viewed,

to be understood, to be studied in their particularity—hence the lines of vision removed from all distractions, in the *Artisanat et Traditions de France* Museum, but to be so obsessed by this is to lose the symbols of urban participation, those of its regional roots, the subtle variations of changing light, and to surrender to artificial illumination, to the weariness and monotony thus created, to limit oneself to an unimaginative course. Why cut oneself off from the view of the Bois de Boulogne? When the sun plays upon it, the gleams of light on the waters of the Seine reflect on the windows of the great *Galerie du Louvre*; would it not be an aberration to blot them out on the pretext of viewing the canvases better? The interaction and the passage through must be interrupted by some kind of reassuring movement or imperceptible variation in the midst of the differing degrees of rapture engendered by the works, whose acquaintance it is so important for us to make, in this century, and in the course of our lives. Thus, we should be permitted to set down the goal of a “museology” oriented about the six communicative functions in the organization of such interaction: it allows such excess to be avoided by the compensatory regulation of one function by another, while at the same time leaving room for particular modifications.

MUSEOLOGICAL VITALITY (EMOTIONAL FUNCTION)

The function of dissemination is essentially the concern of the Art Center’s director, the custodian of yesterday. Just as the group needs an organizer whose task it is to co-ordinate the various activities of its members, so must the activities of the Art Center be co-ordinated by a guiding idea, since they are the focus for the communication of symbols. And this is the sole function of the exchange of symbols. Should there be any weakness in this guiding idea, then the museological plant will soon become underused, through the pressures of an environment given over to mechanism and consumption, and through the conditioned satisfactions that go with it. The public at large would be cut off from the opportunity to participate in the semantic richness of its own heritage: this risk must be foreseen.

It goes without saying that the works of art, which are the backdrop to the symbols displayed for common study, will be

Art Centers and Participation

kept in preservation, but the museological director will assume the additional task of constantly reappraising the conditions of viewing by the public at large. The director continually improves the methods for sharpening awareness; he adapts his dialogue and his suggestions for involvement to the immediate needs and potentialities of the cultural community he is called upon to serve.

The criticisms aimed at Frank Lloyd Wright for his creation of the Guggenheim Museum in New York, thus fall to the ground. The exhibition areas of this museum only allow the presentation of five hundred canvases out of a stock of almost four thousand works. But who can fail to see the wealth of choice, discussion and renewed interaction that such a system allows the curator to draw from, as is equally the case with an interested public, in successive presentations—which become equivalent to new events—thus an encouragement to further visits?

This is also the drift of temporary exhibitions, which are today the specialty of the Art Centers. What is perhaps most essential before all else in these activities, is to put the museological team and its public to the test of dialogue, to pinpoint on each occasion, the attention, the demands, and the understanding in which the public will indeed come to share. Of such involvement with the works of the human genius, at the limits of sensitivity and intelligence, it has become capable.

CONCLUSION

The rejection of the museum, and I mean the radical rejection—“the museums must be burnt down,” said Mayakovsky—is no more than the expression of a more general passion, even more pledged to collective participation, but deprived of the living contact where it meets with the artistic purpose. But again, contact, open confrontation, and primitive simplicity are merely words, superficial events, unless they produce through dialogue a necessary sharing, unless they are born out of a communication in which the exchange of symbols is interiorized.

The fresh impact does not exhaust the significance of the artifacts of civilization. Furthermore, even those responding directly to a desire for brutal confrontation, open-air sculptures,

architecture that corresponds to the curvature of space, and tragic drama amid sacrificial ritual and public games, themselves require, by way of amplification for the transmission of symbols, a time and space ordered according to the demands of valid communication. In the tribal symbols, the community finds its primitive roots, the mists of whose oblivion have finally dissipated.