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within society is to maintain impeccable standards of scholarship and research, to the ultimate advantage of everyone and not to the advantage of parties with a current particular interest. At any rate, it is no more simply to make discoveries of a kind or to teach subjects of a kind that are not made or taught elsewhere. We do things that other people do not do, but our justifying function is to do things better than they are done elsewhere because, through the elimination of the grosser constraints of the profit motive, we do things better than they are done elsewhere. To some extent we do things that other universities are among the most perversely and widely shared — scholarly virtues, and in another way to peculiarities of the subject matter, case by case. Perhaps Psychology is finally reusable to Physics, but for the time being it seems clear that they are equally subjects in their own right, and that the universities among the most plausible claimants to custody of the best ways of researching and teaching them.'

What, then, have these rather grand generalizations to do with the propriety of encouraging our students to sell art works on campus for the benefit of the University? It seems first of all to restate the suggestion that some universal thesis about the contamination of scholarship by commerce is implicated. I do not think that selling things is wicked in principle, or that devoting the proceeds of our work to scholarly precedents as wicked in principle. I do not even rely upon the more plausible case that this combination might be reprehensible from the point of view of the Art industry. A university department of Pharmacology, for example, that set up an on-campus drug warehouse, with special procedures and facilities for the distribution of medicinal drugs, would surely not need to be made the subject of a thoughtful essay of mine as a precondition for the legal public misgiving. That consideration is a little bit, but not enough like that to provoke serious anxiety.

The point lies deeper, and is not yet clearly exposed. It depends upon the nature of the subject matter at stake is independent of art-institutional practices, and not a mere residue of these practices.2 However, this is a position that nowaday needs to be argued for its correctness — whether on my own or on some other criterion of art — can no longer be assumed. Just as an institution that can do philosophy, is an institutionally unsupportable 'discipline'. And whatever we incline to our own opinion, that a discipline is independent of the art market, (along with other features of the Art institution and its behaviour) is precisely and properly our subject.

It may be the case, indeed, that the art market (along with other features of the Art institution and its behaviour) is precisely and properly our subject.

Now it is not impossible to study one's own behaviour as an art-promotor, art authenticator, etc., along with the study of the behaviour of others. However, our reputation for objectivity and disinterestedness is likely to be enhanced if we detach ourselves as far as possible from the practices we criticize, however holy they may in some cases be. It is true, we must not mistake our own indulge in these practices for the art world. It is true that genuine art can be entirely neutral, but not energetically promote marketable art — and especially new Aboriginal art — without a ready and sound justification for doing it ourselves and for doing it as we do. After all, there is no shortage of examples of art-promotion and commerce to examine, within the cultural ecology of the art world. If we think that our own enterprise would somehow be superior, we had better try to say why.

NOTES
1. For an overview of some recent opinions on the putative reduction of Cognitive Psychology to Physics, see James D. Carney, A New Theory of Art, in Political Science, 1981, esp. Part II: 'Reduction and Unity of Science'.
2. One serious attempt, against the current mainstream, to make plausible the opinion that art is, after all, a mere distinctive subject-region of Knowledge, is to be found in James D. Carney, A Kratikop approach to aesthetic theories. British Journal of Aesthetics, Vol. 22, No. 2, Spring 1982.
3. This sort of position is not perfectly incommensurable with a genuine reduction of art to the cognitive, since the cognitive is a synthetic class. However, it does encourage a massive concentration on Art as a topic in the subject-region of Political or Cultural History. See, for recent examples of cognitive attitudes, such studies as Roger L. Taylor, An Enemy of the People, Harvester, Sussex, 1978.
4. The locus classicus of 'open concept' theory is Morris Weitz, In the Realm of the Traditional, 1959. For criticisms of this approach to aesthetic analysis, see Morris Weitz, Problems in Aesthetics, Macmillan, N.Y., 1959.
5. The 'open concept' of art as an aesthetic possibility, rather than a determinate kind, is essential to avoid misunderstanding. More seriously (for mistrust can unjustified) we shall be unable to define our own practices as art sufficiently on this view. For the same reason, I shall neither be able to define the art of commerce in principle, nor the art of commerce in particular.

There is a further point that must be made. The art marketing project that stimulated this discussion is connected with the question of the Art industry and the Visual Arts discipline at Finders has a special interest in this topic in general, and in the transitional art of the Western Desert people in particular. It is certain that we need to point out that our practical engage-ment with organized initiatives and the activity so close to the edge of cultural change is inescapably political. No intervention in the world can be entirely neutral, but some positions of art can be so close to the edge of cultural change that we are to seek engagement in the ordinary art-institutional practices, instead of detachment from them, we shall have to try to make art-institutions and practices to be free from the politics within Anthropology or Social History, etc., we cannot afford to display an indifference to the way in which art works are embedded in art-institutional practices.

In the case of Australian Aboriginal art, in particular, we must be very careful indeed to ensure that our public practices and criteria in art are not even seem to be more advantageous to us than it is to the people who are the nominal bene-ficiaries. I conclude that we should study and be seen to study the Art Institution (which inevitably includes ourselves) with as much objectivity as possible. We should not try to do so for its own benefit, and we should not energetically promote marketable art — and especially new Aboriginal art — without a ready and sound justification for doing it ourselves and for doing it as we do. After all, there is no shortage of examples of art-promotion and commerce to examine, within the cultural ecology of the art world. If we think that our own enterprise would somehow be superior, we had better try to say why.

In the case of Australian Aboriginal art, in particular, we must be very careful indeed to ensure that our public practices and criteria in art are not even seem to be more advantageous to us than it is to the people who are the nominal benefi-caries.