Footnotes

[1]In this paper, artistic <u>expression</u> refers to studio work or the making of art. Aesthetic <u>response</u> refers to verbal statements made during processes of art criticism and aesthetic inquiry.

[2]Feldman (1980) placed development or change <u>within</u> the discipline under study rather than within the individual. Therefore, how a discipline is defined, how it is studied, and what is studied will greatly influence what type of "disciplinary development" occurs. To date, the developmental character of art as a discipline is described as: the entry of unschooled or "naive" individuals who are expected to learn (develop toward) the endpoint of the knowledge possessed by the "sophisticated" expert of fine art culture (Feldman, 1980; Greer, 1984). The possibility that there are developmental (or nondevelopmental) journeys for other art forms or for other art cultures (e.g., within quilting or basket making circles) has not been broached in research on models.

[3]See Parisner's (n.d.) discussion of possibilities of multiterminus graphic development based on Wolfe and Perry's (1988) finding that children use different visual systems depending on context and purpose.

[4]Behaviors and lifeworld experiences that occur outside the formalized institution of school have been variously described as child culture, situational learning, situated knowledge, contextual knowledge, local knowledge, everyday cognition, community subcultures of learning, informal learning, and nonschool domains of knowledge (see Brown, 1989; Lave, Murtaugh, & de la Rocha, 1984; Rogoff, 1990; Rogoff & Lave, 1984).

[5]In addition to "school art styles" (Efland, 1976) and "children's art styles" (Wilson, 1985), we perhaps also need to identify and study "research art styles."

[6]Just as color wheels and value charts serve as exercises toward broader applications in the making of art, it is suggested in this paper that many art criticism and aesthetic inquiry activities might be thought of as <u>exercises toward other ends</u> rather than as being considered sufficient in-and-of themselves. However, developmental aesthetic response models based on research comprised of verbal exercises imply that these activities constitute *bona fide* art criticism and aesthetic inquiry experiences.

Linear Perspective and Montage: Two Dominating Paradigms in Art Education

Charles R. Garoian

...every picture is an ideological work, independently of its quality. In this sense the world that it reveals is the world of an ideology, regardless of how realistic the painting may be for realism is only one of numerous visual ideologies.

Nicos Hadjinicolaou
Art History and Class Struggle

Introduction

As a former public high school art teacher, I was always puzzled by the common belief held by my students in what they referred to as the right way to represent images and ideas in their drawings and paintings. After years of producing art works during early childhood that appeared to be uninhibited

in their expressive qualities, their world view in adolescence had shifted dramatically towards a preoccupation with photographic representation—realism.

In addition to rendering images with photographic likeness through the use of linear perspective, my students were also infatuated with the radical juxtapositions of surrealism. The principles of surrealist composition—its radically juxtaposed imagery and multiplicity of vantage points—are grounded in the montage experiments of the dadaists. The familiar world of linear perspective space is made strange, overturned through montage and surrealism. Its absolute conditions are distorted and its images are represented in a dream-like state of suspended animation.

Today, coopted versions of linear perspective and surrealism pervade contemporary media and, in their appeal to adolescents, they have become the principal means by which images are represented in genre such as Music Television. MTV is a major cultural idiom commanding its own international network with adolescents constituting the majority of its customers. The dialectical opposition between the "real" and the "surreal" on MTV seems to stir the imagination and reflect the cognitive capabilities of adolescents just as linear perspective and montage did for students in my art classes. Through the former, linear perspective, they were able to objectify their world—to gain control of it. Through the latter, montage, they subverted the perceptual conventions of that world in order to create their own.

The historical and philosophical foundations of these adolescent obsessions are deeply rooted in the linear perspective and montage traditions of western European culture. The desire to draw and paint based on the principles of linear perspective and the surrealist principles of montage begins in the formative years as young children are taught how to see their world by

such ubiquitous technologies as family photographs, television, motion pictures, magazines, newspapers, and in school by textbooks and the chronological presentation of history. By the time adolescence begins these underlying perceptual constructs employed by the media have been assimilated to the degree that they serve as dominant cultural paradigms by which adolescents objectify their world.

How do the linear perspective and montage cultural paradigms function as devices for visual communication? How did they come to dominate as western European models of perception? What are their similarities and differences? How do these models affect the way children learn to view their world? These questions will be the focus of my discussion. The ideologies implicit in these perceptual constructs will be discussed according to three aspects: linear perspective as a master narrative; montage and its paradoxical narrative; and, montage pedagogy in contemporary art education. In doing so, terms like "perspective," "montage," "mapping," and "camera obscura" will be used metaphorically to represent models of perception in which their technological and ideological functions aredialectically intertwined.

Linear Perspective as a Cultural Paradigm

In his book, *Technology as Symptom and Dream*, psychologist Robert D. Romanyshyn (1989) identifies the discovery of linear perspective as the birth of a perceptual technology that has dominated western European culture since the Renaissance. He argues that the window-like view of the world constructed through linear perspective "establishes as a condition for perception a formal *separation* between a subject who sees the world and the world that is seen, and in so doing it sets the stage, as it were, for that retreat or withdrawal of the self from

the world which characterizes the dawn of the modern age" (p. 42).

The imposition of linear perspective space as a dominant cultural paradigm that promotes a particular way of seeing is a perceptual construct that is familiar to most art educators. Invented in 1425 by Filippo Brunelleschi and later published in 1435 by Leon Battista Alberti in his *De Pictura*, linear perspective codified a means of representing the world that diminishes, separates, then assaults the viewer with a hierarchy of conditions, images and ideas contained within its pictorial space.

Romanyshyn further describes the construct of the grid within linear perspective space as a "map" [whose] "scientific attitude, ... in its *mathematical* character, sketches in advance of our experience of things the conditions according to which things will appear"(1989, p. 51). The implications of such a map is all encompassing as we can see in Albrecht Dürer's woodcut, *Draftsman Drawing a Nude*,1538 (1989, p. 116, figure 4.5). Here the grid functions on two levels: first it serves as a perceptual device—a simulation of the human eye—that enables the artist to objectify, survey, and map the proportions of the female body; and second, it serves as a conceptual model—a construct or an "attitude"—by which to order and make judgments about world. In the second instance, the grid manifests itself as an instrument of culture—a form of cognitive patterning—that precedes our experience of things by "replacing" those experiences with what Jean Baudrillard (1991) refers to as the "simulacra" where the actual world "no longer precedes the map, nor survives it. [Instead,] the map precedes" the actual world (p. 253).

This compulsion to map through linear perspective is further discussed in *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the*

Seventeenth Century by art historian Svetlana Alpers. Alpers (1983) describes the work of Dutch painters as follows: "Like...mappers, they made additive works that could not be taken in from a single viewing point. Theirs was not a window in the sense of the Italian model of perception but rather, like a map, a surface on which is laid out an assemblage of the world" (p. 122). This art historian's comparison distinguishes between the mapping impulse of Dutch artists influenced by the invention of the microscope and camera obscura, and the window of linear perspective used by Italian painters. She claims that the Dutch model enables a representation of perceived phenomena that are "seen" and "witnessed," whereas the Italian model represents things as "dramatized events" (p. 68). Alpers' characterization of mapping as "assemblage," points to the representation of coexisting phenomena requiring perception from multiple vantage points similar to montage in the twentieth century. She describes David Bailly's painting *Still Life,* 1651 (1983, p. 84, plate 1) as "an assemblage of materials made by nature and worked by man" (p. 103). It is a virtual catalogue where "the traditional reference [is] made by almost every object (candle, bubbles, hourglass, skull, jewels, coins, books) and the inscription at the lower right to vanity and hence to the transience of all human endeavor and particularly of life itself" (p. 106). This perceptual movement from one object in the painting to another is suggestive of the multifarious nature of montage to which Alpers makes a direct link. By including Jasper Johns' *Map,* 1961 (Alpers, 1983, p. 125, figure 69) as a cognitive pattern—a geographical construct existing within the mind—she reveals the potential in Dutch art to represent a diversified pictorial condition from which a master narrative can be constructed. Like linear perspective, the dialectic of mapping disparate objects and images enables a critique of vanity and materialism on the one hand while it represents a hierarchy of selection and ordering on the other.

Romanyshyn (1989) states "much of this mapping of the world in advance of our experience of it has meant the substitution of quantitative measures for the world's qualities" (p. 51). Like Alpers, he too implicates the microscope and camera obscura, but then adds x-rays, cameras, television, laser instruments, radar screens and $E = mc^2$ as the lineage of linear perspective. As hegemonic visual technologies, these perceptual instruments represent the modernist realization of the "dream" of progress. Motivated by utopian humanitarian ambitions to improve the quality of human life and eliminate suffering, this dream has as its dark side the "symptom" of technology—a cultural homogeneity that marginalizes and exploits those whose values do not fit within the confines of its frame. Thus, what was intended as a humanitarian cause became dehumanizing.

Aesthetician Carl Hausman, in his essay "Can the Concept of Psychical Distance Be Defended?" (1992), grapples with the dialectical conditions of Edward Bullough's assumption that aesthetic attitudes are made possible through psychical distance. Hausman characterizes Bullough's use of "distance" as a metaphor in which two sides are in tension (p. 3). In doing so, he presents a striking parallel to the inherent contradictions of linear perspective. On the one hand, psychical distance delineates a positive critical engagement that enables one to "attend to the complexities, intricacies, and inner relations of a phenomenon, [in order to] experience a revelation of qualities not before perceived" (pp. 3–4). On the other hand, the critical disengagement or alienation that represents the negative side of Bullough's metaphor "points to something inhibitory, to something that is negated when one adopts an attitude of psychical distance...something that has to do with a frame of mind, or an attitude, which might be thought of as a mind set" (Hausman, pp. 3–4).

Hausman defends Bullough's assumptions about psychical distance in spite of two main objections by postmodern critics. One objection represents psychical distance as an "old-fashioned essentialism" and "aestheticism," [that] "eliminates moral sensitivity and our disposition to respond to things morally" (p. 2). Hausman counters this objection by arguing that psychical distance "is simply attending to the qualities of an object...If anything distinguishes an experience as aesthetic rather than moral or scientific, etc...it is to be found in one's motives or reasons for attending to the object" (1992, p. 6). Herein lies the power of psychical distance to serve an ideological purpose similar to that of linear perspective. That is, psychical distance, like linear perpective, is not synonymous with any particular ideology except when individuals or groups of individuals assume positions of power by assigning it one.

Another objection to Bullough's assumptions argues that "if one assumes psychical distance, one will be wholly detached from the things of which one is conscious" (p. 10). Again, psychical distance is not inherent in the experience itself, but in those aesthetic and moral attitudes that we assign to the experience. In his defense, Hausman states that aesthetic detachment "can be deplored when it is adopted in morally sensitive situations, not because it goes with aesthetic experience, but because we believe that certain human conditions are at stake and that these override purely aesthetic considerations" (p. 12).

Aesthetic detachment through the psychical distance created by linear perspective has contributed to the perception of natural and human resources, other than the Eurocentric male dominant one, as exotic entities. Through the moral imperative of manifest destiny, this detachment has led to the deplorable marginalization, subsequent exploitation, and in some cases the depletion of these resources. Western

colonialism's effects on native African and American cultures serve as prime examples. As previously indicated, the technology of linear perspective, which contributed greatly to this cultural imperialism, found its apotheosis in the industrial age where machines provided a modern means by which to attain aesthetic detachment. The application of structural and moral precepts of linear perspective, however, first began with the work of Renaissance artists and scholars in the fifteenth century.

In one of its earliest examples, the young Leonardo da Vinci produced *The Annunciation,* 1472 (Wasserman, 1984, p. 55, plate 4), an oil painting with a Christian theme whose spatial configuration is carefully composed according to the principles of linear perspective laid down by Alberti just forty years earlier. In the painting we find a division of "sacred" and "profane" areas and a hierarchical ordering of images and ideas within those areas that represent the predominant values of the Christian church in the fifteenth century. For example, as we follow the diminishing scale of objects, from the foreground to the vanishing point on the horizon line in the background of the painting, we become aware of the mechanics of linear perspective as well as its ability to establish a hierarchy of order.

The sacred space of the painting is made evident by the placement of the Virgin at the threshold of an architectural space—a temple of God—on the right hand side of the composition. It is further implied by the vanishing point from where all things originate and to where they eventually will return both literally in the visual rendering and symbolically. To the left side of the vanishing point and composition we find the Archangel Gabriel in the act of genuflection humbly announcing to the Virgin that she will give birth to the son of God.

The Archangel has entered the profane world as a messenger of God—a world or order that, as the "temple of nature," consists of flora and fauna and is composed according to God's "immutable laws" (Edgerton, 1975, p. 30). By association with Church canon, the device of linear perspective takes on a divine significance that proclaims its hegemonic status in western culture. As a dominant western European cultural construct, its mathematically delineated space is created in the service of an ideological project that represents a particular world view. In doing so, it extends the sacred pictorial territory in a work of western art to the viewer who inhabits the profane world. The ideological implications of hierarchy notwithstanding, there is a simple, yet profound truth claim that we accept in Leonardo's image. Its dependence on linear perspective claims, crudely, that the world depicted by Leonardo "could have existed" or "continues to exist." Thus, by accepting linear perspective as a model for representing their world without questioning its ideology, my students recognized and accepted that claim.

The writings of René Descartes provide a philosophical parallel with this codification of linear perspective in the visual arts. When in 1637 Descartes declared *"Cogito ergo sum"* ("I think, therefore I am"), he established a dualistic condition—the famous "Cartesian split"—between mind and matter, the perceiver and the perceived. This deterministic view, based on reason, echoes the objectification of human experience from the world through the linear perspective paradigm. Moreover, the objectification of nature by Descartes and the determination of its laws based on cause and effect led to a mechanistic view that he described in his *Discourse on Method* (1637) where the workings of the human body and the universe were found to be synonymous with the workings of a clock. In similar fashion, linear perspective provides a mechanistic means by which to step back from the world in order to see how it works.

Thus, as in the example of linear perspective, Descartes' metaphor of the machine provided a philosophical model by which to "drive" its precepts towards a position of cultural dominance. Ironically, two hundred years later in the nineteenth century, Descartes' metaphor "was dramatically transformed by the advent of the modern motor, capable of transforming energy into various forms" according to historian Anson Rabinbach (1990, p. 2). Taking their cues from the industrial environment, these forms represented a modern vision of culture based on the potential energy of the human and social motor—a scientific vision, not unlike linear perspective, that imposed a position of power and justified the exploitation of human and natural resources in the name of progress, profitability, and capitalism.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the metaphor of the machine had "fused the diverse forms of labor in nature, technology, and society into a single image of mechanical work, universalizing and extending the model of energy to a nature conceived of as a vast, unbroken system of production" (Rabinbach, 1990, p. 25). The pervasiveness and scale of this rapid growth of scientific and technological progress inspired French author Charles Péguy to write in 1913 that "the world has changed less since the time of Jesus Christ than it has in the last thirty years" (Hughes, 1991, p. 9).

The impact of machines in the landscape was immediately felt by visual artists. From the beginning of the industrial age artists like William J. Turner, John Constable, Honoré Daumier, and the French Impressionists began to familiarize themselves with machine images by including them in their art works. Turner, for example, painted one of the earliest representations of the new technology. In *The Fighting Temeraire*, 1838 (De la Croix and Tansey, 1970, plate 16-4), the English Romantic painter depicted this majestic sailing vessel being towed out to sea for burial by an ungainly steam vessel on the left side of his

composition. On the right side, the ambiguity of the sun's position suggests both dusk and dawn; that is, the passing of one era and the dawning of a new one.

The nineteenth century saw the development of three significant "technologies" that were to influence the western European art of the next century: photography, chronophotography, ergography, and their impact on Taylorism as a mechanistic explanation of work. First, the invention of photography and the camera in the 1830s enabled a mechanical device, functioning similarly to the human eye, to be used to capture and record light on film. The etymology of "photo" is light and of "graphy" is drawing. This transformation of light into matter constituted a form of scientific materialism—a cultural construct that represented the use of nature's unseen and ephemeral properties as sources of perceptible information and energy.

The medium of photography inspired further investigations by the English photographer Eadweard Muybridge and the French physiologist Etienne-Jules Marey, both of whom revealed information about discreet increments of motion that were hitherto unknown. Muybridge's studies (Muybridge, 1955 and 1957) were conducted with a line of cameras whose shutters were cabled across to a gridded wall. As human and animal subjects moved down the line, they tripped the cable of each camera and, in doing so, recorded the sequence of locomotion that took place at each juncture.

Whereas Muybridge's photographs deconstructed locomotion, Marey's images documented intervals of time through a process he called "chronophotography," the second significant technology (See Rabinbach, 1990, figures 10–14). "Chrono" is time and "graphy" is drawing—thus transforming time into matter. Influenced by Muybridge and astronomer Pierre Jules Janssen's astronomical revolver, a photographic

apparatus that Janssen combined with a telescope to produce as many as seventeen images on a single glass plate, Marey built a photographic rifle (figures 5 and 6) that contained a device functioning similar to a clock whose luminescent dial (chronometric dial) located at the front of the camera obscura. "The chronometer signified the complete integration of time into the study of motion," according to Rabinbach (1990, p. 107). The discoveries of both Muybridge and Marey played a signficant role in the development of the motion picture industry.

The third technology, the ergograph ("ergo" is work and "graph" is to draw—thus transforming work into matter), was developed by the Italian physiologist Angelo Mosso. Mosso's ergograph (Rabinbach, 1990, figures 17–19) consisted of a device that was tied to the fingers of the hand and, when exercised, "'measured exactly the mechanical work of the muscles' [and] produced hundreds of graphic representations of fatigue, or 'fatigue curves,' which plotted the rate of fatigue in different individuals and with different weights" (Rabinbach, 1990, p. 134).

The aforementioned technologies—photography, chronophotography, and the ergograph—were to have their greatest influence on the development of Taylorism. A form of "scientific management," Taylorism was developed by the American engineer F. W. Taylor to provided new information about the energy and fatigue potential of the human body as motor that, when applied to social and cultural conditions enabled a "maximization of output—productivity—irrespective of the physiological cost to the worker" (Rabinbach, 1990, p. 117). Whereas the human body was perceived as a machine, Taylorism applied the metaphor to industrial work places which functioned as social and political organizations in order to minimize fatigue, waste, and to stimulate production through an efficient structure of work. In doing so, Taylorism provided

a context for efficiency that led to the prolific output of modern industry—a realization of Romanyshyn's dream. The symptom, or dark side, of this modernist phenomenon was the management of workers as component parts of a labor machine which could be conformed to a particular corporate or cultural ideology.

Thus, according to Rabinbach (1990), Taylorism, like the human motor, became an exploitative metaphor that "ended the skilled laborer's monopoly on expertise, dissolved the traditional foreman's authority over the shop floor, weakened the power of unions to control wages, and gave management a powerful method of exercising control over the entire production process" (p. 239). In doing so, the modern machine, like linear perspective during the Renaissance, became the utopian ideological metaphor that paradoxically promised a better world to live in, while creating the hegemonic conditions that gave rise to the oppressive conditions of corporate capitalism and Soviet communism in the twentieth century.

Today, lured by the virtual realities depicted in photographs, films, television and computers, junior high and high school-aged students, learn to identify with and to accept these technologies as the utopian metaphors by which to represent their world. Their preoccupation with realism and their desire to use linear perspective as a dominant cultural paradigm, is an indication that adolescents are influenced by these technologies. Lacking the knowledge to critique the ideological conditions of linear perspective and the systems of the mass media by which it is delivered, adolescents easily conform to this cultural paradigm. In doing so, they become blind consumers who continue its tradition as the dominant perceptual construct by which to represent the world.

Montage as a Paradoxical Cultural Paradigm

It was not until just after World War I that the term *montage* was invented by the Berlin Dadaists to describe the fragments of photographs introduced in their works. According to art historian Dawn Ades (1976), "*Montage* in German means 'fitting' or 'assembly line,' and *Monteur* 'mechanic,' [or] 'engineer'" (Ades, p. 12). Dadaists like Raoul Hausmann, George Grosz, John Heartfield, Johannes Baader, and even Hannah Höch actually dressed in workmen's overalls while producing montage works of art to demonstrate their commitment to the modern age of mechanization.

Although this image-making process originated in the nineteenth century, montage can be linked to the use of the camera obscura in the seventeenth century—the historical antecedent to the modern camera whose roots lie in linear perspective. According to Svetlana Alpers' theory, previously discussed in this article, the camera obscura was used by seventeenth century Dutch artists to produce montage-like multiple perspective points and to represent a montage-like assemblage of Dutch material culture in their oil paintings. However, unlike these paintings that were valued for their uniqueness and originality and collected by the wealthy, modern montage works depended on mechanically reproduced photographs as the principal resource from which to appropriate their component parts. Through mechanical reproduction, photographs were available to a broader range of consumers as compared to oil paintings.

The camera's portability and instantaneity enabled the photographing of a variety of subject matter that heretofore were considered too difficult and often inaccessible to easel painting. The convenience of the camera further made it possible to photograph any given subject from a number of vantage points. These conditions, and a growing availability of

photographic images, provided the bases from which to expand on the singular vantage point of the camera through the multi-perspectival space of montage. In *Metropolis*, 1923 (Ades, 1976, p. 98, figure 117), for example, Paul Citroën has cut images of metropolitan buildings from their original photographs and pasted them together within a single frame. In doing so, he has created a complex pictorical condition where the converging lines of each building contradict those of the buildings that surround it—a visual condition that metaphorically represents the complexities and contradictions of living in a large city. By repeating singular vantage points mechanically, Citroën's montage simultaneously pays homage to the tradition of linear perspective while it parodies the limitations of its construct.

The process of montage involved the appropriation, assembly, and gluing of fragments of images and texts into abstract compositions of component parts that functioned visually as powerful machine metaphors as illustrated by Hausmann's *Tatlin at Home*, 1920 (Ades, 1976, p. 29, figure 27). Similar metaphors are present in modern literature of the period. According to literary critic and historian Cecelia Tichi, "the gear-and-grinder technology summoned new literary forms suited to its perceptual values. The novel and poem, like the automobile and bridge...exhibited formal traits of this technology. Fiction and poetry became recognizable as designed assemblies of component parts, including prefabricated parts...The author's role in this technology was to design, even engineer, the arts of the written word" (1987, p. 16).

Assuming the role of engineer, the visual artists of the historical avant garde transformed their studios into "factories" and "manufactured" works of art representing utopian visions of the modern world. In doing so, they were able to subvert the traditional assumptions of art that dictated the role of the artist, the nature of artistic production, and the function of the art object. In the process, the inventors of montage became

aware of its most significant allegorical function: the ability of the artist "'to speak publicly with hidden meaning,' in response to the prohibition of public speech" (Buchloh, p. 43).

In his seminal essay, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," Walter Benjamin (1968) characterized twentieth century art as being increasingly dependent upon mechanical reproduction. Through mass reproduction, art lost its aura of uniqueness, which defined its original existence (p. 221). Removed from its original context, its aura is no longer connected to its original function, but to that of commodity and politics (p. 224). The machine aesthetics of montage, predicated upon the appropriation, displacement and subsequent subversion of images and text, ranged from a "meditative contemplation of reification to a powerful propaganda tool for mass agitation," according to art critic Benjamin Buchloh (1982, p. 43). Elaborating on Buchloh's notion, four distinct guises of montage aesthetics can be characterized: as fantastic imagery; as social and political criticism; as propaganda; and, as non-objective art.

First, as fantastic imagery, montage-making resembles the dynamics of dream-logic. The "disorienting power of combined photographic images" inspired dadaists like Hannah Höch to construct absurdities such as *Cut with the Cake-Knife*, c. 1919 (Ades, 1976, p. 18, figure 14), that would bring into question modes of representation found in the tradition of oil painting. In addition, certain surrealists such as Max Ernst simulated dreams or altered states of consciousness, as in *Here Everything is Still Floating*, 1920 (Ades, 1976, p. 112, figure 136).

Second, as social and political criticism, montage could be used to reveal the mechanisms behind class structure and totalitarian ideologies. The montage works of John Heartfield, for example, demonstrate how images and text can be assembled to subvert social and political agendas. In *Hurrah, the Butter is*

Finished, 1935 (Ades, 1976, p. 56, figure 62), Heartfield parodies a quote from Hermann Goering's Hamburg speech that "Iron always makes a country strong, butter and lard only make people fat." In this work, Heartfield has cut parts of various photographs and assembled them to depict a German family and their dog dining on a large bolt, a motorcycle chain, bicycle handle bars, and other machine products made from iron—this to criticize the absurdity of Goering's remarks and the severity of Nazi propaganda. Ironically, this method of subversive criticism is easily coopted by an opposing side.

Thus, the third characteristic of montage, as propaganda machine, can be used to extol the virtues of a political ideology as in Gustav Klutsis' *The Old World and The World being built anew*, 1920 (Ades, 1976, p. 68, figure 73) where Lenin is placed in a constructivist composition between two circular forms representing the dynamics of the Soviet Union's past and future histories. Finally, as non-objective art, the fourth characteristic, montage functions as a formalistic design as in Laszlo Moholy-Nagy's *Structure of the World*, 1927 (Ades, 1976, p. 146, figure 183) and Man Ray's *Rayogram: Kiki Drinking*, 1922 (Ades, 1976, p. 148, figure 184). These machine-metaphors consisted of disparate images and text that were assembled to create dynamic new patterns of line, shape, texture, value, and space.

The machine age generated an artistic revolution that had profound effects on art and language. According to Tichi (1987), "Mixed metaphors of nature and machines abutted each other...whose themes were antitechnological...Suddenly loosed from their separate categories, technological, and organic figures of speech seemed to jostle each other, suggesting the tensions that invariably arise in times of rapid sociocultural change, when old order seems to vanish in the onrush of the new" (p. 18).

After realizing the linguistic potential of montage, dadaist Raoul Hausmann remarked that "the image would *tell* in a new way" (Ades, 1976, p. 20). The cognitive functions of this "new way of telling" with montage can be illustrated with Arthur Koestler's (1975) notion of *bisociation* where "two habitually incompatible matrices [result] in an abrupt transfer of the train of thought from one associative context to another" (p. 59). Koestler (1975) uses a pun to describe this transfer as "two strings of thought tied together by a purely acoustic knot" (p. 179). Characterized as "underground games," bisociative patterns of thought function as the "grammar and logic of dream-cognition" (p. 179). Psychologist Albert Rothenberg (1979) characterizes these creative contradictions as "Janusian thinking" after the Roman god Janus, who was able to look in opposing directions simultaneously. Unlike dialectical and dualistic thought, Janusian thinking does not involve a synthesis. On the contrary, all opposing concepts coexist in the same cognitive space. Like Koestler, Rothenberg also uses the dream process as an analogy. He states that Janusian thinking functions as a conscious means of setting up conceptual contradictions characteristically found in dreams "for the purposes of abstracting, conceptualizing, and concretizing...In contrast to dream thought, which produces confusing, chaotic, and manifestly illogical images and sequences, the creative process [Janusian thought] produces order and meaningful images and metaphors, as well as tight conceptualizations" (p. 410).

Thus, predicated on dream processes, the theories of both Koestler and Rothenberg suggest a semiotic dance taking place within the mind whereby signifiers, upon disembarking from their signifieds, arbitrarily collide with one another and, in their contradictory juxtapositions, subvert their traditionally assumed functions. Puns, paradoxes, and other conceptual bipolarities serve as illustrations. These metonymic functions of the mind, manifested visually in montage works, serve as

metaphors or allegories of dream logic, as well as the complex and contradictory conditions bestowed by the modern industrial environment. According to critic Craig Owens (1983) "the avant garde sought to transcend representation in favor of presence and immediacy; it proclaimed the autonomy of the signifier, its liberation from the 'tyranny of the signified'; postmodernists instead expose the tyranny of the signifier, the violence of its law" (Owens, p. 59). The implications of "presence and immediacy" can be interpreted as a form of cultural imperialism on the part of the avant garde; one that exploited the traditional assumptions and establishment of art as well as the resources of the modern industrial environment.

The dream-logic metaphor of montage further represents the dream of modernism whereby the revolutionary avant garde characterized linear perspective and its window-view of reality as the signified and sought to overthrow its tyrannical rule in order to liberate the signifier "art." Revolutions served as the violent "means" by which to supplant these traditional assumptions of art and the "ends" as the avant garde established a modern form of tyranny, a fascistic rule that created a mainstream art world wherein its "cutting edge" ideas and images dominated. Thus, under the banner of progress and originality, the artists of the avant garde forged ahead with their manifestoes in one hand and tools of modernism in the other. In doing so, they created a mainstream condition, the effects of which dominated the history of modern culture for decades. One object of post modernism has been to deconstruct and to expose this mainstream cultural montage in order to reveal its violent and exploitative nature, and to identify hitherto disenfranchised groups whose artists have been hidden in its wake.

As Owens further suggests, contrary to its exploitative nature, montage can also be used to liberate the viewer from the tyranny of the signifier as previously illustrated in John

Heartfield's critique of Hermann Goering's speech. When used as a procedure for social criticism, montage can raise the public's awareness and appreciation of cultural differences. Herein lies the paradox of montage, on the one hand we have propaganda and its step-child advertising and, on the other, social criticism. Thus, montage can be used to impose the will of a particular ideology or, conversely, can be used to critique that same ideology.

Anthropologist Michael Taussig's (1987) studies of cultural montage in southwestern Colombia provide examples of how montage has been applied both as a form of critique and imposition of power. He claims that the collision between colonial culture and that of natives has produced a rapid and dramatic change in both cultures. Ironically, "while the European surrealists were condemned by their society and its traditions (including its traditions of revolution and rebellion) to clumsily manipulate and juxtapose incongruent imagery, laboriously constructing outside realities, in the European colonies and ex-colonies something like surrealism was inherent as a deeply embedded social practice in everyday life" (p. 201).

To overcome or to heal the inconsistencies produced by this collision, both cultures were driven toward the use of montage as an attempt to control their own understanding of change and also to respond to what was being imposed upon them. We have two choices, according to Taussig, one is to interpret cultural differences from a preconceived cultural bias, and the other is to prevent a colonialism of information by accepting differing bits or remnants of culture and to allow them to coexist without melting them down into some homogeneous dominant point of view.

MTV is an example of where montage appears to engage cultural differences, yet is responsible for a colonialism of information. The mass consumption of MTV by adolescents today represents what I experienced with my high school students—a desire to use a montage/surrealist motif in order to make the familiar world view of linear perspective strange, to overturn the tyranny of its construct. However, the implied critique of the linear perspective world view and its replacement with a montage of music videos by MTV is an example of one dominant ideology supplanting another. The tyranny of MTV lies in its inability to engender a critique, to educate adolescents about its own ideological structure.

Thus, with montage as its principle motif, MTV represents a revolutionary form of programming that subverts the visual character of conventional television programming whose roots lie in linear perspective. In doing so, MTV replaces the familiar ideological content of the linear perspective paradigm with that aspect of montage ideology whose principle purpose is propaganda—not social criticism as in the example of the montage works of John Heartfield and other dadaists. Attracted by its visual polemics and unaware of its exploitation, adolescents comprise MTV's principle audience. They are the consumers of its music videos and the products of its corporate sponsors.

In the next section, the social critical aspect of montage will be discussed as a form of pedagogy in art education whereby high school students can learn to critique the hegemonic aspects of linear perspective and montage in order to engender a broaderappreciation of cultural differences.

Montage Pedagogy in Contemporary Art Education

Thus far, I have discussed the dialectical conditions of linear perspective and montage ideology that enable a critical awareness of experience through objectified points of view on the one hand and an alienation and subjugation on the other. As Hausman suggests, ideological content is not an inherent part of these constructs, but the result of our intentions to aestheticize and moralize.

The ideologies of linear perspective and montage frame a dialectical condition similar to Paul Ricoeur's (1976) notions of "distanciation" and "appropriation." Addressing the hermeneutical problems inherent in reading and writing, Ricoeur states "To appropriate is to make 'one's own' what is 'alien.' [And] distanciation is...the dynamic counterpart of our need, our interest, and our effort to overcome cultural estrangement" (p. 43). Thus, in an educational context, distanciation represents the endeavor of students to "overcome" master narratives imposed upon them by cultural constructs like linear perspective and montage. Through appropriation they are able to make these narratives their own.

The conditions of distanciation and appropriation can be identified within the context of educational practice through Benjamin S. Bloom's (1973) differentiation between an implicit and explicit curriculum in the schools, a "null curriculum" according to art educator Elliot W. Eisner (1979), and David Gordon's (1981) notion of a "hidden curriculum." Bloom characterizes the explicit curriculum as one that is "visible; it can be documented in many ways; and most of the resources and personnel of the schools are dedicated to the students' learning of some variations of this curriculum" (p. 140). He further uncovers the invisible character of the implicit curriculum as "the curriculum that teaches each student who

he [*sic*] is in relation to others. It may also teach each student his place in the world of people, ideas and activities" (p. 140).

In Eisner's 1979 publication *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs,* he presents the thesis that "what schools do not teach may be as important as what they do teach" (p. 83). In doing so, he exposes an implicit hierarchy in the schools where performance-based subjects like music, art, and dance are discriminated against in favor of discursive subjects like reading, writing, and arithmetic. The impact of the null curriculum is so significant that students perpetuate the tradition of academic hierarchy throughout their lives, and in doing so, pass it on to other generations.

In similar fashion, Gordon criticizes the special significance given to the arts as a subject that is "doomed to failure." He argues that the "school is an institution whose nature militates against achieving the aims of aesthetic education" (1981, p. 51). The fate of aesthetic education is determined by the "hidden curriculum"—an implicit form of discrimination against the arts presented in the guise of advocacy. The "unintended learning outcomes" of the hidden curriculum are more pervasive and consistent than the intended ones according to Gordon (pp. 56-57). Thus, despite their compulsory status, the academic emphases given to the arts is rendered insignificant by comparison to those given to other subjects in the school curriculum.

What Bloom, Eisner, and Gordon render is a critique of academic hierarchy—one that falls short of identifying how children's cultural differences are marginalized by the explicit or manifest school curriculum. Ironically, the three are guilty of committing the very same mistake as the institutional practices that they criticize. Like the implicit, null, and hidden curricula, what they fail to address in their theses is as significant as in where they succeed. That is, the academic

marginalization that occurs through these veiled curricula in the classroom is compounded when students from other than mainstream western European cultures learn the implicit, null, or hidden lessons of cultural hierarchy.

The disguised academic prejudice that Bloom, Eisner, and Gordon uncover in their characterizations of school curricula are not context specific. The lessons of hierarchy learned in one situation can be easily transferred to another inasmuch as students learn to discriminate between culturally appropriate types of study in the schools as well as culturally appropriate types of people. The most insideous form of transfer occurs when students from diverse cultures assimilate the values of a dominant culture. Once they do, they become carriers who take the dominant ideology back to their respective cultures and create a condition whereby cultural difference is nullified.

What educators must understand is that a universalizing of classroom experience—lumping the inherent interests of academic hierarchy with that of race, sexual preference, ethnicity, and gender issues—produces a leveling effect where the significance of all things is either assumed, considered equal, or thought too complex to deal with. From an educational perspective, however, the critique of the explicit and implicit dimensions of curricula creates a paradoxical condition wherein students from culturally diverse backgrounds are left in the lurch. There is a need to transcend this realm of "binary oppositions" because that form of logic "appears to have become an obsessive fatal attraction," according to educator Henry A. Giroux (1992, p. 23).

In his book *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*, Giroux (1992) presents two basic assumptions about critical education: "One, there is a need for a language of critique, a questioning of presuppositions...the second base assumption of radical education is a language of

possibility... [which] goes beyond critique to elaborate a positive language of human empowerment" (Giroux, p. 12). Giroux grounds his educational theories in a critical discourse that deconstructs hegemonic ideologies. He proposes a "border pedagogy" whereby students are allowed "to write, speak, and listen in a language in which meaning becomes multiaccentual and dispersed and resists permanent closure. This is a language in which one speaks *with* rather than exclusively *for* others" (p. 29). Thus, border pedagogy decentralizes the gaze of linear perspective and the bombardment of montage that claim dominion over students' cultural identities and their individual potentialities. Instead, Giroux's radical border pedagogy empowers students "to engage the multiple references that constitute different cultural codes, experiences, and languages. This means educating students to both read these codes historically and critically while simultaneously learning the limits of such codes, including the ones they use to construct their own narratives and histories" (p. 29). What Giroux is suggesting here is a deconstruction of master narratives that, heretofore, have been sanctified by historical constructs like linear perspective and montage. Furthermore, he calls for a pedagogy of inclusion whereby students' critiques of their own cultural experiences provide them with an awareness of their own significance—their voice—in the cultural politics of the classroom.

However, awareness alone does not make for cultural collaboration, for it is merely the first step in a process of political and social empowerment in students. According to Giroux, awareness left to its own accord "often degenerates into a form of narcissism, a cathartic experience that is reduced to naming anger without the benefit of theorizing in order to both understand its underlying causes and what it means to work collectively to transform the structures of domination responsible for oppressive social relations" (Giroux, 1992, p. 80). What is required then, is an action that transforms

students from passive and manipulable subjects into individuals who are actively involved as "cultural workers" in a "radical democracy [that] continually reevaluates and produces new forms of civic life" (Trend, 1992, p. 7).

One such endeavor significant to the field of art education is the 1990 publication *Mixed Blessings: New Art in a Multicultural America* by art critic Lucy Lippard. In her book, Lippard recognizes artists that represent a range of American cultures that, heretofore, have been ignored by mainstream critics, gallery dealers, and museum curators on the basis that their work does not measure up to the hegemonic standards of western European culture nor that of their ancestral homelands. On the basis of being Mexican-American, Chinese-American, African-American, etc., these artists represent hybrid cultures within the United States that, until Lippard's book, have yet to be recognized by the dominant culture. Lippard identifies shared characteristics found in the work of artists who are "different," "other," and in the "minority." Those characteristics include: a "naming" process whereby artists like Margo Machida in her painting *The Buddha's Asleep*, 1985 (Lippard, 1990, plate 3) and Linda Nishio's *Kikoemasu Ka (Can You Hear Me?)*, 1980 (Lippard, 1990, p. 18, figure 1) accept and claim through their art their cultural identities; a "telling" process of producing art like Betye Saar's *Mti*, 1973 (Lippard, 1990, plate 11) and Faith Ringgold's *Bitter Nest Part II: Harlem Renaissance Party*, 1988 (Lippard, 1990, plate 14) that involves biographical storytelling and a transmission of history; a process of "landing" where art works like Jaune Quick-to-See Smith's *Osage Orange*, 1985 (Lippard, 1990, plate 19) and Luis Jimenez's *Southwest Pietá*, 1987 (Lippard, 1990, plate 20) show geographical and spiritual roots; a "mixing" process like Martin Wong's *Attorney Street: Handball Court With Autobiographical Poem by Piñero*, 1982–84 (Lippard, 1990, plate 32) in which the artist explores a coexistence of diverse cultural perspectives with equal rights through works of art; and, a process of

"turning around" where artists works like Robert Colescott's *Knowledge of the Past Is the Key to the Future (Love Makes the World Go Round)*, 1985 (Lippard, 1990, plate 38) and Adrian Piper in her *Vanilla Nightmares #8*, 1986 (Lippard, 1990, p. 237, figure 28) use ironic juxtapositions to provoke viewers through humorous and shocking imagery. *Mixed Blessings* provides a positive view of the individual cultures that represent the American montage as a polyvocal condition. Lippard has treated the work of each artist with respect to their own cultural orientation and, in doing so, has "co-authored" the book by representing each artist's work as well as the written and spoken comments that they have provided about that work.

Yet another example that relates to a montage of border pedagogy in art education is the exhibition *The Emperor's New Clothes: Censorship, Sexuality, and the Body Politic*, 1990 (Trend, 1992, p. 139) created by artist, writer and critic Richard Bolton. As described in critic David Trend's book *Cultural Pedagogy: Art/Education/Politics* (1992), Bolton used his installation, which consisted of photographs and text that juxtaposed "three categories of erotic photographs: 'Art, Fashion, and Pornography'" (Trend, 1992, p. 138) to engage a public debate on censorship between such prominent opposing personalities as Donald Wildmon of the American Family Association and censored artist Andres Serrano. In addition to these responses on the topic, the written comments of gallery viewers were included on special display panels. Bolton's installation, unlike traditional art exhibitions which provide a public forum on a socially and politically charged subject, "relied from its inception on a multiplicity of voices to analyze the issues at hand" (p. 140).

Using Lippard's and Bolton's works as models, a radical pedagogy can be developed through a collaborative decision-making process as high school art teachers and their students explore and discuss montage as a cultural metaphor. In doing

so, montage can be used to develop four aspects of an art lesson: as the guiding principal by which the teacher and students identify cultural diversity in their classroom; as the principal that they use to inquire about their own cultural backgrounds; as the structure by which to organize a large-scale installation, a public montage, comprised of the cultural works produced by each individual in the group; and, the structure to organize a forum within the installation where discussions about the represented cultures can continue and within which the public can participate. This use of montage, both as a curriculummetaphor, an art making process, and as community outreach empowers students to bring their own cultural experiences to bear on the cultural politics of art education and the limitations of its two dominating paradigms—linear perspective and montage. As suggested by Giroux, such cultural experiences can provide the foundation from which students can learn both the historical and critical significance of these paradigms.

Although the characteristics of Lippard's book and Bolton's installation may be criticized for their politics, they nonetheless, serve as examples of Giroux's radical pedagogy where art students learn to "critique" the assumptions of dominating cultures and, through a "language of possibility," they learn how to create a diverse cultural condition in the classroom wherein each student's voice has the possibility of being heard. In doing so, each site, each classroom, provides a new opportunity—a different context—within which to critique and from which to tailor a specific pedagogy determined by the participants within the cultural montage of the classroom that each student represents.

References

Ades, D. (1976). *Photomontage*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Alpers, S. (1983). *The art of describing: Dutch art in the seventeenth century*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Baudrillard, J. (1991). The precession of simulacra. In B. Wallis (Ed.), *Art after modernism: Rethinking representation* (pp. 253–281). Boston: David R. Godine.

Benjamin, W. (1968). *Illuminations*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Bloom, B. S. (1973). Individual differences in school achievement: a vanishing point? In L.J. Rubin (Ed.), *Facts and feelings in the Classroom* (pp. 113–146). New York: Viking.

Buchloh, B. H. D. (1982). Allegorical procedures: Appropriation and montage in contemporary art. *Artforum*, 21(1), 43–56.

De la Croix, H. & Tansey, R. G. (1970). *Gardner's art through the ages*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Edgerton, S. Y. Jr. (1975). *The renaissance rediscovery of linear perspective*. New York: Basic Books.

Eisner, E. W. (1979). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. New York: Macmillan.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall.

Gordon, D. (1981). The aesthetic attitude and the hidden curriculum. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 15(2), 51–63.

Hadjinicolaou, N. (1978). *Art history and class struggle*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.

Hausman, C. (September, 1992). *Can the concept of psychical distance be defended?* Paper presented at the International Society for Aesthetics, Madrid, Spain.

Hughes, R. (1991). *The shock of the new*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Koestler, A. (1975). *The act of creation*. London: Picador.

Lippard, L. R. (1990). *Mixed blessings: New art in a multicultural america*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Muybridge, Eadweard. (1955). *The human figure in motion*. New York: Dover.

Muybridge, Eadweard. (1957). *Animals in motion*. New York: Dover.

Owens, C. (1983). The discourse of others: Feminists and postmodernism. In H. Foster (Ed.), *The anti-aesthetic: Essays on postmodern culture*. Port Townsend: Bay Press.

Rabinbach, A. (1990). *The human motor: Energy, fatigue, and the origins of modernity*. New York: Basic Books.

Ricoeur, P. (1976). *Interpretation theory: Discourse and the surplus of meaning*. Fort Worth: The Texas Christian University.

Romanyshyn, R. D. (1989). *Technology as symptom and dream*. London: Routledge.

Rothenberg, A. (1979). *Emerging goddess: The creative process in art, science, and other fields*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Taussig, M. (1987). *Shamanism, colonialism, and the wild man: A study in terror and healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Tichi, C. (1987). *Shifting gears: Technology, literature, culture in modernist America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

Trend, D. (1992). *Cultural pedagogy: Art/education/politics*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Wasserman, Jack (1984). *Leonardo*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.

The War of Labels: An Art Educator in Search of A Sign

jan jagodzinski

I recently had the occasion to go shopping with my twelve year old son Jeremy who is now finishing grade seven in a Canadian public school. He had somehow (mysteriously) saved twenty dollars and was determined to buy a T-shirt. Coming from the boomer generation, T-shirts for me where either those funny Stanfield undergarments that my dad wore under his dress shirt (to absorb the sweat during hard work, I suppose?) or what gang members with duck-tails in the '50s wore under their leather jackets to look cool - like the 'Fonz' of *Happy Days*. During my college art school days, the days when you had to 'smoke' to find yourself in your art, the T-shirt changed into psychedelic colours as we flower children began to tie-dye them. They became a sign of protest against the plastic world, hand made and, of course, "authentic." From that point on, T-shirt culture seemed to have vanished from my consciousness. I was dimly aware that they were worn with all kinds of humorous sayings, or by runners who unwillingly wore all kinds of sponsor logos on the sleeves and backs of their 'free' T-shirts. And, oh sure, grade school art students would often paint their own designs on them; you know, the usual album