



THE ANAEROBIC BACTERIA at work on the Winogradsky Column will produce a mix of Carbon dioxide CO<sub>2</sub> and Methane gas CH<sub>4</sub>

## WINOGRADSKY COLUMN

FILLED WITH PRIMARY SLUDGE will form HORIZONS OF ANAEROBIC BACTERIA

EXPECT THE FORMATION OF PURPLE SULFUR BACTERIA (ACID FORMERS) AND METHANE FORMING BACTERIA



2310 AVE WWTP TOUR CONCEPT  
LAB STOP

# The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education

---

## Editorial Team

Michael J. Emme  
*Central Washington  
University*

Elizabeth Garber  
*The Pennsylvania State  
University*

Charles Wieder  
*Southern Connecticut  
State University*

Book Review Editor

Roy Pearson

Caucus Coordinator  
Coordinator Elect  
Past-Coordinator  
Secretary  
Treasurer  
Newsletter Editor  
Columnist  
Delegate

Harold Pearse  
Gayle M. Weitz  
jan jagodzinski  
Rosalie Politisky  
Connie Landis  
Ed Check  
Amy Brook Snider  
Doug Blandy

## REVIEWERS

The JSTAE Review board rotates among the membership of *The Caucus on Social Theory and Art Education*. The individuals listed below are those who participated as reviewers on JSTAE 14

Robert Bersson, *James Madison University*, Harrisonburg, VA  
Doug Blandy, *University of Oregon*, Eugene, OR  
Georgia Collins, *University of Kentucky*, Lexington, KY  
Kathleen Connors, *Southern Connecticut State University*, CT  
Steve Darnell, *University of South Carolina*, Columbia, SC  
Paul Duncum, *Central Queensland University*, Rockhampton, MC  
William Folkstadt, *Central Washington University*, Ellensburg, WA  
Yvonne Gaudelius, *Penn State University*, University Park, PA  
Elizabeth Hoffman, *University of Maine*, Orono, ME  
jan jagodzinski, *University of Alberta*, Edmonton, AL  
Don Krug, *The Ohio State University*, Columbus, OH  
Connie Landis, *Eastern Montana University*, Billings, MT  
Cathy Mullen, *Concordia University*, Montreal, PQ  
Robert Saunders, former Connecticut State art consultant  
Amy Brook Snider, *Pratt Institute*, Brooklyn, NY  
Don Soucy, *University of New Brunswick*, Fredricton, NB

The *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education (JSTAE)* is a publication of the *Caucus on Social Theory & Art Education (CSTAE)*, an affiliate of the *National Art Education Association*. Its editorial policy is in compliance with the CSTAE's constitutional mandate:

---

to promote the use of theoretical concepts from the social sciences—which include, but are not limited to, anthropology, sociology, and political science—to study visual culture and the teaching of art; to inform art educators about theory and practice in the social sciences, thus acting as a liaison between social scientists and art educators; to encourage research into the social context of visual culture and teaching art; and to develop socially relevant programs for use in the teaching of art.

The editors invite formal and informal contributions on all matters relating to social theory in art education. Correspondences, book and exhibition reviews, and performance pieces are welcome. Original manuscripts, together with three copies should be prepared according to an internally consistent publication style. Membership is not a precondition for submittance. Deadline for submission for JSTAE No. 15 is July 15, 1995. Send relevant articles and images to:

**Michael J. Emme**  
Central Washington University  
Art Department, Randall Fine Arts Building  
Ellensburg, WA, 98926-7564

Inquiries concerning membership and distribution of past issues should be addressed to:

**Connie Landis, Treasurer, (CSTAE)**  
3200 Wendimere Lane  
Billings, MT 59102-6536

### Subscription Rates:

The *Journal of Social Theory in Art Education* is a benefit of membership in the *Caucus on Social Theory & Art Education*. Membership in the Caucus is currently set at \$20.00 U.S. The journal is published annually. Individual copies of JSTAE may be purchased for \$15.00 U.S. ISSN 1057-0292

JSTAE 14 has been published through Central Washington University.

© Copyright by the JSTAE 1994

# Contents

---

JSTAE Number 14 1994

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |    |                                                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><i>Michael J. Emme</i><br/><i>Elizabeth Garber</i><br/><i>Charles Wieder</i></p>                                                                                                                                                    | 5  | Editorial                                                                                                   |
| <p><i>Daniel L. Collins</i><br/><i>Charles R. Garoian</i></p>                                                                                                                                                                          | 15 | <i>The Deep Creek School: Technology, Ecology and the Body as Pedagogical Alternatives in Art Education</i> |
| <p><i>Doug Blandy</i><br/><i>Kristin G. Congdon</i><br/><i>Laurie Hicks</i><br/><i>Elizabeth Hoffman</i><br/><i>Don Krug</i></p>                                                                                                       | 35 | <i>The Green Quilt: An Example of Collective Eco-Action in Art Education</i>                                |
| <p><i>Michael J. Emme</i></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 44 | <i>An Editor's Note: Critical Theory, Art and Education</i>                                                 |
| <p><i>David Amdur</i><br/><i>Robert Bersson</i><br/><i>Gene Cooper</i><br/><i>Drent Howenstein</i><br/><i>Laurie Lundquist</i><br/><i>Meryl Meisler</i><br/><i>Juanita Miller</i><br/><i>Gretchen Riemer</i><br/><i>Kai Staats</i></p> | 47 | <i>The Gallery</i>                                                                                          |

- Yvonne Gaudelius* 70 Valuing Difference:  
Luce Irigaray and Feminist  
Pedagogy
- Paul Duncum* 101 Behind, the Road is Blocked:  
Art Education and Nostalgia
- Clayton Funk* 120 The Committee on Public  
Information and the  
Mobilization of Public  
Opinion in the United States  
During World War I: the  
Effects on Education and  
Artists
- Lara M. Lackey* 148 Art, Education, Work, and  
Leisure:  
Tangles in the Lifelong  
Learning Network
- Mary Wyrick* 170 "Truth" that Sells: Broadcast  
News Media In Video Art  
and Art Education

#### BOOK REVIEWS

- John H. White Jr.* 187 Terry Barrett (1994)  
*Criticizing Art: Understanding  
the Contemporary*
- Joanne K. Guilfoil* 191 Leslie Weisman (1992)  
*Discrimination by Design:  
A Feminist Critique of  
the Man-Made Environment.*
- Patricia Amburgy* 197 Robert Hughes (1993)  
*Culture of Complaint: The  
Fraying of America*

#### On The Cover

Phoenix Waste Water 1992 mixed material drawing  
By: Laurie Lundquist & Jaune Quick-to-See Smith  
Working through the Phoenix Arts Commission, Laurie Lundquist and Jaune  
Quick-to-See Smith worked collaboratively to generate to-tour concepts for  
the 23rd Avenue waste water facility in Phoenix. *City Sludge Scene* depicts an  
interactive exhibit that humorously shows the phenomenon of settling that  
plays a key role in waste water treatment (not constructed).

## Editorial(s)

---

Charles Wieder Elizabeth Garber Michael J. Emme

This editorial is a model of the kind of collaborative process shared by Chuck, Elizabeth and myself throughout the growth of *JSTAE 14*. In this instance, given a suggested structure, Chuck wrote his portion of the editorial focusing on issues arising from the two articles where he lead the editorial team. He then sent his work to Elizabeth who wrote her editorial with reference to the articles where she took the lead, but also in response to Chuck's writing. As the third in line I have the opportunity to comment on the articles for which I had final responsibility as well as being able to springboard off of both Chuck and Elizabeth's efforts in commenting on the journal as a whole. I know that we could easily continue to pass our comments around the circle until we had a book length editorial. Clearly, then, this is an unfinished work, which means that it, like the publication at large remains open to question. M.E.

### Charles Weider

Taking my lead from the Gaudelius article printed within these pages, I'd like to explore a couple of seemingly intractable questions—questions more about our methods of inquiry rather than any particular research findings. The kind of answers I'm seeking here are more for the sake of checking my bearings and how I go about sorting through all of the claims to knowledge and the grounds offered to support this body of information. It's

not just a matter of my being uncomfortable with what are often rather basic inconsistencies of the knowledge claims in art and art education, its as much to do with my sense of a reluctance among many to reflect upon that body of information and to check out the assumptions on which it rests.

A year ago, in this same space, I wrote of taking a step back to try to see what needed further attention based on my reading of the articles that made up *JSTAE* 13. In my stepping back an analogy to the art making process was drawn. That work, artful or not, continues. Except this time I think I'm ready to move forward in my effort to question the subject matter of the arts and the kinds of questions that we are asking and how. I want very much to know how different forms of art affect us personally and affect the forming of culture—but also who decides which forms will count most and how they know what will hold meaning for me and others who might see things differently. And above all I want to be able to raise questions concerning who this art education is for and for what purpose.

Guiding my inquiry, Gaudelius has pointed to some places to look that I hadn't thought of. The language at first appeared different, causing some apprehension. But the clarity and truthfulness were reassuring, and I began to find in the writing a means of gaining a new perspective on what I was looking for. Drawing upon the work of Luce Irigaray, Gaudelius not only raises the sort of core questions that I agree we all must face, it is her approach to inquiry that I found compelling. A fundamental part of the method entails probing "how questions...that questions themselves...shape our inquiry." It's not a simple course that Gaudelius sets. But I felt I could trust that I wouldn't get (too) lost, (And to be honest, editorials aren't the riskiest sort of explorations anyway.)

Another compass for my journey came from the Lackey article also appearing in these pages, which seemed to be pointed in the same direction. The timing was right for me to get away, to step back from my day-to-day efforts observing student teachers in public schools working with certified, mentored, and re-assessed master teachers teaching tried-and-tested,

accredited, art-like courses. From the distant place that Lackey and Gaudelius had taken me I saw things that I'd never quite known to look for. Lackey's probing into relationships between formal and non-formal educational approaches, between K-12 and lifelong conceptions of art learning, between standardized curriculum and community-based cultural values helped me see my own work with the Connecticut public schools more clearly. And upon returning from the excursion I feel I had gained a deeper appreciation for what's back home.

Others within the Social Theory Caucus ranks have written on the critical import of critical inquiry, of raising honest questions about what really matters to us. This, over and above my shared interest in theory, is what brought me to the caucus over a decade ago: The willingness to question what others take for granted, whether matters of practice or policy, curriculum design or the latest recipe for some computer graphics program. In the pages of this journal Caucus members have taken on the most nagging questions and more than a few sacred cows and bulls. In these uncertain times we were certain that this was not the time to be timid about the questions we asked. What was often most discouraging to many of us was the sense that so many others in the field seemed to have given up asking the hard questions, or had conceded that the problems were beyond our reach, and had preferred instead to work on damage control. What these individuals seemed prepared to give up on were the meanings and the visions that give our work direction.

What was the alternative?—conceding our status as educational frills?—or worse, that of unabashed romantic idealists? For the Caucus this complacency and being defined by others who don't know us very well became a call to action. We stood up to defend the fringe, the margin, the decorative detail; and try to bring renewed meaning and value to the educational process. Above all we sought to hold those accountable who have taken it upon themselves to set the policies and the goals against which they would assess us.

In a way being called a frill frees us up to take stock, to check our course, to seek more honest truths than those who relegate that stuff to presidential commencement speeches. We don't have to wait to be told when to bow and applaud, but can live daily with the images in and on the fringes and the frills of the decorative surfaces, which are probably closer to what matters in human life than the more traditional annual ceremonial symbols ritually paraded before us at conferences and on official holidays.

In our journeys through stormy seas and over mountains and across deserts and down the corridors to the offices of principals and department heads, let us continue questioning—questioning as we go our own efforts, assumptions, and tactics. Isn't that what we ask of our students? Asking not just for the sake of shaking others from their complacency, but because as teachers our concern is more to help others gain confidence in their questions and learn the skills of raising ever more incisive questions and the ability to check out their answers as well as those they've been given.

There is but one question that needs not be asked, and that is how much I've benefitted from having Mike and Elizabeth working alongside me (as close as a fax or phone call away) in putting together *JSTAE 14*.

### Elizabeth Garber

Over the course of the past two years of our collaboration as an editorial team for the *Journal*, Chuck, Mike and I have often exchanged our thoughts on what it might, could, or should mean to be a journal of social theory in art education. Does it mean that all articles published should be socially oriented? or that theory should always be present? Does it mean that the relationship of the contents of the journal to the field of art education must be integral? We have come to grips with the first question—that of social orientation, and the third question—that of educational relevance, not only because of our personal, professional, and political convictions, but because of the title of the journal and its stated purpose. It is the question of theory to which we returned again and again. Chuck particularly has kept the embers

of this discussion alive in responding to the various manuscripts submitted not by drawing conclusions or definitions, but by bouncing off the manuscripts as possibilities of social theory.

Theory being nothing more than "a coherent group of general propositions used as principles of explanation for a class of phenomena"<sup>1</sup> it strikes me as curious to think only intellectuals in academia might be involved with theory. But then, who are our intellectuals? As many of you will recall, in his *Prison Notebooks* Antonio Gramsci distinguished between two types of intellectuals. He charged what he termed "traditional intellectuals" with reinforcing social hierarchies because they served as "experts in legitimation."<sup>2</sup> Arguing that intellectuals are not characterized simply by the activity of thinking, which is intrinsic to all people, but by the function that they perform, he coined the term "organic intellectuals" to refer to individuals within groups who work to create a "counter-hegemony" to subvert the existing power relations. Out of every class, he argued, come intellectuals who function as agents of change<sup>3</sup> These people actively participate in practical life not simply as orators, but as organizers, persuaders, and constructors. Organic intellectuals must be part of the people and are important to the organization of constituent groups for change.

While I do not want to label the writers in our journal, I see them as acting in this capacity of organic intellectuals. Let me clarify by discussing the two articles I coordinated for *JSTAE 14*. In "The Green Quilt: An Example of Collective Eco-Action in Art Education" Doug Blandy, Kristin Congdon, Laurie Hicks, Elizabeth Hoffman, and Don Krug describe a kind of passion that developed as participants in their NAEA sessions on Green

---

<sup>1</sup>Random House Dictionary, 1992

<sup>2</sup>Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, eds. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York: International Publishers, 1971), 9-10

<sup>3</sup>Gramsci used the Italian word *commissi* meaning agent or commercial traveler (Roger Simon, *Gramsci's Political Thought* [London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982], 96).

Quilts hung their squares on the NAEA quilt. As a participant in their project, I felt this rise of communal passion. Much later in his *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci discusses how "feelings and passion become understanding and thence knowledge."<sup>4</sup> I know (because I heard them deliver it at the NAEA Conference in Baltimore) that there is a more traditionally academic component in the development of their project,<sup>5</sup> and yet I understand the Green Quilt project as an action that stands on its own, one that began the process of bringing constituents together to form the "historical bloc" that Gramsci talks about—a coalition of people who are both leaders and workers acting together for change. I hope readers of Doug, Kristin, Laurie, Elizabeth, and Don's article will find in the written word the excitement to join the coalition for change by producing their own quilts and working in the struggle for a just and sustainable world.

Carol Becker, in a recent talk at Penn State, extended Gramsci's organic intellectuals to activist artists.<sup>6</sup> Among them I would include the artists Mary Wyrick describes in her article "Truth that Sells: Broadcast News Media in Video Art and Art Education." Mary communicates well the passion and conviction conveyed by these artists in their work, and begins herself to

---

<sup>4</sup>Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, 418.

<sup>5</sup>Don Krug, Doug Blandy, & Kristin Congdon, "Art Education and the Interconnectedness of Cultural and Ecological Restoration," paper presented at NAEA Convention, Baltimore Md., 8 April 1994.

<sup>6</sup>Carol Becker, "Art, Pedagogy, and the Struggle for Life," paper delivered as part of the Waterbury Forum for Education and Cultural Studies, Penn State University, 16 February, 1995. George Lipsitz has similarly developed the idea that Chicano popular musicians have acted as organic intellectuals in forming an historical bloc to challenge the "ideological hegemony of Anglo cultural domination." He argues that they have been at least partially successful in influencing change in popular music (see George Lipsitz, "Cruising Around the Historical Bloc—Postmodernism Aned Popular Music in East Los Angeles," *Cultural Critique*, vol. 5 (Winter 1986-1987), 157-177.

construct that bridge from passions and feelings to understanding and knowledge. Beyond reading Mary's overview as a catalogue introduction to the many artists working with the subject of broadcast news, I found myself making connections between Mary's implications of this catalogue for art educators and Stanley Aronowitz's and Henry Giroux's concept of teachers as "Transformative intellectuals" that relates to Gramsci's organic Intellectuals.<sup>7</sup> In seeing education as a site for cultural change they (and other radical educators) argue that teachers, rather than indoctrinating students into a system that is inherently undemocratic, should reject their roles as fascilitators of predetermined content and instructional procedures and work to understand the legacies of high culture as well as popular culture, leading their students to critique both and look for possibilities for change. This is how they conceive of teachers as transformative intellectuals. This vision is one that includes the relationship between theory and practice, with the intellectual being understood as the agent of change. Mary conveys an optimism that schools can be sites of social change and that teachers and artists can be agents in that change. Again, I am excited about the possibilities she presents us.

While I find room in the *Journal* for (and indeed welcome) what is more widely Accepted in academic circles as theory (some of which I have participated in here), I find the negotiated space of a more practiced theorizing has its place in the *Journal* as well. I fully hope that we are up to the challenge that such theory presents us with.

---

<sup>7</sup>Although these theories are laid out in several places, for a highly readable version, see Stanley Aronowitz & Henry A. Giroux, *Education Under Siege: The Conservative, The Liberal and Radical Debate over Schooling* (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1985).

### Michael J. Emme

One of the challenges of relating to the natural environment with a mind framed by the educational systems of the late 20th century is being able to acknowledge and even live comfortably in an environment that is complex beyond comprehension or control. In proposing ECO•TECHNO as a theme for JSTAE 14 I hoped to draw together a wide variety of works that both reflected and explored this complexity. Three works in this journal explicitly pursue the theme. Daniel Collins and Charles Garoian's discussion of the art and issues of the *Deep Creek School* allows us to observe the melding of theory and practice, and of ecology and technology through the works of a number of young artists. Elizabeth has already commented on *The Green Quilt: An Example of Collective Eco-Action in Art Education* which draws further attention to the knowledge and passion that art making can bring. And finally *The Gallery* is an explicit acknowledgement that we can form questions and propose understandings on an issue as central to our continued existence as the relationship between our technologies and the environment through our experience of art.

Clayton Funk's exploration of the Committee on Public Information, and Paul Duncum's essay on the potential costs of intellectual nostalgia are more obviously anchored in more 'traditional' theoretical concerns. Funk describes in detail the ways in which early concepts of information management were used to frame the visual information and education in the US. Duncum revisits the elitist assumptions of theorist considered to be sympathetic references in our field and describes how these theoretical frames limit our capacity to engage our whole cultural environment. The concept of cultural geography proposed by Lucy Lippard and cited in this journal by Collins and Garoian makes it clear, however, that all of the work in JSTAE 14 can be read with reference to the theme of ECO•TECHNO. This possibility suggests that there are two kinds of thematic readings of JSTAE 14. The first, what could be called a production theme, must really be limited to the three collected works produced with the intent to explore the relationship between our technologies and the environment. The second, not unlike the idea of an interpretant proposed by semiotician C.S. Pierce (1955) and elaborated by Theresa

DeLauretis (1984) allows us to bring the question "what is the relationship between our technologies and the environment?" to all our reading. All of this may be a rationalization for the fact that a truly 'structured' theme issue is probably impossible given the delightful feistiness of you, the caucus membership. On the other hand, I kind of like the idea that the task of defining theme issues be taken out of the hands of editors and put in the hands of the readers.

This is my fourth year working on the *Journal*. I worked down the hall from Harold Pearse when he took over editorial duties from Jan Jagodzinski for JSTAE 11. As a newcomer to both academia and the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design I was enthusiastic about the chance to get involved with the *Journal*. As I recall, my come-on to Harold was the fact that I knew how to run Pagemaker. What was essentially an initial offer to serve as galley slave for a publication I respected has evolved into a professionally challenging and enriching experience. By the time Harold stepped down after JSTAE 12 I had moved to my current position in Washington State where I have been allowed closer access to the American approach to art education which sometimes seems to (but doesn't) dominate our field's thinking. Although there were pragmatic considerations (who is this Emme guy anyway?) the Caucus approved an idea hatched by Harold and me in Chicago to try a team approach to editing the JSTAE 13. Chuck Weider and Elizabeth Garber, both of whom put themselves forward as potential editors, graciously took up the challenge when the idea of a team approach was proposed. Like the form of the *Journal*, our relationships as editors have evolved with each publication. As a lone art ed. person in a fine arts department (and happily so) it has been important to find colleagues in my mailbox. Chuck and Elizabeth and all of you who have submitted manuscripts or images in the last two years have been the visiting scholars program in art education for central Washington. Thanks!

With JSTAE 14 Elizabeth, Chuck and I have moved very close to what I would describe as a truly balanced collaboration. Each of us has taken primary responsibility for individual manuscripts, but each has had substantial input with all of the writing in this publication. I think we have each come to



understand the voices of our team members. Elizabeth has eloquently describe Chuck's attention to issues of theory. The passion he has brought to his reading of the manuscripts set a standard for engagement that guided me. I have also been grateful for Elizabeth's breadth of knowledge in our field as well as her editorial precision (she catches all the mechanical stuff that I miss!). She and I have also shared a growing passion for the gallery portion of JSTAE 14 (see the Gallery introduction for more on this). And, in the end, I am still the galley slave who knows how to run Pagemaker. Anyone interested in taking up an oar?

---

De Lauretis, T. (1984). *Alice Doesn't: Feminism, semiotics, cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Peirce, C.S. (1955). Logic as semiotic: The theory of signs. In J. Buchler (ed.) *The philosophical writings of Peirce*. New York: Dover Press.

## **The Deep Creek School: Technology, Ecology and the Body as Pedagogical Alternatives in Art Education**

---

Daniel L. Collins & Charles R. Garoian

An old station wagon pulled up the dirt road of the canyon and came to a stop next to the stone house. Kai, an industrial design student, and his girlfriend climbed out of the car and stretched their limbs after their long journey from Phoenix. The rear compartment of the vehicle was jammed full of camping equipment and other necessities for Kai's participation in a five week art program in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado. Most unusual were the control panels, speakers, and other electronic equipment that he had brought along, "to use in his art works," he said.

Kai immediately began to negotiate a studio space. Unlike the other students who chose to establish their working spaces around the open areas of the welding shed, the large open space in the new studio, or in the open areas near the sleeping tents, Kai wanted to seclude himself in the dusty ice house—a defunct turn-of-the-century food storage shed. As the other students walked through the pine and spruce forest, along the winding mountain creek, and over the rugged mountain terrain to search