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ENCULTURATION AND
THE VISUAL ARTS CURRICULUM

Nancy R. Johnson

An overview of some theoretical viewpoints on enculturation is presented. These viewpoints are relevant to the development of the visual arts curriculum. The perspective presented is a critical one that calls for an examination of the cultural constructs in which art education is embedded.

Teaching and learning about art in schools is a social act. It involves taxpayers, legislators, administrators in state departments of education, and school boards whose decisions legitimate the presence of school buildings, teachers, and curriculum materials. It also involves the creation and organization of art knowledge by artists, art historians, art critics, aestheticians, art educators, art teachers, and gallery owners. Further, it involves the handiwork and thought of countless individuals throughout time who helped to fashion the concept of public art education and the language by which it can be talked about. In the arena of the art room, children formally encounter the collective mind and actions of society regarding art through interaction with the art teacher.

In view of this, teaching and learning about art and even making art are not as personal or as subjective as we might think. They are very much a part of the on-going social drama known as enculturation.

What is Enculturation?

To fully understand the term enculturation, it is useful to first examine the concept of culture. Anthropologists often view culture as a mental template or blueprint by which life is to be conducted. Human beings need culture because their genetic endowment does not provide a complete program for coping with the totality of experience that can be had in the world. Whereas animals operate almost exclusively on their instincts, this is not the case for humans. Humans rely heavily on the accumulated learnings of others encoded as culture.

In other words, as Barrett (1984) states, the degree of dependence that human beings have on learned traditions is enormous when compared to the relative lack of dependence on learned or shared traditions by animals. A kitten or puppy taken away from others of its kind will grow up into a cat or dog who behaves typically like most other cats and dogs. This is not the case with human beings. Barrett (1984) notes that there are a few well-documented cases of children who were deprived of interaction with peers and other adults, and neglected by their parents. This is a small amount of evidence, but it does show that these children did not grow up behaving like typical adult human beings. Culture, then, appears to be very necessary to human beings.

For the anthropologist, Clifford Geertz (1973), culture:

denotes an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life (p. 89).

Barrett (1984) defines culture "as the body of learned beliefs, traditions, and guides for behavior that are shared among members of any human society" (p. 54). Returning to the meaning of enculturation, we can now say that it is the process of
learning the meanings, symbols, and traditions that enable one to appear as a typical adult in a given society.

How Does Enculturation Take Place?

Barrett (1984), Beals (1979), and Berger Luckman (1966) all provide thorough accounts of how enculturation occurs. They each use different terms, however. Barrett speaks of enculturation, Beals of cultural transmission, and Berger and Luckman of socialization. Nevertheless, the three accounts permit a broad understanding of how the young become participants of the society and culture into which they are born.

Barrett on Enculturation

According to Barrett (1984) "humans live in a world of symbols and conventional understandings" (p. 54) that are acquired by observation, imitation, and instruction. At birth babies are the recipients of cultural and familial practices developed over many generations. As children grow, they become habituated to these practices, and assimilate them as a part of their own behavior. An enculturated individual knows the general cultural program for appropriate behavior in society. This program is interpreted and acted upon in different ways by individuals. There may be a great deal of leeway or a variety of alternatives available in the application of the program to specific events. Thus, within a culture, there is room for manipulation and some degree of freedom.

Beals on Cultural Transmission

Beals (1979) states that human social systems differ from animal social systems in that they possess cultural traditions or plans for living. Cultural traditions, an environment, members, material culture, and a set of processes form a cultural system. The operation of a cultural system is dependent upon cultural transmission which "involves teaching and learning ways of behaving properly and according to expectation" (p. 29). Cultural transmission takes place throughout life and varies according to different cultures who develop unique plans for living. The cultural message, however, may not be transmitted in the same way to all cultural members. Differences can occur in how the message is sent and received in rich or poor families, among the first-born or last-born, and among sons and daughters. Beals also allows for differences in people through the exercise of preferences amidst selected alternatives. The end result of the transmission process on the growing child is recruitment into the cultural system maintained by adults. The child as adult in turn transmits the cultural message to the next generation.

Berger and Luckman on Socialization

For Berger and Luckman (1966), the process of becoming a knowledgeable participant in the on-going activities of society requires socialization. Socialization involves the internalization of meanings expressed by significant others during shared events. An important part of this process is language. Language categorizes and anonymizes experience. It contains recipes for action built up by others which Berger and Luckman call the social stock of knowledge. As individuals learn to speak, they also acquire preconceived ways of thinking about experience that are encoded in language. Berger and Luckman view the social world as a constructed edifice collectively manufactured by human beings. This world appears as an objective reality to each individual. In a dialectical fashion, individuals can act back upon the social world as well as having it act upon them. Individuals are not passive recipients of social
and cultural directives. They can disobey them, negotiate them, and half-heartedly carry them out. The directives can also be reformulated. Thus, the process of socialization is not totally deterministic.

**Enculturation and the Curriculum**

From the summaries of how enculturation, cultural transmission, and socialization take place, it is possible to view schooling as a major agency for shaping the young into adequate performers of the cultural traditions. Of consequence, within the school, are the teacher and the curriculum. Teachers are certified professional informers. They are sanctioned by society to explain aspects of the social world to children and they are required to undergo professional socialization wherein they pass through the ritual of student teaching and receive their certification. As official representatives of society, their major task is to ensure that students have internalized selected parts of the social stock of knowledge that have been approved by school boards, state departments of education, and textbook companies. This selected knowledge is then presented, interpreted, and mediated by the teacher. The documentation of the knowledge and the instructional process for sharing it make up the curriculum.

Beauchamp (1983), a curriculum specialist, supports this view. He states that: "A curriculum is an expression of the choice of content selected from our total cultural content...curriculum planning is a process of selecting and organizing culture content for transmission to students by the school" (p. 92).

Connelly and Dienes (1982), who are also curriculum specialists, likewise note that: "The actions teachers perform before, during, and following instruction are undertaken in the interests of students and, as such, are appropriately seen as curricular. Curriculum, in this sense, is a process continually under development, since the course of any sequence of teacher actions is inevitably varied and only partially charted in advance" (p. 183).

**The Visual Arts Curriculum**

Art education is very much a part of the process of enculturation. Through art teachers, curriculum guides, art textbooks, and art materials, many historically rooted ideas about art come to be known by the young. They most likely will come to know about the elements and principles of design, that art is creative, and that the best way to know about art is by making something. These concepts are part of the cultural traditions and stock of knowledge espoused by art teachers. They are familiar taken-for-granted ideas that we have examined very little, if at all. Because we have been in a crisis situation for some time regarding our presence in the schools, it seems to me that it is appropriate to examine and reflect upon the concepts that we transmit through our lessons and classroom activities at the elementary and secondary levels, and in teacher education. Let us examine our practice and engage in cultural analysis to see if we have a need to rethink and revise the messages that we share about art in the classroom. Questions that might be raised during a cultural analysis are: What is actually taught in art and art education classes? Where have these concepts come from? Why do we transmit them? Are they of value? Do they enhance student understanding in the visual arts? How are they understood?

Cultural analysis of our art ideas and practices in art education can contribute to the development of theory and practice in the study of culture. Wuthnow, Hunter, Bergesen, and Kurzwell (1984) note that many contemporary thinkers "perceive significant problems in modern..."
culture which require critical reflection" (p.18). In a recent book, they reviewed work in cultural analysis by sociologist Peter Berger, anthropologist Mary Douglas, historian Michel Foucault, and critical theorist Jürgen Habermas. These scholars have attempted to examine the phenomenon of contemporary life and to reflect upon what it is, how it came to be, and the structure of our present web of cultural meanings, and to suggest how our culture might be reformulated. To be considered in a critical reflection of our culture and its problems is an examination of the role of the visual arts in modern society and their place in the lives of educated persons. Art educators are in an excellent position to reflect on these problems and others about art, society, and culture and to contribute answers to them. From this kind of analysis and reflection, we might be able to better understand what it is that we do and how we might improve our practice and position in the schools.
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SOCIAL PURPOSES OF ART EDUCATION

Robert J. Saunders

In very broad terms, I wish to address the social purposes of art and art education in an historical context, assuming that art education's purposes extend to some extent from those of art. I will discuss these social purposes in the framework of major historical divisions: the tribal society, the agricultural community, industrial civilization, and the future scientific-planetary community, or new age.

Art education is one side of a triad in which art and education make up the other two sides. All three are human enterprises with social origins which change as society's need for them changes. Within this triad art education has, more often than not, responded primarily to the social purposes of education which have been more economic, ethical, moral, political, and religious than aesthetic and spiritual.

Throughout most of art history, since the cave painters, art instruction has been a form of apprenticeship, a one to one experience between a master and an apprentice. The structure we today recognize as art education is really a product of industrial civilization. Arnold Hauser, in the Social History of Art (1951) repeatedly makes it clear that art styles change in response to the purposes that societies have for art. Accordingly, the position of the artist and the art teacher in society also reflects those changes.

In the tribal communities, the major purposes of art were magic and divination or prophesy, and in some tribal societies narrative history of the clan or tribe. In magic and divination the techniques of making art were ritualized to create the magic. The artist and shaman were one. The shaman-artist taught his/her initiate the skills and rituals of image-making, the historic traditions of their clan, and their importance to the clan community. The apprentice learned by imitating, or copying the techniques and rituals and by memorizing the chants and procedures.

The agricultural community began with the Neolithic Age and continues from the ancient world, and the great ages - Classical, Roman, Medieval, and Renaissance - to the Reformation. In the early stages of agricultural societies a division of labor between the artist and shaman developed. The artist was reduced to an artisan and the shaman elevated to high priest. The artisan painted on the tomb walls and carved the scriptures, while the craftsman made utilitarian objects. Women, who had done the weaving and pottery in the early tribal society, continued to do so for the home, but the man made them for the market place. Art in ancient Egypt had metaphysical purposes, depicting the lives of the pharaohs on tomb walls, or effigies on monuments. In Crete, the craftsman making idols to sell in the market place disregarded the magic ritual. The purpose became industrial and commercial. During the Christian area, from the Byzantine to the Renaissance, the purposes of art were religious instruction of the illiterate masses, and the glorification of the church.

The ancient Greeks, in distinguishing between the liberal arts and the servile arts, identified the artist with the liberal arts - the intellectual, poet, dramatist, and musician. The artisan was associated with the servile arts, the manual arts, and was considered one
who used his hands rather than his head. This distinction continues through the Renaissance, and is still with us in many ways. The artisans' trades carried forth the apprenticeship training system. When Leonardo, Raphael and Michelangelo achieved status as artists, because of their genius, methods of instruction also changed. At that time, it developed that painters and sculptors were taught in academies of design. The masters had studios with many apprentices assisting in their work and studying classical design. Formal principles of design were established, and disciplines related to style were also changing the content of art instruction. It has been frequently noted that Rubens' studio was like a factory of apprentices working on his commissions.

Beginning with the Reformation period, the development of the industrial civilization set the framework for art education as we know it today. For this structure, we need a middle class, and leisure time that reaches a level of society other than the rulers and aristocracy. The aristocracy had long been the patrons of the arts and its chief collectors. For one thing this patronage meant that the artist was freed of the tyranny of the wall. S/he could paint or carve in his/her studio and carry the work to its place of installation. The Protestant antipathy for religious art and idols opened the range of subject matter to landscapes, portraits, still lifes, genre, and with the blessing of John Calvin, history painting. Possessing works of art gave merchants and businessmen social status. This gave art an entirely new purpose. The Protestant artists and businessmen created their own market, rather than depending entirely upon the aristocracy and the church. The feudal institution of religion evolved into the industrial institution of education. Religious moralism, and realism of the industrial civilization replaced the scholasticism and humanism of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. Education was installed into the homes of the upper and leisure classes with tutors, and governesses for young children. Orphans and children of the working class were taught in public institutions, if at all. Society prescribed the type of art that would be taught, according to the social class and the sex of the child, and dictated the limitations of its use.

Boys in the upper middle class were taught lettering, drawing, and perspective as practical skills for making diagrams, illustrating descriptions when words were not enough, designing their own houses, and reading plans for machinery. Girls were taught watercolors, drawing, embroidery, and playing the pianoforte and singing - the so-called female accomplishments - for the purpose of gaining a suitable husband in the marriage market. Neither young gentlemen nor young ladies were encouraged to take their art making seriously enough to become artists or professionals. The artist was still considered a member of the working class who could not make a suitable living. Children of the working class were taught geometrical drawing, printmaking, and etching, skills which could be used for industrial employment.

Although the North American colonies were founded during the early stages of the Industrial Revolution, they were agricultural communities. The agrarian Protestant work ethic was strong, and the artist was considered an artisan. Several generations passed before the standards of upper middle class instruction in America reached those European standards described above, but the divisions between middle class and working class purposes for drawing remained much the same.

Art instruction had definite purposes. Geometrical drawing and
linear perspective, when taught in the common schools prepared students for factory employment. This was established by the Industrial Drawing Act of 1870 in Massachusetts. But, in the private schools of the Transcendentalists, geometrical drawing taught the Pathagorean philosophy of the divine order of nature and the universe. It was a form of moral education. In the private schools, children learned picture making, often through copywork; but in the public schools, it was discouraged. Horace Mann promoted drawing because it improved penmanship.

Art Appreciation, introduced into Yale and Harvard in the 1850's, was more to insure that young gentlemen taking the grand tour would know which works of art to purchase and which to avoid than for increasing their depth of sensibility. Art appreciation for women was for moral uplift, and it was this aspect which was carried to the Art Study Units of the 1880's to the 1920's.

When we look at the whole long history of art, the aesthetic movement of the 1860's and the art for art's sake movement at the turn of the century are late arrivals. These movements represent the arrival of aristocratic elitism in the upper middle class, and possibly the ultimate social response to the democratization of art which followed the American and French Revolutions. The real social purpose of elitism is establishing social status above the general middle class. Art collecting served this purpose. It showed one has good taste, a depth of sensibility, and the money born of success and education.

Throughout the early 1900's, the manual arts and crafts programs sustained the industrial orientation of the 19th Century with an emphasis on skills for the home; and Progressive Education encouraged the use of art and crafts correlated with other subjects as a means of making the curriculum less dull and academic.

Correlated art education peaked in the 1930's and continues with us today.

The picture study units, which were the main source of art appreciation in the lower grades at the turn of the century, emphasized the moral lessons of artistic narrative, and the pride of work. The upper grades were supposed to develop aesthetic criteria for critical appreciation but this advanced stage of appreciation was never really developed. Most of the subject matter predated the Impressionists, but included the Barbizon school of realism. Modern art, and even the Social Realists of the Depression years, were not widely taught until after World War II, when returning servicemen and women entered art education. Post World War II brought the use of art for developing creative and mental growth (Lowenfeld, 1947) and established the stages of growth, as perceived in childrens' image-making ability. They were recognized first in the Child Study Movement of the 1890's, but neither our schools nor society were ready for them. The emphasis on self-expression propagated by Lowenfeld, and creative drive espoused by D'Amico, (1947), addressed a public school audience ready to use them. Art was seen as a release of emotional tensions.

If we briefly identify social purposes in the decades since then, creativity was certainly one of the major thrusts of the 1960's, and reflected the American concern over the lapse in not beating the Russians into space. Arts for the disadvantaged, handicapped and exceptional children developed in response to legislation dealing with these concerns in the 1970's. With the psychological orientations of the arts, self-expression, and arts for the handicapped, art education is moving into the next major area-or role that art will play in our society — and that is art therapy. This is a long-range direction. It
has also been part of the thrust of the 1980's.

New enthusiasm for art in education is also being perpetrated by arts advocacy groups, who very often represent the wealthy and the elite in American society. Whether or not these groups effect an elitist attitude on the content of teaching art remains to be seen.

We are now in transition from the industrial civilization to the next phase of social-cultural development. It has been called The Third Wave, (Toffler, 1980), Scientific-Planetary Civilization, (Thompson, 1972), The Aquarian Age, (Ferguson, 1980), but most popularly the New Age. Whatever it is, John Naisbett (1982) seems to have described it best as a conflict between high tech and high touch. On one hand, high tech advocates the advancement of a materialistic, automated society, while high touch advocates a return to the spiritual, mythic and natural world lost with the incursion of the industrial age. We already see movement toward a human services oriented economy, indicating that high touch is the wave of the future.

I think the next movement in art and in art education will reflect the humanistic trend through the therapeutic uses of the arts in society, and in the schools. Historically, there has been promise of a time when the arts would be the center of our culture and a great deal is happening in that direction. Art education, in the future, may balance the high tech aspects of society with the spiritual, mystic, and natural qualities that make society humane. That is the major role of art education in the future.
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ENCULTURATION AND TEACHER EDUCATION IN ART

Jessie Lovano-Kerr

There are many ways to address how we prepare art and elementary teachers to teach art. We can wait for the Getty study results which look at the topical content of selected art education programs throughout the country. Or, we can be on the alert for the completion of the comprehensive survey funded by the National Endowment for the Arts and the Department of Education, conducted by the Council of Chief State School Officers to determine, from the standpoint of each State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the status of arts education in each state. This survey will cover curricula, certification requirements, budgets, educational personnel, graduation requirements, and other areas (Hodsoll, 1985). Or, we can look at the results of the National Art Assessments conducted in 1974-75 and again in 1978-79 on the art performance of nine, thirteen and seventeen year old students throughout the country. Or, we can do a truly grass roots survey among the NAEA members to, at least, determine similarities and differences in required courses in undergraduate art education programs. Each of these sources could provide valuable information directly or indirectly related to art teacher education practices.

For the sake of expediency, I will look at the National Art Assessments (1981) as a point of departure, since it is the most comprehensive measurement on the status of art in the schools ever conducted. Four areas on art learning were assessed: (a) Valuing Art, (b) Knowledge about Art History, (c) Responding to Art: Perceiving, Describing, Analyzing, and Judging, and (d) Design and Drawing Skills.

Results Indicate That:
Students who have taken many art courses (1) do somewhat better than others on valuing exercises, (2) but are no better in responding to works of art in ways that deepen understanding and appreciation (p.4).

Most students do not know how to perceive and respond to works of art well enough to apprehend either their sensory qualities or their structures. Even those with the most art instruction are not much better than the rest. Also most students seem unable to go beyond the look of a painting's subject matter in order to make judgements about the merit of a work (p.4-5).

In the area of knowledge about art, seldom did as many as half the students recognize famous works or know when, where, or by whom they were created. Questions about art styles elicited almost random response patterns with a high percentage of students who simply did not know the answers (p.5).

Those students who had taken 4 to 6 art classes performed considerably higher than other students on the drawing exercises that called for design. The range of performance suggests that design skill improves slightly more with age than drawing skills. However, the ranges show that the majority of students do not appear to draw or to design particularly well (p.78).

Wilson, Chapman, and Silverman (NAEP, 1981) concluded in their analysis of the data from the 2nd National Art Assessment that:
Romantic notions about the child and child art need to be replaced by the realization that to be art educated implies possessing (a) an understanding of a body of subject matter -
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contemporary and historical aesthetic objects, theories and facts to be comprehended - and (b) a repertoire of skills for expressing oneself aesthetically in visual form (p.16).

The findings of the National Art Assessment reflect the general practice of art in the schools. Although six and a half years have passed since the second study, the focus of art instruction at the elementary level still tends to be on the exploration of materials, self-expression, and the making of objects for self and parents. Instruction is usually devoid of art concepts, sequence, and continuity, and art is usually taught by the classroom teacher (Lovano-Kerr, 1985). This situation is not surprising to art educators since elementary teacher preparation includes only one or two courses in art: an art appreciation course and/or an art methods course which consists of some theory and a number of "hands in projects."

At the junior high or middle school level, art instruction, which is generally provided by an art specialist, most often consists of drawing, painting, sculpture, and crafts. Instruction is relatively more broad and more structured than at the elementary level. In high school, emphasis is primarily on studio art production and design skills. At all levels, very little art history or art criticism is taught - either as individual courses or units or integrated with studio art (NAEP, 1981).

For the most part, current instruction in art continues to be media/technique and project-oriented, lagging behind theory found in the literature for the past twenty-one years dating back to Barkan's delineation of this model at the 1965 Penn State Conference which, as we know, recommends that art programs consist of an integration of art history, art studio, and art criticism. More recently, aesthetics has been added to these three disciplines. There are several socially-defined factors involved in perpetuating the media/technique approach to art education. One of the major factors is teacher education.

Most teacher education programs in art require very few courses in art history as compared with art studio; and usually no courses in aesthetics or art criticism are required. Part of this problem is the availability of such courses; another part of the problem is tradition. The most recent NAEA Guidelines for Teacher Preparation Programs in Art (Wygant, 1979), which serves as a standard for the field, suggests thirty-nine hours of studio and twelve hours to be divided between art history, aesthetics, and art criticism. Assuming three credit courses, this might consist of 2 courses in art history, 1 in aesthetics, and 1 in art criticism. These standards perpetuate the focus on art production since the standards are generally looked upon as the ideal to strive toward.

With such limited exposure to art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, it can be surmised that Western art is the primary focus of these studies. Also, with such a limited exposure, it is not possible for many art teachers and elementary classroom teachers to be knowledgeable about the cultural bases of most of the world of art. Since art is fundamentally a way of seeing, these teachers have limited perceptions. Art is an essential human process that vividly depicts human diversity. If our experience and knowledge are limited in the understanding of human diversity, our capacity to understand art is also limited.

To comprehend this diversity, and to truly see and to understand art, we must be knowledgeable about the contexts from which art works come. The history, the values, the rituals and tradition of the culture, and the social forces within the
culture at the time, provide the context for the work of art.

Another related dimension perpetuating the production focus is discussed by Patricia Clahassey in the March, 1986 issue of Art Education. Clahassey draws an interesting parallel between modernism, post-modernism, and art education practices. She defines modernism as including expressionism, formalism, and technology and science. Clahassey believes that art education embraced expressionism in the 1930's and continued in this vein until 1970. The term "self-expression" permeated the literature during this time, with an emphasis on creativity. New materials, new techniques, and the latest technology were continually sought. About 1970, instruction in the formal elements re-emerged in the literature and in the classrooms. Clahassey observes that "As formalism began to pervade the curriculum of both elementary and secondary levels those programs ran the risk of making art less meaningful for students" (1986, p.47).

Currently, postmodernism is on the art scene. Clahassey (1986) sees this movement as an expression of social concerns and the rediscovery of content, image, symbol, and metaphor. Contemporary artists, she asserts, are returning to art history for ideas and images.

Art education, likewise, is moving in the same direction through the Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) movement. DBAE consists of four disciplines: art history, art studio, art criticism, and aesthetics. Art programs based on this model are beginning to move away from the heavy or singular emphasis on self-expression and formalism and moving toward including art history and art criticism (aesthetic scanning) as early as kindergarten, and, in some instances, at the pre-school level. Teachers are finding that there are basic skills, concepts, and knowledge derived from the four content disciplines of art that can be taught sequentially, from simple to complex, continuously from preschool through twelfth grade, with scope that encompasses the world of art in all its diversity. Works of art are studied within their cultural context; questions on the nature of art are discussed; aesthetic perception and response is developed through viewing and responding to works of art. This approach provides a series of sequential, continuing experiences which develop a depth of understanding and appreciation of art not possible in previous modes of practice.

The content of the four disciplines of art, together, should yield a diversity of cultural/social contexts inclusive of cultural values, traditions, rituals and basic philosophical thought not possible in other, more limited approaches to art education. Cultural changes and intercultural transformations are more evident and better understood when viewed historically and in perspective. Cultural similarities and differences also become more evident.

The process of change, in particular, educational change, is slow. Although Clahassey discussed the movement in art education theory and practice as three discrete, consecutive stages (from self-expression, to formalism, to social expression), practice tends to lag well behind theory. A survey of art education programs at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels would probably reveal that each of the three movements is alive and well throughout the country.

More and more teacher preparation programs are beginning to respond to needed changes in theory and in practice. The Penn State Seminar on Research and Curriculum in Art Education in 1965, and the literature derived from the Seminar, have influenced programs to some extent. Some programs added courses
in art history as a requirement. Some developed courses in art criticism within the art education program. Many programs developed the three part model for art curricula - art studio, art history, and art criticism - suggested by Manuel Barkan. More recently, with the assistance and encouragement of the Getty Trust, the concept and structure of the DBAE model (Greer, 1984) has been widely disseminated in the field. The DBAE model is certain to bring even more changes at the higher education level.

The model calls for more balance and integration of the content between the four disciplines; it calls for scope and sequence in designing the program, continuous learning, content organized from simple to complex, implementation of inquiry modes specific to each discipline, and written curricula.

Instructional strategies at the higher education level would need to change to accommodate and to facilitate the discipline-based approach. The studio instructional model, so evident in the self-expression and formalistic approaches to art education is no longer sufficient. Instructional modes from art history, aesthetics, and art criticism need to be incorporated and adapted to specific populations. These instructional strategy changes are also needed for preparing elementary classroom teachers to teach art. We can no longer expect classroom teachers (or for that matter, art teachers with bachelor's degrees only) to design their own art programs. It is not possible to master the content of art with so few courses. Instead, a thorough understanding of the structure and premises of discipline-based art teaching, and the kinds of content, processes, skills, and modes of inquiry of the four disciplines would replace the current emphasis on developing a sampling of studio art techniques and skills. Developing skills for critical teachability in a real-world setting through field experiences could better prepare preservice elementary teachers for teaching art. Using discipline-based art textbooks that meet specific criteria indicating excellence in quality would insure much better art programs at the elementary level than has been traditionally provided. Classroom teachers are simply not prepared to teach art well with only three art and art methods courses.

I am very optimistic about the future of art education. This optimism is based on the premise that the field will embrace the DBAE approach; that DBAE will change the way in which we prepare the teachers to teach art; and that the schools will welcome and expand the art program because of its relevance, its quality, and its status as a discipline.
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RESPONDING TO JOHNSON, SAUNDERS, AND LOVANO-KERR

Ronald N. MacGregor

The papers presented by Johnson, Saunders, and Lovano-Kerr are varied in content, but united in the sense of originating within two linked dilemmas. The first dilemma asks whether art educators are to embrace and actively work towards incorporating one currently popular political stance into the education process, or whether we are to devise, as far as we can, a curriculum formed from a synthesis of positions. The second asked whether, in using words like "enculturation" and "social transmission," we mean "to the world of the school," or "to the world at large."

These are well-worn dilemmas. Their continuing presence is evidence of past failure to address them successfully, and of their persistence as matters frustrating to the field.

Lovano-Kerr produces data to show that the prevailing current model for art education is production-centered, and goes on to suggest that Discipline-Based Art Education (DBAE) is a vehicle that encompasses "the world of art in all its diversity. Works of art are studied within their cultural context; questions on the nature of art are discussed; aesthetic perception and response is developed through viewing and responding to works of art" (Lovano-Kerr, 1986). It is, in short, a better model, because it is multilateral.

The assumption held by the field at large about DBAE is, however, that its writers have very definite ideas on what may occur within the spirit of DBAE in the name of art, and what may not. The school district that adopts DBAE is clearly buying a set of values, and since Lovano-Kerr states that the teacher need not (in fact, should not) be responsible for program design, one assumes that the four areas of a DBAE program -- production, history, criticism, and aesthetics -- having received initial sanction from the program writers, will give their own sanction to the content of the program, to create a closed model for art education.

To take that approach will permit the teacher to do what the program requires, but is likely to exclude the teacher from the ideological controversies that have marked recent debates between the proponents of DBAE and those of different persuasions: debates that recently caused Ken Marantz to remark "There just ain't no consensus" (Marantz, 1986). Contrary to what Lovano-Kerr has written, I do not believe that DBAE will expose its clients to the world of art in all its diversity. I believe it embodies one set of values: those that result in thinking of art as a discipline.

At the same time, some of the reticence expressed in some quarters for DBAE, deriving from the notion that DBAE may drive all alternative art programs out, is misplaced. At this point, the most reasonable course would be to get to know it better, before coming to any conclusion for or against it.

Of course, it may be that those who implement curriculum at state levels will find the kind of format presented in DBAE, rooted in tidy aesthetic rather than in untidy social affairs, just what they prefer. A program where argument is formalized and where issues for discussion are clearly identified has some definite advantages for administrators. Saunders probably has these in mind when he contends...
that to neglect social consciousness may be to run counter to the general pragmatism of the American way of life, but to emphasize that social consciousness might draw the fire of those who hold to an apolitical role for art education: a group that, according to Saunders, exercises much of the clout in American art education (Saunders, 1986a, p.5).

Lovano-Kerr mentions Patricia Clahassey's article as one that offers evidence of new interest among artists in social consciousness (Clahassey, 1986). One has to remember, however, the risks of drawing parallels between what goes on among professional artists and what goes on in schools. In general terms it seems that, rather than the linear progression that Clahassey describes, there occurs a continual shifting focus upon one or another part of a spectrum of possibilities, and a selection of one group of ideas for attention from a number of options currently being practiced. That emphasis is limited to one group, rather than having a curriculum derived from a cross section of possibilities, perhaps says something about our continuing unwillingness to see the wood for the trees.

One should not even assume that the selection of one group of options is dynamic or deliberate. More likely, it is the visible part of an inertia that serves to keep traditional divisions operating long after the social circumstances that brought them into being have disappeared. Art teachers are now trained in universities, but university programs have not seriously moved to reflect the character of art as practiced today. Industrial art and commercial art are taught in isolated pockets, while architecture is presented as an adjunct to the history of art, with emphasis on the building as art object rather than as provider of services. Almost twenty years after the publication of Reyner Banham's Architecture of the Well Tempered Environment (Banham, 1969), mention of climate control systems and their effect upon building possibilities (and ultimately, upon the communities that supported them) is rarely to be found in undergraduate art education courses.

Saunders quotes William Irwin Thompson's notion that, confronted by unmanageable complexity, we should look in the opposite direction, to simple messages (Saunders, 1986b). That seems not totally useful, unless what Saunders has in mind is stepping back from the data far enough to be able to look at its elements and their relationships, and grouping them into a set of economical categories. Human beings seem, happily, capable of this sort of activity, and then of using the categories as if the underlying complexities had somehow resolved themselves.

The second dilemma, whether enculturation means school enculturation or society enculturation, has particular significance for multicultural education settings. In one city that I know, over 40% of the student body has a first language other than English. The art teacher of one of the high schools, where that city-wide ratio is duplicated, told me that most students were much more interested in becoming assimilated into the little world of the school that in waving the flag for their parent culture. When I looked through their sketchbooks, that seemed to be confirmed: their subjects were media-influenced, state-of-the-art images of Transformers (currently a big-selling item in toy stores), rock stars, and sports figures. Some of these students, arrived only recently from Vietnam and Chile, appear to have an agenda that calls for fitting into the school; other groups (for example, a number of students of Ukrainian descent) actively seek identification with the larger Ukrainian community, and use their school activities as one way to achieve
enculturation, Johnson hints at, but never quite mentions specifically, the corollary of acculturation. Life for the school age person is a recurring process of being weaned away -- or sometimes thrust away -- from the general pattern of enculturation. One cannot assume that while our ideas about educating students change, the subjects of our study remain the same. Ask any student teacher: the comment is likely to be "I've only been out of school myself for three years, but these kids are nothing like we were."

If the expectation is that students be enculturated into the closed system of the school, then the body or content around which that process occurs could well be something like DBAE. If enculturation into society at large is the goal, then courses in the economics and the sociology and the politics of art should be an essential part of teacher training. Johnson's point about the teacher being a professional informant is an important one, for it implies that the teacher first receives the message. Suppose our informants receive only part of it; worse, suppose they receive the articles and prepositions and miss some of the substantive nouns and verbs. Johnson quite rightly asks: What concepts should be taught? Where do they come from? We should also ask those questions in the context of teaching teachers.

The two dilemmas, involving the setting of values and the identification of a context for their implementation, appear to be inevitable concomitants of the educational process, and incapable of resolution. But it is possible that the dilemmas are the result of misconceiving the educational process itself. Stephen Jay Gould (1985) writes of Pierre Louis Moreau de Maupertuis, an 18th century embryologist who spent much of his time wondering where different species came from. Maupertuis' notion was that eggs and sperm might carry parts of particular organisms within themselves; modern science reveals that the answer lies in coded instructions: DNA. Maupertuis could not have visualized such a solution, says Gould, because technology had not yet provided the means to construct that kind of metaphor. For example, when Jacquard looms were built, each "instructed" by a stack of thin wooden slabs with holes cut in them; that metaphor was suddenly available.

It is impossible (to make a bad biological pun out of it) to conceive the inconceivable. The metaphor we currently use, of thinking of the educational enterprise as a society in microcosm, may not be the most appropriate. But for the moment it is the best we have, and it makes sense to give students and teachers alike the kinds of strategies they need to make the enterprise comprehensible, as well as some acquaintance with the different agendas and different constituencies involved.
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THINKING THE RIGHT STUFF: TYPES OF ACADEMIC REALITY IN ART EDUCATION

Karen A. Hamblen

The purpose of this paper is to examine types of academic reality in graduate education and how the accepted ones come to be considered as exclusionary and correct ways to understand the field of art education. It is proposed that socialization processes in graduate programs offer attractive rewards to those who become proficient in the manipulation of selected types of knowledge construction and modes of inquiry. The following aspects are discussed in terms of how they contribute toward the shaping of academic consciousness: (1) socialization procedures of graduate art education, (2) the failure of even reflexive modes of inquiry to make graduate experiences relative, and (3) assumptions shared by art educators and other New Class intellectuals (Gould, 1979). The socialization procedures of graduate art education are discussed within the framework of a social theory of knowledge distribution.

TYPES OF ACADEMIC REALITY IN ART EDUCATION

When I was a graduate student, I had several opportunities to observe candidates who came to our campus to interview for job openings in art education. Part of the interview process consisted of the candidate presenting some of his/her research, preferably with a slide presentation that kept it somewhat entertaining for us. This event was open to anyone who wished to attend; the audience primarily consisted of faculty and graduate students. After the candidate's formal presentation, s/he would answer questions. What predictably and quickly emerged from this interchange was that there seemed to be some serious wrong thinking going on at other universities. Fresh from our classes in which the latest theories, research, and art education developments had been discussed, we asked the candidates questions on particular sources, scholars, and ideas. To our satisfying surprise, candidates were often unaware of certain sources, or, even if they had read a particular book or article, they often gave interpretations that were blatantly wrong. Furtive glances, a stiffening and shifting of posture, and even perhaps a trace of horrified smugness would pass among us. The graduate students who asked intricate questions that probed the premises of a resident professor's favored ideas could be assured of looking good, even if the candidate managed to answer correctly. This was our home turf and treacherous terrain for the candidate, and it was as easy for us to make points in this environment as for the candidate to lose them.

As far as I know, there never was any formalized plan of conspiracy to put any candidate in a bad light, but candidates managed, in some measure, to commit intellectual faux pas. Besides serving to eliminate candidates obviously incompatible with the general philosophy of current faculty members, for graduate students, this informal and unplanned rite of occupational passage seemed to verify that we were being educated in the right direction and outsiders were often woefully off-track. True believers in the field of art education could be identified on the basis of what they knew and how they expressed themselves. To elaborate upon Tom Wolfe's (1984) descriptive
title, having the right stuff for the job was a matter of thinking the right stuff.

The purpose of this paper is to examine types of academic reality and how some come to be viewed as correct and others as wrong in an environment ostensibly dedicated to the promulgation of multiple viewpoints and to the examination of ideas. The discussion will be limited to graduate art education programs and how the particular characteristics of individual universities inculcate selected knowledge, assumptions, and procedures that lose their human authorship and become taken-for-granted. Integral to most socialization processes is the development of a resistance to looking at one's learned assumptions and procedures as being relative and humanly selected (Apple, 1979; Bowers, 1984). The concern in this paper is with how graduate program socialization may serve, despite its ostensible liberalizing cast, to limit the abilities of students to see their experiences as being relative in time and space. The following aspects will be discussed in terms of how they contribute toward the shaping of academic consciousness: (1) socialization procedures of graduate art education, (2) the failure and limitations of even reflexive modes of inquiry to make graduate experiences relative, and (3) assumptions shared by art educators and other New Class intellectuals (Gouldner, 1979).

Most of us who observed the candidates' interview sessions have subsequently, I am sure, learned all too well during our own job interviews at other universities that right thinking has little to do with a higher order of truth and a great deal to do with the university environment one happens to be in at the time. Yet, the patterns of thought and the procedures of investigation acquired during graduate study persist and remain a powerful influence on one's academic reality set, as basic similarities among the mature work of graduates from the same university often reveal. I am proposing that socialization processes in graduate programs offer attractive rewards to those who become proficient in the manipulation of selected types of knowledge construction and modes of investigation. Conversely, undesirable consequences have been known to befall those who fail to internalize their program's condoned assumptions and procedures of study.

**SOCIALIZATION PROCEDURES OF GRADUATE EDUCATION**

**Graduate Education as Capital**

In this paper, the socialization procedures of graduate education are discussed within the framework of a social theory of knowledge distribution. According to Gouldner (1979), in the nineteenth century the control of production and capital drastically changed from the Old Class who possessed durable goods to the New Class who possessed knowledge and information which were validated by acquiring academic credentials. This New Class consists of intellectuals and technocrats who possess concepts and skills that enable them to manipulate ideas and processes in both prescribed and new ways. In our rapidly expanding information society, abstract knowledge has become a commodity traded through educational systems which provide avenues for upward mobility. Intellectual capital provides access to incomes and the ability to exercise one's potential in a socially condoned manner.

As our stepped educational system aptly attests, membership in the New Class entails a lengthy process of learning highly socialized and specialized codes for processing information. For many occupations, graduate study is the culminating educational experience for induction into the New Class. Graduate creden-
tials are an indication of a refined understanding of the knowledge base and procedures of a given area of study. The major contradiction of the New Class is that while it wishes to extend its membership -- inasmuch as its social value is related to the size and prestige of its membership -- at the same time its capital value is dependent on maintaining exclusionary practices (Gouldner, 1979). Capital had meaning, significance, and power only to the extent it is desired and is accessible through procedures that eliminate some aspirants. If essentially anyone could easily gain access to a New Class occupation, its capital would be devalued. It is herein that selected and exclusionary types of reality emerge that acquire -- and actually require -- a commitment resulting in reification. Reification occurs when the historicity, human authorship, and relativity of an idea, value, or behavior becomes obscured (Apple, 1979; Sowers, 1984).

The New Class is composed of various knowledge bases and operating procedures for a variety of occupations and disciplines. History and ongoing developments provide each discipline with a variety of schools of thought from which to choose their intellectual bases. In other words, there are within the New Class types of knowledge and procedures more or less specific to each occupational area, and, within each area, such as art education, there is a further differentiation of selected knowledge bases.

The rather generalized child-society-subject triad of Ralph Tyler (1949) has been used to describe the focus of programs and even eras in art education (Hamblen, 1985). Efland's (1979) differentiation of aesthetic and psychological schools of thought into mimetic-behaviorist, pragmatic-cognitive, expressive-psychoanalytic, and objectivist-gestalt has been applied to curricular foci. Designations such as these provide convenient labels for describing varied and wide-ranging phenomena. Most graduate programs, however, have a much more differentiated and esoteric knowledge base that eludes such categorizations. The nature of this knowledge base and the difficulties encountered in understanding it make it desirable and give it power. Also, it is the knowledge base's relative inaccessibility that makes the socialization processes of New Class learning especially potent and long-lasting. A graduate program knowledge base cannot be learned half-heartedly. In the hectic pace and intense focus of graduate study, students must learn a range of foundational information as well as quickly figure out which research topics and methods of inquiry are preferred within their graduate program. Historical origins and relativity of knowledge and procedures are not continually probed. While taking a statistics class and working with maximum variance in factor analysis it is doubtful many graduates have learned that this procedure "arose historically with reference to a definite theory of intelligence (Thurstone's belief in independent primary mental abilities) and in opposition to another (general intelligence and hierarchy of lesser factors) buttressed by principal components" (Gould, 1981, p. 301). I am proposing that graduate programs select bases of knowledge that are in favor, that these are exclusionary, and that they become reifications due to the powerful reinforcements involved.

**Selective Distribution Within Art Education**

In art education there is a selective distribution of knowledge. Although individual programs change over time with personnel changes, they also exhibit a recognizable character based on the types of academic reality which are given
Wrong thinking. This is what we, as graduate students, readily recognize in candidates from other universities and often saw as being a matter of wrong thinking.

Particular types of inquiry can be seen in dissertations from particular universities. One might be fairly accurate in predicting that many Pennsylvania State University dissertations would have a phenomenological focus during the 1970's. During this time, the University of Oregon was represented by a number of dissertations with a sociocultural framework placed on art instructional phenomena. The University of Illinois has had a fair number of dissertations based on the empirical investigation of the psychology of responses to art; Stanford graduates have often written on the use of educational criticism as a mode of analysis. Even greater differentiation of patterning can be ascertained by looking at the dissertations produced under the guidance of particular mentors at these universities.

That types of inquiry and ultimately meaning are a matter of social conditioning and are relative to one's purpose is highly evident in who is quoted and by whom within research circles. Broudy (1985) has noted that, even when a number of scholars are dealing with a fairly narrow topic, their references will differ. For example, he found that among four scholars who compiled a reference list of fifty to ninety sources on a given topic only five sources were repeated and those sources were works by the four scholars.

There is no one particular body of knowledge required of an area of study. As our hapless candidate often found out, reference to a researcher not currently in favor was a breach of etiquette tantamount to making unseemly noises at the dinner table. In some art education programs, Lowenfeld's ideas still shape the focus and modes of inquiry. In others, mention of his name in anything other than a critical tone or because of historical necessity will cause one to lose points. The bad blood generated between Lowenfeld and Schaefer-Simmern in the 1950's is still a controversial issue on some campuses, generally falling among the lines of professors who had them as their advisors or who were, in turn, schooled by professors who worked under them. In some art education departments, Carl Jung is best considered two four-lettered words. In others, one must believe that art provides avenues to the ineffable and that art can unite all of humanity in a common vision—or one risks being labelled a positivist. Examples of who is in, who is out, who is a nobody, what sources are current, which ones are passe, how particular sources are to be interpreted, which research modes are preferred, and so on, could, with some research, be cited for each art education program in the United States.

One can reasonably argue that program differences are necessary for the vitality of any field; they provide graduate study choices, and they result in research being produced from a variety of perspectives. These benefits are not being disputed. Rather, I am proposing that due to the highly selective information and procedures in each program and due to the attractive rewards to be gained and the punishments to be avoided from adhering to the tenets of a specific program, a program's knowledge base is often not seen as relative to human selection and authorship. It becomes seen as the correct way to understand the field of art education.

Education as a Means of Socialization

In this discussion, socialization is being used interchangeably with education. Sociology of knowledge theorists suggest that knowledge...
and modes of inquiry do not exist as entities separate from human selection, interpretation, and significance (Berger & Luckman, 1966; Bowers, 1984). To participate in any educational process is to participate in learning what has been given some type of social group validation. It may mean learning to discuss the refinement of aesthetic sensibilities as the main reason for art criticism instruction and to consider only artistic exemplars as valid objects of study. Conversely, one may learn to consider art criticism as primarily an analytic tool and to believe that all artistic forms are worthy of study. In graduate study these and myriad other distinctions are learned in lectures, discussions, the writing of research papers, and so on. They become the substance of frames of thinking that will be applied to current and, more than likely, future problem-solving. Both knowledge bases and modes of inquiry become a part of what Bowers (1984) has called the deep structure of our thinking and which Apple (1979) has metaphorically located at the bottom of our brains to indicate its imbeddedness.

This is not to suggest that doctoral candidates are passive creatures, soaking up whatever is environmentally offered like some Skinnerian sponge. They do question and give their own interpretations, often vehemently disagreeing with their university professors, and after graduation may produce research very different from what was current in their graduate program. Some graduate students, however, consciously select a university based on the types of reality sets in which they wish to be educated and the professional network they wish to develop. To some extent, through this choice, they participate in constructing the knowledge base and modes of inquiry that tend to become reified as they proceed through the graduate socialization process. They are, in effect, fairly willing and eager to become expertly socialized within some selected shape of academic reality. Even among those who wish to question the process, there are powerful incentives to conform and procedures operating to minimize dissent. As one progresses through the educational system, "one becomes increasingly reticent to tamper with that system in any significant way....As one becomes more central to the system less deviation is acceptable because it has a more profound impact on the system as a whole....The institution does not select...those who will potentially do it harm by making sweeping changes. The strongest institutions accept dissenters into peripheral positions, giving these dissenters a chance to accept parts of the system, thus developing a stake in that system. Dissent is thereby dealt with through a co-opting rather than confrontational technique. (Anderson, 1985, p.22-23).

Reinforcements in Graduate Study
Among the growing research of folklorists are collected stories on the anxieties and perils of writing a dissertation in which instances of lost, misplaced, stolen, and destroyed dissertations have been related (Lipson-Walker, 1983). To this body of research could be added accounts of changed dissertation topics to fit committee members' wishes, how dissertation committees are selected, and so on. Within the oral tradition of art education, there is the perhaps apocryphal account of the professor who would lock his office door, turn out the lights, and then hide out on the fire escape to elude a persistent doctoral student. And, there are the comic-tragic accounts of students having to schedule committee meetings in the mornings because by the afternoon a professor's liquid lunch would have taken effect.
Psychologists, political pollsters, and business managers might do well to study how graduates select their doctoral committees as one of the most sophisticated, finely tuned decision-making examples in today's society. This is a high-stakes decision wherein types of academic reality of different professors encountered during graduate work must be delicately balanced and reflected in one's own work or, at the very least, not criticized. Graduate students have been pampered and given every type of assistance; they have also been terrorized by personality conflicts, innumerable dissertation rewrites, and ambiguous expectations.

In a variety of fields, there have been publicized accounts of students who have failed to finish their programs because their controversial research would cause their university to lose the support of powerful foundations or lose exchange students from a potentially offended foreign government. At some universities, individual doctoral dissertations must fit within a larger research project. Failure to work with the project can mean interminable delays in finishing the program. One is reminded of the jaded definition of a successful student as being one who knows how to adjust his/her thinking to conform to the requirements of the situation.<2>

Characteristics of Academia and Academics

That professors educate within a particular academic reality set is to be expected. Professors are in the business of professing. They are often hired for their strong, distinctive, and well-developed research in a fairly narrow area of study. As a significant other, they are formidable. They have an elaborated speech code that is not easily assailed. But again, graduate students do not enter programs to become skeptics regarding their home university program. Graduate students are poised to believe, and only with difficulty may come to admit that a formerly admired mentor has been found to have feet of clay.

Graduate students are expected to develop a finely tuned sense of skepticism regarding the work of art educators elsewhere, but if such criticism is openly directed toward their own program, they may find themselves without any mentors, let alone a friendly doctoral committee. Not only must graduate students avoid criticizing the specific work of their own professors, they also must be careful that their ideas are not too divergent from their professors' general frames of reference. For example, Lowenfeld was not known for producing a generation of art education graduates who were either critical of his work or of his views on a variety of subjects. This does not suggest they were passive, unthinking individuals, but, rather, that in selecting to study under him, they were predisposed to some extent to his viewpoint.

Doctoral students, more than many others in society, have been rewarded throughout much of their formal education for thoroughly learning information presented to them. They have often become very proficient in the business of being a student. As they have focused on a particular program of graduate study, their types of academic reality became more finely tuned and discriminatory. These types of reality take on a correctness which is questioned at the peril of lower grades, lack of support for a graduate assistantship, numerous dissertation proposal rewrites, a lingering dissertation, and, to some extent, a loss of personal stability. As in most socializing situations, it is infinitely easier to believe and conform that it is to dissent. Duplicity within a doctoral program is not easily maintained.

Doctorates are not necessarily given to the most creative peo-
ple, but more often to those who have learned to conduct themselves in such a way as to successfully make it through all the required rites of passage. A certain kind of acceptance of the status quo is required of those who would advance through the educational system - either acceptance or phenomenal cunning and patience. (Anderson, 1985, p. 24)

Ostensibly, universities are in the business of educating for critical thinking and for encompassing multiple viewpoints. Yet, one can read of professors who are not granted tenure for their political views or, perhaps, for their less than Puritan life-styles. The seriousness of thinking or doing the wrong stuff is evident in the fairly common and lingering idea-feuds between professors who have different viewpoints. Orwell's (1949) and Koestler's (1941) chilling accounts of mind control indicate that a fearful onus can be placed on making ideological errors in thought as well as in deed. In our information society, it is not just a matter of outwardly acting correctly. One's ideas--and the values and assumptions integral to those ideas--must also be properly aligned.

As Gouldner (1979) has discussed, ideas are a commodity; they are a form of capital. Capital as hard cash can be used to buy real estate; capital as ideas can be used to influence meanings, values, and actions that have few geographic restraints. Star doctoral candidates produce research that furthers their mentor's ideas much as favored children physically and emotionally resemble their parents. Starting with graduate school, a network of contacts and of mentors is built that can have important implications for future employment, editorships, consultancies, and so on (Hamblen, 1986). A community of like-minded thinking is built up around ideas, forming a subculture of occupationally related identifiable members. It is this professional subcultural component developing around ideas that provides the designations of insider and outsider and all the parochial protectionism that comes with believing that one's group is correct.

This is not to suggest that graduate faculty are intent on breaking the spirit of students or that students are isolated from divergent views. Quite the opposite is true, and this latitude, in fact, tends to give the patina of correctness to the reality set the student does finally acquire. A specious freedom of expression is implied in academia (Shaw, 1985). At any university there is a wealth of library resources, professors in other subjects areas with different views, and contacts with educators on national, state, and local levels. The academic is portrayed as being actively involved in weighing alternatives, engaging in debate, refining positions, and questioning premises. The appearance of choice is everywhere. Moreover, most professors want students to develop into independent, critical thinkers who are able to base their arguments on a wealth of ideas. Yet, such critical thinking occurs within assumptions of shared definitions of what is and what is not correct. Selected assumptions offer approaches for looking at a range of phenomena which, throughout one's graduate program, are used as part of one's argumentation, are made public, and are subject to review. Students practice defending and refining their developing reality set and devising lines of thought to repudiate and deflate criticism of their views. A lengthy series of formal and informal reinforcements and implied and real threats operate to socialize the graduate student into particular modes of thinking.
MODES OF INVESTIGATION

Within the university environment, dedicated to the presentation of multiple viewpoints, one would think that processes of investigation would mitigate against the reification of knowledge and modes of inquiry. Such is not the case. Bowers (1984) suggests that modes of inquiry such as positivism and rationalism obscure their human authorship and tend to provide their own justification. "Positivism lends its own form of legitimization to the idea that knowledge is socially neutral. Challenging positivism, particularly within the university setting, is a lonely formidable challenge indeed" (Bowers, 1984, p. 69). According to Bowers, rationally fails to "grasp the nature of reality and to take control of it from the mystifying forces of history...reason itself is shaped by the unconscious history embedded in the language through which we derive the cognitive maps that serve as the basis of the rational process" (p. 69).

Hermeneutics, phenomenology, and existentialism have often been offered as antidotes to ahistoricism and asocial positions. They are considered approaches that can make explicit the relativity of experiences and meanings throughout time and space. This paper's examination of types of academic reality in graduate study falls into this general category of reflexive inquiry. However, such an approach should not lull us into believing that some greater truth is thereby being revealed. The fallacy of self-reflexive modes of inquiry is that they also cannot escape their historicity and a selected framework of assumptions. Reflexive approaches are also subject to reification and exclusionary attitudes toward other modes of inquiry. An examination of one's own premises is a twentieth century phenomenon that is evident in a variety of New Class disciplines and is very much part of modernity (Foucault, 1970; Gouldner, 1979: Hamblen, 1983).

It is not the purpose of this paper to proffer a solution to what could easily develop into a regression of problematizing stances, i.e., an examination of one's examination ad infinitum. It is, however, being proposed that graduate programs with reflexive modes of inquiry are no more immune to a reification and parochialism of their methodology than positivism, rationalism, or whatever. Ironically, a methodology that incorporates a problematizing methodology, reflexive stance can give a sense of correctness specifically because a stable truth is not being claimed.

NEW CLASS VALUES IN ART EDUCATION

Part of the reason for the reification of varying types of academic reality that may even encompass problematizing modes of inquiry is that art education shares in the altruistic values of the New Class. Members of the New Class believe that they are the guardians and promulgators of knowledge that is necessary for individual and societal well-being (Gouldner, 1979). Their motives and actions are embedded in the democratic and humanistic principles of equality, honesty, and caring. The rhetoric of art education literature would have one believe "that there is not a mean bone in art education's collective body" (Hamblen, 1986, p.102). It is easy to assume a correctness of knowledge and mode of inquiry when one's ideas and actions are focused toward aesthetic enlightenment, social understanding, individual awareness, improving the quality of life, and so on.

New Class intellectuals are not merely content to act. They are also actively involved in examining their own acts. There is the implication that such self-reflexion will eliminate bias. When involved in what is socially defined as a worthy cause,
it is easy to forget that one is making selections from a range of possibilities and that one's own shape of consciousness is also part of the examining consciousness. One only need be in a class where a self-reflexive model of inquiry is mandatory to see that there can also be a dictatorship of compulsory openness and benevolence. The failure to examine types of reality in art education as a function of relative socialization processes is, in part, a function of sharing in the New Class belief that methodologies based on good intentions equate with right thinking.

SUMMARY

Most research in art education has been applied to education at the elementary and secondary levels, with little interest focused on the assumptions and life world circumstances of those who carry out such research and who formulate policy. Attention needs to be directed to the socialization processes to which art educators are subject and the implications of those processes.

This paper has dealt with an examination of how graduate students in art education learn types of academic reality based on the select-ed knowledge bases and modes of inquiry particular to their university's program. These knowledge bases and modes of inquiry take on a reified correctness and lose their historicity and human authorship due to the rigorous socialization process and the reward system of graduate education. New Class members' belief that they are engaged in improving the conditions of society and are acting without self-interest also obscures the selection process and relativity of individual knowledge bases.

In this paper, no solution is offered to eliminate the parochialism and exclusionary attitudes that develop around types of reality in art education. A social theory of knowledge distribution has been deemed applicable in this instance to examine the circumstances of art education graduate study. This author agrees with Donmoyer's (1984) belief that research approaches need to be evaluated, not on an apriori set of criteria, but on the basis of the purposes and meanings relative to one's intent. In other words, thinking the right stuff can be mostly a matter of deciding what one wishes to accomplish.
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2 After a particularly grueling series of statistic assignments, my education professor jokingly remarked that individuals with doctorates are in high demand, not because of what they know, but because they do whatever the task demands.
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FOLK ART IN ART EDUCATION: TOWARD A GENERAL THEORY OF ART AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

James Noble Stewart

Art may be understood by considering it as a social institution in which particular artifacts are presented as candidates for appreciation. This institution includes the domains of production, distribution, and consumption, all of which are regulated according to rules and standards relating to both art objects and behavioral roles for those people involved. In the paradigm case all participants in the institution are of the same cultural group. This is important for art educators to understand because of the diversity of cultures represented in the classroom. Because a person's greatest opportunity for meaningful involvement in the arts comes from within his or her native culture, art education which is excessively tied to the fine arts represents a form of cultural imperialism which alienates most students as potential participants in the arts.

Introduction
This paper is intended to outline (1) the importance of social theory in art for art education, (2) a unified conception of art which defines all art as the products of a genre of social institution in which artifacts are produced, distributed, and consumed within a particular folk group, and (3) some implications for art education of this position. The social institution being defined is necessarily tied to a single cultural group and is further defined by (1) a set of rules regulating the domains of production, distribution, and consumption of art objects, and (2) a set of role expectations for the individuals involved in the institution.

A relationship between art and society is recognized in art education literature. Art's impact on people is considered (Feldman, 1970), its function in various aspects of other cultural and social activities is considered (Chapman, 1978) and it is considered as a communication system (McFee and Degge, 1977). Although he does not take issue with these writings Bersson (1986) contends that art education still lacks social relevance. An assumption in this paper is that the lack of social relevance in the art education literature is due to an inadequate theoretical base within which to organize the many social phenomena discussed. In order to clarify the relationship of art, society, and education this study is focused on how art emerges in a culture and the implication this has for education.

The Importance of a Social Theory

The artist is not a person with a particular complex of personality traits, but one who, within a culture, is acknowledged to be an artist (or its equivalent) by other members of the same culture. To paraphrase what Worsley (1968) has said of charismatic leaders, (1) artists can only be identified in social context, (2) artists only have in common a certain relationship to a group of other people, and (3) artists from one group may be met with indifference in other groups or at other times. Being an artist is not a quality of the person per se, but a phenomenon of the relationship of an individual to a constituency.

An example of one recognized as an artist in her community would be Almeda Riddle of Herber Springs, Arkansas, a singer of Ozark ballads (Abrahams, 1970). She is a woman...
passionately concerned with the arts but with no apparent interest in the fine arts. She is concerned and knowledgeable about matters of expression, style, performance context, critical standards, metacriticism, and the philosophy of the Ozark ballad. This raises two questions. First, how can her sophisticated reception be reconciled with a body of aesthetic theory which ignores, or patronizingly romanticizes her art? Second, how can we even be sure that art exists in other cultures in Light of Merriam's (1964) putative proof that it does not exist in certain tribes which are acknowledged to have songs which are generally considered in other contexts to be art?

No work of art can be either identified or evaluated without reference to its broader cultural position. It is hazardous even to classify a particular object (ballad or painting) as art without knowing first what other things are considered art in the culture in which it was made. Art may be defined in terms of a class of objects, therefore, if it is first known that either (1) there is a recognized class of objects which are considered art works, or (2) that a social institution exists which is analogous to that through which we produce such a class of objects. In the first case such a class of objects implies a social institution through which members of the class are produced. In the second case it will further be necessary to determine what objects are produced through this institution regardless of whether or not they are categorized as a class of objects known as art.

A social theory approaches art as the manifestation of genre of institution. It is not intended to supply a definition in terms amenable to a particular political agenda, as it often is in Marxist literature such as, for example, in Vasquez (1965). To posit a social theory which overemphasizes revolution (Ruz, 1980) or class struggle (Hadjinicolaou, 1974) is to ignore the intra-group (intra-clas) or esoteric (Jansen, 1965) nature of art. Neither is a social theory simply a populist attack on artistic standards of judgment, as Smith (1983) has suggested. A social theory of art should guide the researcher to focus on the mechanisms through which art arises in a culture.

Although art is a social phenomenon, the individual is by no means unimportant. Mukarovsky (1964) suggests that a continuum may be drawn between the individual aesthetic and the structured aesthetic. The individual aesthetic is related to what one person may find pleasing, as in the fortuitous combination of paint splashes on a wall. The structured aesthetic defines the genres of art, as in the structure of poetry as it is understood in a particular time and place. All works of art fit some point between the extremes of the continuum. While the individual aesthetic is an important psychological phenomenon, it is the structured aesthetic which defines a work of art as such in a socio-cultural context.

A Social Theory of Art

The minimum information required in order to state that art exists in any culture is the presence of a particular genre of socio-cultural interactions among people. This requires an etic (Pike, 1954) point of view, that is, one which stands outside of any one culture. The emic (Pike, 1954), or intracultural, point of view of art may seem irrelevant to an outside observer. The Abela people of New Guinea, for example, have criteria for good art which have to do with traditional correctness and magical efficacy (Forge, 1971). This may indeed be irrelevant to art in general while remaining a valid frame of reference for those familiar with it. Similarly, the history of
Western aesthetics shows the development of an emic philosophy. From a folklorist's perspective it is incorrect to generalize from one emic conception or to apply that conception to another group (Pelto and Pelto, 1978). From this it follows that Western aesthetics is an inappropriate base from which to develop a generalizable concept of art which would be applicable to other peoples. It has the function of a theory of art to account for the phenomenon despite the variety of emic forms it may take.  

The Locus of Art in Culture  
An emic theory may, for example, associate art with something like expression, but one is then faced with the problem of locating that expression in the art object, the viewer or elsewhere. To locate it in the art objects themselves leads to formalism as in the work of Bell (1913). To locate it in the reaction of the perceiver leads willy nilly to making art a matter of personal psychology as in Collingwood's (1938) discussion of expression as a personal imperative.  

In ethnographic terms all that is in art is located within the complex of shared ideas which are called culture. Culture, in this sense, is a non-evaluative term which has been defined in at least eleven ways (Gould and Kolb, 1964). These definitions have in common the concept of a sharing among members of a group. A list of cultural phenomena would include stories, dances, rites, festivities, ideas, beliefs, legends, language, ways of eating and sleeping, and so on. Like a personal opinion, the unstructured aesthetic may be little influenced by culture, but, like the wisdom of a proverb, the structured aesthetic is a shared construct. The sadness (or other expression) in a painting is to be found in such shared ideas.  

Art and the Folk Group  
Groups of people may be variously described. Alan Dundes (1980) defines a folk group as, "...Any group of people whatsoever [sic] who share at least one common factor" (p.6). The folk group is, as Ben-Amos (1979) suggests, a small group as compared to the complex interlocking groupings in a society such as that of the United States. The common factor of the small group may be language, religion, occupation, or an interest in art. To define all art in terms of the culture of the folk group implies that to the extent that a particular group has developed some esoteric lore which it considers its own, it may be a cultural unit or sub-unit within, but distinguishable from, the broader society.  

Definitions of art have turned upon a variety of attributes of works, all assumed to be manifested in the object. The difficulty of such definition caused Wittgenstein (1979) to suggest that a group of objects may be conceptualized as a set without having any one thing in common. They may exhibit a family of resemblances. Mandelbaum (1979) suggested that all works of art may have in common some non-manifest attributes. George Dickie (1974) took this suggestion seriously and offered a definition of art in which all works are (1) artifacts (2) some aspects of which have had conferred upon them the status of candidates for appreciation (3) by persons acting on behalf of a social institution. This definition has been developed in various ways some of which may be found in the work of Aagaard-Morgensen (1976).  

Appreciation is prominent in this theory because it implies some affective responses to works of art. Surely art works are valued, in large part, because of the appreciation which we have for them. This response is the fuel which drives the processes of production, distribution and consumption of art. The process could be described, as it is by...
Peckham (1978), as one in which art works are considered, "...occasions for a human being to perform the art-perceiving role in the artistic situation" (p.97). Perception seems, however, to be a fairly neutral act and while it may be a necessary part of the role of the person to whom an art work is offered, appreciation, in the sense of an evaluative response, is the presumed goal of the perception.

What is necessary for an institution of the kind under discussion is a relationship among individuals of a cultural group such that some produce art works, other present the works (although the presenter may be also the producer), and others appreciate them. There are, thus, three domains in the institution which are identified by the Mexican philosopher Acha (1984) as: (1) production, (2) distribution, and (3) consumption. In the ideal case different members of the same folk group fill each of the three roles. If the process involves persons from different folk groups there is less relevant shared culture and therefore appreciation is less likely to occur.

There are rules or standards governing the art institution. Although adherence to standards and strict genre expectations are common in many artistic traditions the existence of rules does not condemn the entire process to simple mechanistic adherence to formulae. To understand the rules, consider the proper functioning of the institution. When all goes well and a valid art work is produced, offered, and appreciated, the process may be considered "felicitous" (Austin, 1965). The rules for the felicitous production of art (regardless of its quality) may be derived by paraphrasing Austin's rules for felicitous verbal acts such as marrying: (1) there must be an accepted social procedure for the production of artifacts and for their being offered for appreciation; (2) the persons and circumstances for offering for appreciation must be appropriate, that is, not just anything may be offered by anyone at any time, there are particular persons and situations involved; (3) the procedure must be followed correctly; and (4) the procedure must be executed completely. An infelicitous example of an art work might be a hammer left on a pedestal by a gallery operator who had not intended it to be considered a sculpture, but which was taken as such by a visitor. The particular rules would vary from group to group and from genre to genre of object, but the particular rules will all be related to these four general principles.

Clearly, what we are seeking in this theoretical orientation is a useful common description of all art which will guide research and instruction. It is specifically proposed, therefore, that distinctions such as those made by Acha (1984) among artizenry (las artesanas), fine arts (las artes cultas), and design (el diseno) be disregarded until such time as specific rules can be formulated for particular varieties of the art institution. The paradigm of art should be drawn from folk art rather than the fine arts because the folk cultural experience is more basic than that of artworld as defined by Danto (1964), which has as its principle constituency those with an interest in the arts. From this point of view, the fine arts in the galleries of New York or Chicago would be a folk art for the members of the artworld, which is, in turn, defined as those involved in art. This reflexive character of the artworld in no way bars it from consideration as a folk group in its own right. Its various claims to uniqueness are emic cultural elements, the simple ethnocentricity commonly found in primitive culture. Broudy's (1964) insistence, for example, that there are experts who are qualified to make judgments about
what is good art carries no weight whatsoever outside the artworld if, as he seems to imply, these experts are a definable group of Western artists and critics enculturated into the fine art tradition who apply what they have learned among their own folk to the rest of the world. We could equally select as experts the elders of the Tiv in Africa. After Bohannan had told them the story of Hamlet they informed her that she had made a few mistakes and that sometime they would instruct her in story telling so that she could return to her own people and show them that she has, "...not been sitting in the bush, but among those who know things and have taught you wisdom" (1982).

Art Education

The implication for art education is that what one has to learn to participate in the arts has to do with the various role models in the domains of production, distribution and consumption. These may be partly learned through participation in a folk group, but even in primitive societies we find that art must be taught. According to Hart (1974), the education of young children in primitive societies is generally concerned with practical matters of making a living and getting along, but adolescent or adult education -- particularly in initiation rites and other formal schooling -- is concerned with cultural subjects including philosophy, art, and music. To assert that all art is folk art is not, therefore, to assert that everyone will learn without instruction, but to focus on the relationship of art with particular cultural contexts.

From a folklorist's perspective fundamental learning in the arts would, in part, consist of (1) learning about production of particular types of things which are valued by a folk group (particularly the student's), rather than things which are only made in schools, i.e. "school art" (Efland, 1976); (2) learning about such things as how art works are distributed, to whom, by who, and for what reasons; and (3) learning about the appreciation of art works including how they are evaluated in our culture and in others. This last area of learning would probably be the largest because the domain of consumption is the one in which students will be most extensively involved. The distribution of art may, however, be of particular interest because as Acha (1984) suggests, that is the arena in which the dialectic between the interests of the producers and consumers is played out. It is also the domain in which the intervention of monetary concerns can influence, even determine, the judgment of the nominal experts.

The critical implication of the point of view outlined here is that a person can most fully be involved in the arts in his or her own folk group, in which the greatest cultural sharing takes place. Appropriate education would enable students to learn more about their own cultural inheritance and make them aware of other cultures through learning about the kinds of social interactions involved in the art institution. To speak of other cultures, however, is not to speak of broad groupings like American, black, working class, or urban. A person may participate in many cultures. Catholic culture is different from protestant, male from female, right wing from left. Three general statements should be made about the implications of such a social theory for art education.

First, to focus exclusively on the fine arts is to represent a form of cultural imperialism in the schools, ignoring the fact that students come with rich traditions of their own. The fine arts represent a form of art which pertains to a particular constituency of people. To present it as the only correct concern of all who have an artistic interest is to imply that this folk
group is the only one to which all people should aspire. In its extreme form this elitist position claims that art is a rare thing with which few people come into contact and that the bulk of the art work available to the common person is inferior and unworthy of attention. This suggests that a teacher in a remote town should tell students, "You will probably never see real art unless you go to New York. You will never own real art and will not become real artists. You will probably never really understand art. Now, let's begin our study of art." That teacher could hope for little more than to make aesthetic peasants of the students, watching what happens in New York so that imitations of products and attitudes can be made.

Secondly, a teacher who wishes to teach successfully should become involved in the student's community. Community involvement would lead to an understanding of the culture of the students. This is an important implication because community involvement may not be perceived as important for teachers. A study by Crow and Crow (1951) indicated that interest in community was ranked as least important of 40 teacher traits by both high school seniors and college seniors. Teachers, in other words, are not thought of as having an interest in the community, but as rather as agents (Cartwright, 1965) of their subject field.

Finally, if the fine arts are only comprehended and appreciated by an elite few then they are irrelevant to the lives of the children except for those who either are brought up in the artworld folk group or aspire to membership in it. The habitual mystification of the arts found in Western aesthetics, if accepted, simply puts them out of the range of serious consideration for education in the schools. The fact that members of the artworld become engrossed in contemplating a painting might only indicate (to the students) that they were involved in the art "...as a plumber might be engrossed by the technical aspects of a bathroom" (Mencken, 1949, p.551).

This analysis suggests that any fundamental unity found in the arts is in the fact that they are all based on analogous social institutions in which art works are produced, presented, and appreciated according to rules of the institution and role expectation for various persons involved in it. It also suggests that, as Glassie (1983) found in Ballymenone, Northern Ireland, people have rich and complex aesthetic lives which they discuss if one learns to listen properly. Because art is a common part of life, the curriculum in art should deal with these roles and rules in order to increase the sophistication of the students as participants in any aspect of the arts in which they may become involved.
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SUE WILLIAMSON:
THE ARTIST'S STRUGGLE TOWARD
FREEDOM IN SOUTH AFRICA

Betty LaDuke

I first learned of Sue Williamson through an exhibit of her photo silk-screen prints, A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS, sponsored by On the Wall Gallery in Medford, Oregon, in November, 1985. Combining visual and verbal elements, Williamson's seventeen portraits focused on black and white women and their ongoing, historical struggle against political injustice as experienced by South Africa's predominant black population. In February, 1986, I had the opportunity to interview Sue Williamson in New York City and learn how her personal development as an artist became linked with the expression of her political views, resulting in A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS. The portrait series forms a powerful aesthetic and educational statement that has now been seen by audiences in South Africa, the United States and Europe.

Sue Williamson's development as an artist-activist is linked with her identity as a white South African engaged in the struggle against apartheid. Her vision of a just society, based upon the free movement and interaction of all peoples within a nation and their right to equal political representation, evolved during the five years she spent in the United States in the 1960's. When she returned to South Africa, she found it hard to accept how separate the two races were.

What is most extraordinary about Sue Williamson is that she forged her vision and subsequent political experiences into an artistic statement that has a significant impact upon black and white South Africans and now within the international community. In a personal interview Sue Williamson told me she believes "Art can certainly create the kind of awareness in people that is a necessary precondition to change. That is why most artists are a critical part of any society, particularly one like South Africa."

Using faces of women to tell an aspect of the story of the history of the struggle for liberation in South Africa, Williamson has created an ongoing series of poster-size portraits entitled A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS. These portraits are the faces of women who married, raised children and carried on the struggle for freedom in obscurity, or occasionally in the international spotlight, as Winnie Mandela did.

I first saw an exhibit of A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS in On the Wall Gallery in Medford, Oregon, in 1985, and a short time later fortunately had the opportunity to meet with Sue Williamson in New York City, thanks to the efforts of two American photographers, Susan Lloyd and Catherine Allport.

These photographers each met Sue on their separate journeys to Cape Town, South Africa, where they also saw her work at Cape Town's Gallery International. Subsequently Susan Lloyd arranged for the exhibit, A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS, to be brought to the United States, while Catherine Allport invited Williamson to speak on "Apartheid, South Africa: The Role of Art in the Struggle for Liberation," at a panel for the Women's Caucus for Art in conjunction with the College Art Association annual meeting in New York in 1986.

When I finally met Williamson at this conference, we took time to go together to a nearby cafeteria where we could quietly talk. Still fatigued from the long plane journey...
and the intense pace of her activities just hours before her departure from South Africa, she was nevertheless willing to share with me some of the life and death events of the past ten years that encompassed her development as an artist, her work with the Women's Movement for Peace, and her family. I soon became aware that a key to understanding Sue Williamson was her calmly spoken statement: "You must face very freely that you can be jailed at any time. Otherwise, you would become so paralyzed that you don't do anything. I'm not prepared to let that fear dominate my life." During our ongoing conversation for the conference duration, I developed respect for Williamson, not only aesthetically, but in her outspoken personal commitment to justice.

Williamson was born in England in 1941. She moved with her parents to South Africa in 1948, where her father worked for a construction company in Johannesburg. Throughout high school her professional goal was to be a newspaper reporter. After high school graduation Williamson took a secretarial course, and then obtained a job as assistant secretary to a news editor on a major newspaper. At that time, women were generally hired only as social event reporters, and, though Williamson's job included verification of the news reporters' stories, the newspaper management would not let her advance to that position.

Williamson told me that she was always interested in art, but it was not until 1964 when she married and went to New York City with her husband that she pursued this interest. Her husband was a management consultant while she worked for an advertising agency. Then one day, "after a friend took me to an exhibit of Sumi-e style water color paintings, my study of art began." She first enrolled in a Sumi-e class. "At that stage my ambition was no more complicated than doing Christmas cards." But soon Williamson began to study seriously, at the Art Students League, drawing with John Groth, painting with Thomas Fogarty, and etching with Seong Moy. From that time on Williamson began to carry a sketchbook with her wherever she went.

In 1969 Sue Williamson, her husband, and her year old daughter returned to South Africa, where she continued her studies in a Cape Town art school. In 1973 she had her first exhibit consisting mostly of landscape etchings. However, by this time Williamson had joined the Women's Movement for Peace (WMP), and her life and art were soon to merge and undergo dramatic changes. She says that the WMP is "based on the simple idea that if women refused to be bound by apartheid, they could form friendships across color lines. I came to know the black townships as well as I know the white suburbs." The focus of the WMP, an interracial group, was not only to witness the government's genocidal policies towards blacks but to try to stop these destructive activities peacefully, by educating the South African public, as well as the world, as to what was happening.

Williamson describes a typical incident that took place, in 1968, at Modderdam, a squatter camp three miles out of Cape Town: "The government claimed that people had no right to be on the land and they must move as the government was going to knock the camp down. The day the demolitions were supposed to start, we went out there to try to stop the bulldozers. We stood in the road waiting for them to come, while we formed a human chain across the road. They were there, but they did not start up. But by three o'clock in the afternoon most of the mothers had to leave to pick up their kids from school, and then the bulldozers promptly moved into action. [It
was disappointing to realize] that we
couldn't organize on a scale to stop
them. It was too much of a last-min-
ute effort on our part."

But Williamson remained at
Modderdam over the next seven days
with her sketchbook and recorded the
demolition of houses being knocked
down and people being tear-gassed. In seven days 2,000
homes were demolished. In response
to this experience she created a
series of etchings depicting the
demolition of houses being knocked
down and people being tear-gassed. Underneath each image were phrases
sarcastically representative of the
government's point of view: "They
shouldn't be there anyway," and that
praised the government for "cleaning
it all up." One etching was repro-
duced as a postcard and printed
commercially.

Several hundred of the postcards
were then sent all over the country
and overseas to draw the attention of
the world to these events. Within a
week Williamson's postcard had been
banned. The South African Publica-
tions Control Board told her, "While
the postcard is not without artistic
merit, it must be pointed out that it
does not give an accurate image of
the situation. Your postcard is a
tool in the hands of the enemies of
South Africa."

Williamson believes her postcard
was banned because it embarrassed the
government. It was not illegal. The
government policy states that "you
may criticize but not incite or make
plans for illegal action."

According to Williamson, "With
Modderdam down, the government turned
its attention to Crossroads, another
and far larger, banned squatter
community that existed a short
distance from the Cape Town Airport.
Crossroads had become too high and in
the end the people of Crossroads and
their supporters had won."

During this period of intense
political activity Williamson did
almost no art work, but gained an
incredible first-hand knowledge of
the women and the issues for A FEW
SOUTH AFRICANS, which she started
developing in 1983. However, as a
result of her activities, Williamson
began to receive nightly phone calls
and death threats: "You'll get a
petrol bomb through your window, you
dirty Commie bitch!" She says,
matter of factly, "Unpleasant phone
calls are a feature of South African
life. They can't be considered
jokes. The ex-husband of the previ-
ous WMP chairperson was gunned down
by unknown assailants before the eyes
of his children. His wife could no
longer take it, and for her chil-
dren's sake she left the country."

When a Cape Town city councilor
who was a friend of Williamson's
confronted the police about the
threatening phone calls, these calls
finally ceased. Needless to say, all
this was upsetting to Williamson and
her family. As Williamson's activi-
ties increased both as an artist and
an activist, her three children (now
aged 12, 16, and 18) sometimes
wondered, "Why aren't you a boring
normal mother like those my friend
have."

Williamson was not satisfied
with her early attempts to express
her feelings through her art during
this difficult period. She admits,
"My images were just not strong
enough." She felt the need for
further study and enrolled at the
Michaelis School of Fine Art. "I had

launched an intensive campaign to
save Crossroads. There were slide
shows, photo exhibitions, public
meetings, petitions, and events
staged in the community to which
influential people were invited. The
confrontation at Crossroads was
reported in papers around the world.
The political cost of knocking down
Crossroads had become too high and in
the end the people of Crossroads and
their supporters had won."
a wonderful tutor, Jules van der Vyfer, and he gave me the confidence to attempt larger, technically more complex prints that I had ever done before," says Williamson. The works produced for the Advanced Diploma (for which she received a distinction) were the first nine prints of the series, A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS. These prints are 22 by 30 inches in size and combine the techniques of photo etching and silk screen printing.

This ongoing project represents a synthesis of Williamson's skills as an artist and a writer. Accompanying these images are Williamson's personal interviews with the woman portrayed, condensed to a concisely written statement and placed beside each of their portraits. The photo-etched portraits in the center of each print are amplified by a larger symbolically decorated designed border, inspired by pictures that Williamson frequently saw in black homes. These black images consisted of "family snapshots, any kind of certificate or award, religious mottos or reliquiae and were framed elaborately to amplify their importance. Sometimes gift wrap cut into bright patterns was collaged onto the frames."

Figure 1

ANNIE SILINGA
Sometimes while Williamson was working on an image, she would receive a call to go to Crossroads because the police were tear-gassing or shooting. "There I am, working on an image, and the real thing is happening!" She also recalls the occasions when she had gone to Crossroads to observe a police action and it began to rain. "A woman, whose own house was under threat, went inside and brought out a blue pillow-case for me, the only thing she had to offer me to put on my head to protect me from the rain. You can't imagine how kind these people are!" Williamson in her soft voice that reflects pride in both her art and political activities relates, "Working on A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS series has been a very moving experience for me. The strength of the women in the face of oppression gives one real hope for the future of South Africa." She also described people's reaction to her work when it was exhibited in Cape Town. "The feeling of the women is that I've taken their history out of the closet and put it on the walls for everyone to see. It was touching to me to see the response of black women." Williamson also described the responses of white women, who "sometimes stood there, literally crying. They were feeling deprived, that this whole thing had been going on in South Africa and they hadn't been aware of it, because that's what apartheid does, it cuts people off from each other."

The print of Annie Sillinga, who took a lifelong decision never to carry an identification pass (Fig.1), shows her seated and enclosed by a narrow red frame and then by a wider, purple-striped border that contains two South African policemen standing guard on either side of her. The accompanying statement reads in part: "I will carry a pass the day the Prime Minister's wife carries a pass," Annie Silinga declared publicly during the Defiance Campaign in 1952. And to the day she died in June, 1984, she never did.

For her steadfast refusal to submit to the indignity of a pass, Annie was constantly harassed and arrested and was one of the accused in the 1956 Treason Trial. But even when old and poor and carrying a pass would have enabled her to receive a pension, she refused.

Her steadfastness in the face of oppression directed her life.

In another print, a tall, pyramidal figure of a mother with a child in her arms and another beside her as she surveys the devastation is titled Case No. 6831/21--from Crossroads Squatter Camp (Fig.2). On the left of this mother are smaller collaged images of the clustered camp shacks with women and their laundry, while the right side shows the back of the police as they destroy the shacks, smashing and scattering the few belongings of the people. The warm tones of this brown photo portrait are bordered with a pale orange edge forming a center arch. The wider beige border extending around the portrait contains brown linear drawings of adobe and thatch huts of Transkei or their distant tribal lands.

The accompanying statement reads:

Case No. 6831/21. Nameless, for she is but one of thousands like her, 'Case No. 683121' has appeared several times in the Langa Courts for being illegally in the area.

Born in the Transkei, she came to Cape Town some eleven years ago to be with her husband, a contract worker on a construction site.

In those years she has lived in many places, but in 1977 she moved, the shack was demolished and for most of this year she had
been a "bed person," living with her family in the open. Flimsy shelters of sticks and plastic erected over the beds against the bitter Cape winter have been continually destroyed and confiscated by officials in regular raids. Twice this year she has been arrested and had to appear in the Langa courts... 'Case No. 6831/21' on charges of being illegally in the area. But returning to Transkei is not an option. There is no work there. No medical attention for the children. And she would see her husband only once a year, when he is between contracts. So she remains in Cape Town, strong and determined. Her will to survive is matched only by her capacity for endurance.

Some of Williamson's portraits are of white women like Helen Joseph, "the mother of the struggle," shown
sitting in her home with her hands folded and with a determined facial expression.

Now over 80, Helen Jones still travels the country, attracting huge audiences to hear her speak out against apartheid.

Over 40 years ago she became secretary of the newly formed Federation of South African Women and was one of the leaders of the 20,000 women who marched to Pretoria, protesting against the carrying of passes by African women. In 1962 she became the first person to be put under house arrest in South Africa—a restriction which lasted ten years.

Perhaps the only woman who is known internationally from A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS is Winnie Mandela (Fig. 3), "the symbol of resistance." She is shown in three-quarter view with a scarf-covered head and calm eyes. In a brief quotation from the biographical statement, Williamson says:

Since 1977 she has been banished to the small, dusty Afrikaner dorp of Brandfort in the Orange Free State, where she lives in House No. 802 in the treeless location outside town.
Perpetual harassment has extended even to the confiscation of a bedspread in the colours of the African National Congress, and a conviction on a charge of contravening her banning orders, when she called at a neighbour's house regarding a chicken.

But nothing has been able to crush the indomitable Winnie Mandela or prevent her from speaking out fearlessly when she has been able to.

When I asked Williamson about her studio or work space, she told me that her studio consists of an old Cape Town house that was cooperatively bought with two other people. "We have an etching and litho press and facilities for silk screening. Approximately eight other artists can rent this space and equipment."

Williamson is proud that A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS has been purchased for the Oppenheimer Library in Johannesburg and the Durban Art Gallery. Three of the prints from this series are also part of TRIBUTORIES, an exhibition of South African art in West Germany.

Some of her current work includes silk screen projects such as Freedom Charter T-Shirts, "A Pillow for the President," and a section of a very long protest banner. "Gallery art is important, but I also like making art in more accessible forms," says Williamson. Thus, she has had postcards made of eight of her prints, posters of three, and last year she designed a T-shirt which featured the historic Freedom Charter of South Africa, a document recently revived after 30 years of being banned. This famous document, drawn up at the Klipton gathering of the Congress of the People in 1955, lists the basic human rights that should be guaranteed to all regardless of race:

The People Shall Govern; All National Groups Shall Have Equal Rights; The Land Shall Be Shared Among Those Who Work It; All Shall Be Equal Before the Law;

All Shall Enjoy Human Rights;
There Shall Be Work and Security;
There Shall Be Houses, Security and Comfort; The Doors of Learning and Culture Shall Be Opened; and There Shall Be Peace and Friendship.

Making such T-shirts can be a risky business. Williamson describes a recent incident that occurred during a Saturday flea market in Cape Town in which a third-year art student was selling T-shirts containing the slogan, "Liberation for Education." Since the police can arrest anyone they consider subversive, this student was "arrested, thrown into jail where a noose was put around his neck and he was told he was going to be hanged." It took a lawyer a week to get him released. Therefore, Williamson was also worried about her 16-year-old son when he was selling her brightly designed Freedom Charter T-shirts at a similar flea market, but she is very glad that "so far he has not been arrested."

During her New York Women's Caucus for Art presentation, (1986), Williamson questioned the dilemma and motives of the white artist working in South African society. "And for the white artist, may he be sure that if he does produce socio-political art, his motives are pure? Steve Biko, the great black consciousness leader who died in detention, said: "How many white people fighting for their version of change in South Africa are really motivated by a genuine concern and not by guilt?"

Williamson continued to raise other, more significant issues:

"And what of the black artist from his disadvantaged position in our society? He has had no art training in school, and in fact the white-directed school curriculum had discredited his culture. For him to choose art as a way of life requires an especially loving commitment to his craft. If the white artists
cannot survive by art alone in a philistine society, how much harder is it for the black artist?"

The Women's Caucus for Art audience was stunned by many of Williamson's personal experiences that reflect the art historian Ernst Fischer's (1959) position that: "The artist has the responsibility to arouse and stimulate understanding, to emphasize social responsibility." Williamson then added: "And if he or she takes this position, a position critical of the ugly face of apartheid, may he expect the Security Police at his door at 5 A.M. one morning? Please rest assured, the Security Police monitor cultural activities in the broadest sense. In fact, if the South African Embassy is doing its job, there will be someone in the audience here today monitoring what I am saying." Williamson concluded her talk with the statement: "Though it would be naive to believe that artistic protest in itself, no matter how effective the art, will bring about immediate social change, the artist does and will always have a crucial and indispensable role to play in any society. This is the vision that can bring about new perceptions, and the climate of awareness that is a necessary precondition for change."

I decided to ask Williamson what she would really like to do and also express in her art if South Africa ever became liberated, and she smilingly answered: "South Africa is a most amazing and beautiful country. If I could do what I wanted, I might go live in the bush somewhere, or to Botswana and do animal research. I love that life." Unfortunately, in the near future there seems to be little likelihood of Williamson's dreams being fulfilled.

Williamson plans to return to South Africa and continue with her series, A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS, as well as with collective projects such as the protest banner. This project was initiated late last year by an anti-apartheid group in Johannesburg and is being coordinated by the prestigious Goodman Gallery. Artists from all over South Africa were asked to visually portray their deepest feelings of what they would like to see for South Africa. The banner is to be a strip, 24 inches wide, but indefinite in length as the artists can make their sections as long as they desire. The final protest banner is to be used in some significant way, maybe to wrap a government building. Using the silk screens Williamson made earlier for her Freedom Charter T-shirts, she printed a four-foot length with the words 'Freedom Charter' and all the clauses in many different colors. "I wanted to produce the effect of a brilliantly coloured, happy South Africa which we might have if the provisions of the Freedom Charter could be realised," Williamson says. She completed her section the day before she left for the United States.

While in the United States, Williamson not only attended the conference but also shared her experiences with students at several college campuses, as the struggle against the inhuman conditions of apartheid has become part of an international movement for justice. Williamson is also pleased that A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS is now a traveling art exhibit which will be seen throughout the Northwest of the United States, sponsored by Visual Art Resources of the Museum of Art, in Eugene, Oregon. An excellent summation of A FEW SOUTH AFRICANS appeared in Women Artists News (1986) by the Oregon-based artist and writer, Corinne Tee. "The words that came to mind looking at these prints are: inspiring, superb, accomplished, mature, fully realized. Williamson, in her seamless blending of appropriate form and heart-wrenching content, has created an art that is both informing as well as enforcing, meaning an art that can form (change) people's lives" (p.2).
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All quotes by Sue Williamson are, unless otherwise noted, from a personal interview with the author in New York City, on February 11 and 12, 1986.

Betty LaDuke is a professor of art at Southern Oregon State College, Ashland, Oregon.
HISTORICALLY-BASED PERSPECTIVES

SOCIAL FACTORS IN NINETEENTH CENTURY ART EDUCATION:
A COMPARISON BETWEEN NOVA SCOTIA'S PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Donald Soucy

The social context of 19th century art education in Nova Scotia is explored, with comparisons made between the art curricula found in the Province's public and private schools. The social context of art education in Nova Scotia is also compared to Efland's (1985) interpretation of art education in 19th century Boston. It is shown how social factors affected not only access to education but also the type of art education a student received.

Efland's (1985) study of 19th century art education in Boston discusses how gender and social class were important factors in determining curriculum trends. According to Efland:

- Common school art with its emphasis upon practical application and industry was frequently promoted by such upper class men as Mann and Boston industrialists .... One can characterize this as masculine art education. Feminine art education, by contrast, tended to promote the teaching of art as high culture. This occurred in private schools for women, infiltrating the public common schools as these individuals assumed roles as teachers (p.40).

Efland particularly avoids claiming that his findings on art education in Boston provide interpretations applicable to all of North America. Such a claim would obviously require analysis of historical data from other centres. The aim of this paper is to provide some of that data by examining the development of art education in the schools of 19th century Nova Scotia. Access to education is discussed in the paper's first section. This is followed by a comparison of teaching methods used in private and public school art programs. The social implications of these programs are examined, with comparisons made between the social contexts of art education in Nova Scotia and Boston.

Education for All Who Could Afford It

Private schools were prevalent in 19th century Nova Scotia despite the numerous legislative acts which attempted to establish a uniform public education system. The reasons for this were many. Some people rejected all public funding for schools, others supported education subsidies only for the poor. There were also many communities which could not or would not comply with the requirements of the provincial school acts, such as constructing a school house. Even where a school house was provided, many well-to-do parents balked at sending their children to a common school with a limited curriculum taught by an itinerant schoolmaster of questionable competence. They preferred to leave such schooling for the poor, while their sons and daughters secured what was hoped to be a better education in the private schools.

Operators of private schools catered to this hope. In a typical advertisement a Milton, Nova Scotia schoolmaster assured all those with
high cultural aspirations that their daughters would receive a "course of study [which] is equal to that of first-class schools in England and on the Continent" ("Padfield's Seminary," 1875). Many other private schools made similar claims, but only some of the schools actually lived up to these standards. Other schools were allowed by the unregulated system to offer a program which was often less than mediocre.

Fees at the schools were generally based on the program chosen by the student. For example, at the Establishment for Young Ladies in Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, a program restricted to the 3-r's cost three pounds per annum, while an expanded program cost twice that. Over and above this basic fee was an annual charge of three pounds each for French, drawing, or music ("Miss Tupper's," 1847). Even in the missionary schools, which were usually run by the Anglican Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and which usually focussed on reading and religion, tuition in extra subjects such as geography, Latin, or navigation could often be purchased by those who could afford it.

It is evident, then, that the benefits derived from a colonial schooling generally increased in proportion to one's wealth. An ability to pay high fees did not guarantee quality schooling, but the inability to pay often meant no schooling at all. The colonial government did, however, take some steps to increase accessibility. Land grants had been given to schoolmasters since 1749, and financial grants were first offered with the School Act of 1808. Yet, immediately prior to the Free school Act of 1864, only 40% of the province's children between the ages of 5 and 15 attended school on a regular basis. Furthermore, 43% of these school-age children could not read, while 58% of them could not write ("1861 Census, 1866).

While instruction in the 3-R's was far from universal in mid-19th century Nova Scotia, there was at least a general consensus that such instruction was appropriate for all social classes. A similar consensus did not yet exist in regard to instruction in art. Drawing and painting were still generally perceived as leisure pastimes reserved for privileged classes and therefore appropriate for private schools only. This perception, however, gradually began to change in the second half of the century. In 1865 only 15 public school students in Nova Scotia were reported to be taking drawing, which was even fewer than the 22 students listed as taking cricket. By the following year, 3,734 students, about 5% of the public school population, took drawing, and that percentage increased to 10 within the next few years. It remained at about 10% until Nova Scotia implemented Walter Smith's industrial drawing program in the 1880's, which was eventually taught to 46% of the province's students (Annual Report, 1866-1887). This growth in public school art was partially brought about by changing notions of art's role in training and mollifying the working class. These notions helped establish social objectives for public school art which differed markedly from objectives for art programs in private schools.

Private School Art

While even a rudimentary education was out of reach of many working class Nova Scotians in the first half of the 19th century, a private school education for the more well-to-do was usually not without some instruction in so-called ornamental accomplishments and elegant recreations such as drawing, painting, decorative crafts, music, and dance. This was especially true for females aspiring to be cultured ladies. A typical private female school, such as the one opened in Halifax in 1830 by Mrs. Crosskill...
and Miss Sturmy, offered not only the 3-R's, but also drawing, fancy and plain needle work, and painting, including velvet painting ("Female School," 1830).

One of the better known private school drawing instructors was Maria Morris, who began teaching at her mother's Halifax school for young ladies and later opened a school of her own. An 1834 advertisement for the Morris School reveals 19th century attitudes towards "ornamental accomplishments" and "useful acquirements":

The Misses Morris beg leave to observe that their unremitting exertions shall be to counteract those tendencies in female education that too often enfeeble the judgement; and while their endeavors shall be directed to ensure proficiency in ornamental accomplishments, their utmost efforts will be studiously directed to the advancement of their pupils in solid information and useful acquirements; and in whatever can be considered valuable to the female character. (Drawing and Day School," 1833, p.285)

Morris probably used teaching methods practiced by her first art instructor, W.H. Jones. Originally from Boston, Jones conducted a Halifax art class for about forty pupils, mostly from the upper ranks of society (Piers, 1914). Like other Nova Scotian drawing masters, Jones apparently assigned works for his students to reproduce faithfully ("Exhibition of Pictures," 1830). In addition to using this copying method, Morris' own studio work would also have influenced her art teaching. Morris was a published botanical illustrator. This work required her to render directly from wild flowers, and she presumably would have taught her students to also draw and paint from closely observed nature.

In Morris' work a factual reproduction of the referent constituted the finished piece. Carter (1983) suggests that another Halifax art instructor, William H. Eagar, required his students to use their sketches from nature simply as studies. These would be brought back to the studio where they would provide the basis for a picturesque composition. In order for his students to acquire the graphic vocabulary associated with the picturesque, Eagar had them copy works of other painters along with examples of his own engravings.

Eagar taught adults, not children. Like Jones, his students usually came from the more fashionable sectors of society (Sparling, 1980). But teaching methods similar to those used by Eager and Jones would have filtered down into the private schools. Many other Nova Scotian drawing masters also taught their adult students with these methods. Some of these students who, like Morris, were instructors in private schools, would teach their own students in the same manner they themselves had been taught. A number of private school drawing programs could be expected to have emphasized drawing from nature and copying art works, with the main purpose being to produce pretty pictures. This was not to be the purpose of art in the public schools.

**Public School Versus Private School Art**

In contrast to private schools, there was no room for polite, artistic pursuits in government-funded and charity schools of the early 19th century. In these schools, only practical aspects of art and handwork were considered appropriate, and again there was social stratification. For example, some charity schools provided indigent youths with training in a potentially income producing craft. Students who were better off economically could pay a supplementary fee for instruction in
map drawing or geometric drawing, skills which could possibly lead to more lucrative careers than those available to their indigent classmates.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that education is the fine arts was not the exclusive domain of private schools, nor were the practical arts found only in common schools. For example, Efland (1985) cites William Bentley Fowle as being one of Boston's early proponents of practical, geometric drawing. Yet Fowle's drawing system appears to have been used in at least one Halifax private school for young ladies ("Boarding School," 1831). Conversely, the fine arts being advocated for the province's common schools by prominent mid-century educators. The most consistent of these educators was Alexander Forrester, the first principal of Nova Scotia's Normal School and the province's second Superintendent of Education. Forrester (1867) believed that the common school program should include painting and drawing from nature, three dimensional construction, and art appreciation. Although this was similar to the content of private school art programs, the objectives were different. Whereas private school art was to prepare the privileged for participation in a refined, upper class milieu, Forrester's common school art was to prepare the masses for duteous participation in society.

Forrester promoted William Bartholomew's drawing books, which included exercises in representational drawing as opposed to the geometric drawing found in other school texts. Bartholomew, a painter who taught drawing in the Boston Girl's High and Normal Schools, had his drawing texts distributed in a number of North American centres. According to Efland (1985), a principal reason why Bartholomew's non-geometric drawing was accepted in the public schools was that "Young women preparing to teach needed to be ladies of high moral character. Accomplishment in art and music was often taken as evidence that a high standard of moral refinement was met" (p.139).

It was also for moral reasons that Forrester, a Protestant minister, espoused the need for art and aesthetic education. But while Efland posits that such education was aimed mostly at women, Forrester (1867) wanted fine art taught to both sexes. Art, Forrester claimed, would induce the masses to rise above "the low, the degrading and grovelling pursuits of the animal" (p.171) to seek a higher moral purpose. This would occur because in looking for the source of aesthetic beauty "we have only to trace the various steps in the process, until we can get no further, and then assign all to the omnipotent Creator" (p.172). Because of the purported role in inculcating morality, art and aesthetic education were needed for all social classes, not just those who could afford private schooling. Fine art, therefore, belonged in the common schools, where educators like Forrester hoped it would "exert a powerful tendency in elevating the whole refinement of the generation" (p.226).

The generation which Forrester wanted to refine was growing up in an increasingly industrialized era. Partially because of this industrialization, the moral objectives for art education began to be supplemented by economic ones. In Boston in the 1870's and Nova Scotia in the 1880's, Bartholomew's fine art program gave way to the industrial drawing of Walter Smith. In both places, members of the educational hierarchy advocated industrial drawing for its utility. As Smith told a Truro, Nova Scotia audience in 1882, his program of art education could play an important role in Canada's industrial development (Annual Report, 1882).

Despite this perceived role for industrial drawing, by the end of the
century public school art in both Boston and Nova Scotia had moved again toward the fine arts. Moral education was again a central objective of the general education agenda. This objective is especially evident in picture study materials for the younger grades, but it also appears throughout the curriculum. For example, New Brunswick Normal School students in the late 1880's were told that a reason for teaching about colours was that "they appeal to the childrens [sic] sense of beauty e.g. they have a moral value in cultivating correct tastes" (Evans, ca. 1887-88, p.136). Similarly, history was to be taught through biographical sketches whose subjects were "selected with the special reference to bringing out prominently strong points of moral character. In this way the history lesson will serve as a means of giving moral instruction" (p.61).

Stankiewicz (1984) and Efland (1985) conclude that a reason for the swing from an economically rationalized industrial drawing program to a fine arts program with moral overtones was the large influx of women into the teaching ranks. When this influx did take place, it did not, however, change the male domination of educational management. This may explain why the supposedly male industrial drawing program was adopted in the 1870's and 1880's even though, as Efland notes, "women in increasing numbers [had already] entered the teaching profession" by the 1860's (p.133). It must also be remembered that male educators, many of whom, like Forrester, had strong religious affiliations, regarded public schools as agencies of moral transmission even before the influx of female teachers. Furthermore, there were other male influences of the late 19th century school fine art program, such as the romantic critics (Soucy & Webb, 1986, April; Stankiewicz, 1984) and art education entrepreneurs such as Louis Prang (Korzenik,1985). These facts suggest that the feminization of education can provide only a partial explanation of how private school art infiltrated the public schools.

Conclusion

Events in 19th century Nova Scotia support many of the interpretations drawn by Efland concerning art education in Boston. A desire for upward social mobility was a principal reason for fine arts in the private schools. It was especially important for females to acquire skills in polite, cultural pursuits. In the common schools, however, the introduction of art was only justifiable if it could be seen as serving the needs of all social classes. Thus, fine arts appeared first in the private schools, where students copied works of more accomplished artists and learned to sketch from nature. In contrast, only practical and applied arts were allowed in government-funded schools prior to the mid-century. When the entry of fine arts did occur in the common schools, it was not to elevate the social status of working class students. Rather, one of its main objectives was to inculcate them with Christian morality. Increased feminization of the teaching profession also helps to explain the growth of fine arts in the public schools, but other influential factors still need to be explored.

These distinctions between public and private school art are, of course, generalized. Nevertheless, they do make it clear that Efland (1985) was correct in calling for an examination of the ways in which gender and social class "have played a role in influencing how art was taught and for which reasons" (p. 140). Perhaps such historical examinations may even provide insights into the social class contexts of today's art education. Indeed, history, which provides the luxury of hindsight and emotional distance from an event, may for some educators...
reveal the class nature of curriculum
more easily that would a study of
contemporary contexts.
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THE SOCIOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF HENRY SCHAEFER-SIMMERN'S THEORY AND RESEARCH LEADING TOWARD AN INTEGRAL THEORY OF ART EDUCATION

Roy E. Abrahamson

Henry Schaefer-Simmern was fully aware of the sociological implications of his work. His theory of visual, artistic conceiving stated that people possess an inherent ability to transform their perceptions into holistic (gestalt) formations expressed as works of art. They have this ability in varying degrees regardless of differences of sex, race, chronological age (above the motor scribble age), IQ (above 47), socio-economic status, creed, and geographic location. He believed that society should encourage the development and expression of this ability and that those of its members who are artistically active (whether children, adolescents, or adults) can uplift and transform society for the better. He saw the dehumanizing affects of industrialization. He deplored the visual pollution which appears in portions of cities and towns in the U.S.A. Yet he noted the efforts made to bring visual art into communities by such means as the WPA Art Project, and efforts of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Extension Service. He guided students to be aware not only of the gestalt art forming ability within them, but also of the arts of societies past and present.

Schaefer-Simmern's art education includes the handicapped and non-handicapped in the schools, and also people throughout the community. He reconciled opposites in art education: creative self-expression and cognitive-systems (neo-academic) while going beyond them to point a way toward an integral art education for society and for each individual member of that society.

Henry Schaefer-Simmern, the noted late art educator and researcher, believed in the existence of an inherent artistic ability in which people's perceptions of their visible environment are transformed into gestalt formations and expressed as works of art, no matter how simple or complex those works may be. He hypothesized that most people possess this inherent ability regardless of race, sex, chronological age, IQ (above 47), creed, socio-economic status, geographic location, or time.

Schaefer-Simmern addressed people of all walks of life and his art education extended beyond the traditional classroom. As discussed in his book, The Unfolding of Artistic Activity (1948), he worked with the handicapped, the incarcerated, refugees, unemployed workers, and professional people. Also, he worked extensively with children and adolescents (1966, pp. 47-68), and his Institute of Art Education in Berkeley, California, also provided classes for art teachers, artists, and layman adults. His ideas and accomplishments had appeal for people of varying personalities, psychological conditions, physiological systems, and sociological backgrounds and attitudes.

John Dewey (1948) wrote in his forward to Schaefer-Simmern's book (1948):

Escape from the one-sidedness which attends many philosophies of sense, of reason, of bodily or physical action, of emotion, and of doing and making, distinguishes the work reported upon the following pages. In their place there is constant observation of the wholeness of life and personality in which activity becomes artistic (p.x).
Gestalt Formation

Schaefer-Simmern's approach to art education was not an atomistic one concerned with isolated parts or meanings. He was aware of the potential role of art in society, and he referred in admiring terms to the WPA Art Project, art interests within the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the art classes of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, a New York Physicians' Art Club, an American Physicians' Art Club in San Francisco, and various business people's art clubs. He also commended the art encouraged in rural America by the Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. He was interested in such efforts for he believed that they were essential to offset the dehumanization caused by industrialization. He wrote about industrialization of the 1800's and later, and of the unemployment of the 1920's and early 1930's: "Never did the need for defending human worth seem so imperative as in those days of indignity and degradation" (1948, p.4).

Schaefer-Simmern's approach was a gestalt approach to human nature, art, and society. Contrary to criticism (Wilson, 1985, pp. 90-91) classifying him as a romantic, a developmentalist, and a universalist, Schaefer-Simmern was beyond these classifications insofar as the last two imply an exclusive concern for inborn traits or predetermined natural laws. For he believed that social and cultural influences and values as well as inherent gestalt forming abilities influenced the quality of the artistic structure of works of art. However, the inherent gestalt forming ability in individuals was seen as of fundamental importance for the achievement of artworks of high quality. He was a developmentalist, a universalist, and a believer in social values and cultural influences. His ideas and works cannot be subsumed within an extreme, polar position.

To Schaefer-Simmern, a "gestalt formation" (a concept taken from gestalt psychology), is a holistic structure in art, in which each part is interfunctionally related to every other part and to the whole. His research indicated that even young children, beyond the disorganized scribble stage, express simple gestalt formations (also called by him "artistic forms"), which develop in increasing complexity with age and continued artistic activity. The formations evolve according to definite stages of unfolding. Referring to the gestalt formations in young children's art, Schaefer-Simmern wrote in his book, The Unfolding of Artistic activity (1948, p.9), "This unified structure, simple though it is, may be recognized as the 'seed' of the artistic [gestalt] form."

Since the ability to transform perceptions into gestalt formations is inherent, Schaefer-Simmern believed that the role of the art teacher is not to impose rules and methods of achieving gestalt formations upon student, but rather to lead them to discover their own gestalt formations. Through teacher guided self-evaluations of their art products, the students gradually are able to express and elaborate formerly suppressed gestalt formations. Young children, however, do not have a problem of uncovering suppressed formations as these formations have not as yet been blocked by teachers and parents who do not understand the artistic process in general, let alone the process of visual, gestalt form consciousness as defined by Schaefer-Simmern.

Schaefer-Simmern's Sociological Concerns

assumptions that Schaefer-Simmern had ignored cultural influences upon historical art. In regard to Schaefer-Simmern's hypothesis that artistic, gestalt forms exist in historic and prehistoric art, Gardner wrote that Schaefer-Simmern did not state that all art of the past contains gestalt, artistic forms. Because he chose only selected examples as verification does not belie his point. Nor did Schaefer-Simmern deny social and cultural influences on gestalt forms. He stated in unmistakable terms, "The unfolding of artistic activity cannot be separated from the nature of Man; it must grow out of him as a unified process. The essence of his being should determine its course. Only then will it become a force in the upbuilding of a world that is adequate to his nature." (1948, p.7).

The "nature of man" meant to Schaefer-Simmern an artistically endowed human being whose nature includes his fellow beings in a society and culture. However, as the above quotation indicates, the essence of a human being, that is, his or her innermost aspect of personality, can and should exert itself through creative, artistic activity to change society (the world) for the better. Therefore, more than the matter of a balance of the artist's personal side and social influences upon that side is involved. It is rather a matter of the individual and groups of individuals transforming the society in which they live.

Tom Anderson, (1985) in his article, "Toward a Socially Defined Studio Curriculum," nicely presented the two extreme philosophical positions in his explication of a socially-defined curriculum (pp. 16-18). The individual creative position in art education is represented in Anderson's article by the creative self-expression of the Progressive Education Movement. He referred to the other extreme position of social influences upon artistic education and production as the "philosophy of Walter Smith," with its stress upon accuracy of representation and copy work. The creative self-expression view of the Progressive Education Movement fits the Rousiaun, development of, and universalist philosophical position attacked by Wilson (1985). However, Anderson, unlike Wilson, sought to reconcile these two extreme positions. Still, in advocating a third position called a socially defined approach, Anderson thought that accuracy of representation and copy work (stressed by Smith) is acceptable because these activities help students to learn of their heritage (inheritance) and help them gain skills to be used in creative self-expression.

It is an interesting attempt at reconciliation and Anderson should be given credit for it. However, from Schaefer-Simmern's standpoint, there is a flaw in such justification of concern for accurate realism and the practice of copying the art of others.

Schaefer-Simmern pointed out not only in his book (1948), but in his teachings and lectures that reproductive memory work and copying are conceptual thinking exercises that do not develop the inherently endowed gestalt forming art ability which he believed is so important to develop. One achieves a gestalt art forming ability not by reading books on how to compose pictures; not by being taught rules, formulas, or methods in schools; and not by copying art or reproducing live models, still lifes, or other objects from single limited viewpoints. Instead, one needs to be attuned (or reattuned) to one's own inborn sense for holistic (gestalt) relationships within visual, artistic form of the basic art elements and subject contents (1948, pp. 197-199). Surely, the student learns of other people's art ideas and styles, their materials and processes, by copying
their art. We human beings learn from each other and imitation is part of the general learning process. However, if such copying from society is done to the detriment of the individual's own ideas and style, his or her own sense for gestalt, unified art form relationships, and his or her expression of personal artistic understanding, then such a teaching practice becomes highly questionable.

Young children are attuned to their inherent gestalt art forming abilities on a simple level, but often lose touch with these abilities because either no art education is given in the schools, or the approaches to teaching art do not take such artistic forming abilities into account. Yet, consciousness for artistic form can be regained if teachers know how to guide their students back to a sense of attunement with themselves. From Schaefer-Simmern's position, it is not enough to accept Walter Smith's viewpoint as presented by Anderson (1985) and to try to wed it with creative self-expression.

A far better melding would result if the socially imposed art lessons to be joined to the creative self-expressions of a student were designed according to his or her stage of art development and level of visual understanding. A still better joining or synthesis would take place if the socialized art teachings were designed and introduced according to each student's own stage of gestalt artistic form conceptions, artistic cognitions, and perceptual awareness. These should not be confused with abstract, conceptual cognition.

Neither the conceptual, academic approach nor the creative self-expression approach include, according to my knowledge, recognition of an inherent artistic gestalt forming ability in human beings. What good is it to follow an old academic approach and cause students to become confused by styles and forms foreign to their conceptions of the world and imposed on them by their teachers? What is the value of accepting such a limited philosophy of art and society which stresses dependence on external order instead of one's own meaningful sense for visual unity of artistic form? Are there other social values that far outweigh either Wilson's, Gardner's, or Smith's values? I would say that a meaningful socially defined curriculum involving studio experiences would reconcile and transcend the opposite approaches of individual creative self-expression and social conditioning by achieving an innovative rather than an eclectic third way. That is, thesis and antithesis would be reconciled and transcended to achieve a synthesis or integral philosophy and approach.

Certainly there is a transaction that takes place between the individual and his or her culture. The artistic person creates according to a consciousness for artistic form and may, at the same time, respond to a prevailing artistic style within the culture. Yet, the gestalt form instinct or ability is paramount in each artistically active person, no matter how highly controlled or uniform the societal style. S/he may absorb that style and "fuse" or integrate it with his/her own style and stage of artistic conceiving.

Individuals are influenced in a variety of ways, and in relation to artistic activities, the varying degrees range from complete interference with creative art formations to complete encouragement of same. Schaefer-Simmern tried to offset those social influences that blocked the expression of students' artistic, gestalt conceptions. He influenced his students through an indirect questioning strategy. In this way, he helped them to become attuned to their own inherent endowed artistic forming abilities. Schaefer-Simmern provided an example for bringing about the delicate balance between individual artistic form conscious-
ness and social or cultural conditioning. He did not advocate letting students do as they please with creative self-expressions. Rather, he subscribed to the notion of meaningful social influences being used and transformed by people who are artistically active. The concepts developed by art students will then be fused with their consciousness for artistic form. It should be evident that in no way is there any benign neglect for society advocated here.

A Kinship Approach to Our Art Heritage

As students in Schaefer-Simmern's art classes attained new levels of artistic form realization, he would show them reproductions of art works from the history of art which were similar to their own in the organization of lines, shapes, spaces, and so on. Thus, new discoveries of form were reinforced. Students could relate to the art works shown to them individually and they gained deeper understanding and appreciation of those works. Thus, they gained in two ways: (1) reinforcement in their own forming processes, and (2) understanding of the larger artistic heritage. I relate to this experience personally. While studying at Schaefer-Simmern's Institute of Art Education in Berkeley, California, I began to paint large outlined human figures filled in with flat colors. When I was shown reproductions of Romanesque paintings of human figures, I was stunned. The forms were quite similar. I gained confidence in my new art and an appreciation and respect for Romanesque art.

Later, I saw a nine year old boy in Schaefer-Simmern's children's class draw a fine bird. Schaefer-Simmern showed him a slide reproduction of an ancient Egyptian tomb fresco from 2500 BC with birds in an acacia tree. The boy liked it very much, but then he criticized part of it by saying, "That bird looks like it has a branch growing out of its head!" Sure enough, there was an area where the ancient artist had not solved the overlapping of a bird over the end of a branch. Therefore, the end of the branch was isolated from the rest of the branch and it created an illusion of coming out of the top of the bird's head! Here was a nine year old boy in Berkeley, California, criticizing, with justification, one portion of a tomb painting from ancient Egypt. How many children are so guided to develop their gestalt art forming abilities enough to see such things in the art of the past? Not many, I fear. Until art teachers are prepared to look at art works carefully and to make gestalt judgments, we cannot expect their students to be guided to do so.

Through the teaching procedure just described, Schaefer-Simmern instilled in his students a deep visual comprehension of certain art works from societies of the past and also from modern societies. He showed art works from many periods and places. Readers are referred to the case of Miss E. in Schaefer-Simmern's book, The Unfolding of Artistic Activity, (1948). She discovered form solutions similar to her own in certain paintings from the Italian Renaissance. As was the case with students in all of Schaefer-Simmern's classes, such historical works of art were seen after form discoveries were made in students' art and not seen before hand and imitated.

Society and An Integral Art Education

Henry Schaefer-Simmern appreciated the efforts within the United States to foster interest in creative visual art. The Nazis in his homeland encouraged a kind of German romantic realism that glorified the so-called "Aryan Race." Thus, he could see clearly and appreciate efforts toward a freer artistic expression here. Nevertheless, he
was disturbed by the disharmony or lack of unified form of the typical Main Street, USA, with buildings of vastly different sizes and styles set side by side, advertising signs of many colors plastered here and there along the business streets, weeds and trash in public places, and slum housing and junk piles in poorer sections of towns and cities. He abhorred such visual pollution, but he was appreciative of well designed shopping centers, parks, apartment complexes, and civic centers. When he saw a well designed area, he would exclaim, "That makes sense!"

Society is a highly complex organization in the United States, with many layers and facets to it. As visits to schools and communities across the nation reveal, the art that is displayed shows everything from the tracing of adult prescribed images and copies of comic strip characters to creative self-expressions. We can see detailed realistic works with or without organization. We can see works made with obvious skill. However, I have seen few art works of junior high and senior high students that show artistic gestalt formations. Young children's art works do show simple levels of gestalt form, and some older children's art contains it.

Expressing oneself without some centering gestalt is emission and not expression in the best sense of the term. I recall a painting instructor at a midwest university who told Schaefer-Simmern and others at a faculty party, "We live in a chaotic age, and therefore, we must paint chaotically." To that, Schaefer-Simmern replied, "That is as absurd as saying, 'My house is on fire! Quickly, let us put more fire on it!'" Creative self-expression may be organized or it may be chaotic or degrees in between. Dewey wrote in his book, Art as Experience, (1958), "What is sometimes called an act of self-expression might better be termed one of self-exposure; it discloses character - or lack of character - to others. In itself, it is only a spewing forth." (p.62). However, there are certain kinds of self-expressions that would fit Dewey's definition of experience as a unity or gestalt formation, (1958, p.37). Yet, we need not be so impressed by all statements that are called creative self-expressions for they can be very shallow and a mere "spewing forth" as is stated in the quotation above.

The opposites of creative self-expression, on the one hand, and academic art instruction with its prescribed formulas and concepts, on the other hand, do not offer students much because both philosophies and teaching approaches fail to include awareness of the inherent gestalt art forming ability identified by Gustaf Britsch, (4th ed., 1966), Egon Kornmann (1962), and Henry Schaefer-Simmern (1948) and its stages of unfolding and development in people.

Reconciliation and Going Beyond Opposites

Art does not merely reflect society. It has the potential to transform and uplift society. The dichotomy between creative self-expression in art and socially defined and imposed teaching about arts cognitive as well as studio modes can be resolved and transcended. An integral art education with a philosophy that contains these seemingly opposite views and yet goes beyond their limitations can be achieved. Anderson (1985) caught a glimpse of such an art education. Henry Schaefer-Simmern gave us the ground work for it. An integral art education would take creative self-expression higher to a level of creative self-disciplined expression governed by one's own inherent gestalt art forming ability which the research of Britsch, Kornmann, and Schaefer-Simmern made known. Art instruction in society would go beyond the revival of old academic, conceptual
practices of single viewpoint seeing, reproducing images, and copying old and new masters' works and styles to concept development based on each student's own visual conceptions and stage of gestalt form development.

At the end of his book, *The Unfolding of Artistic Activity,* Schaefer-Simmern wrote:

Art education that recognizes artistic activity as a general attribute of human nature and that aims at the unfolding and development of man's latent creative abilities will then contribute its share to the great task which faces all of us, the resurrection of a humanized world (1948, p.201).

An integral art education cannot ignore either the individual student's creative, gestalt forming ability, or the society in which s/he lives. The student needs to be met on his or her level, but should be challenged to go beyond that level in artistic cognition and in conceptual, abstract cognition. Society initially should be accepted for what it is, yet seen as a complex organization in need of betterment. One instrument for this betterment may be art.
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Footnotes

1 "Consciousness for artistic form": awareness and understanding of organized artistic, created structures of basic art elements and subject contents in art works.

2 "Integral": a synthesis containing opposite viewpoints and yet transcending their limitations, while at the same time having a unique and dynamic standpoint.
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DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION AT THE BARNES FOUNDATION

Margaret Hess Johnson

Through the foundation that bears his name, Albert C. Barnes put into practice John Dewey's notions of education, democracy, and scientific method. A description of the egalitarian and empirical aspects of the institution known as The Barnes Foundation confirms the instrumental function of art for education. The Barnes Foundation served as a learning laboratory rather than as a museum of art; in this manner works of art served an instrumental function through indicating Deweyan theory about democracy and education.

The Borderline Between Art and Education at The Barnes Foundation

There is a fine line distinguishing art and education at The Barnes Foundation in Merion, Pennsylvania. The Foundation defines itself not as a museum but as an educational institution. Even today it is easier to view this extraordinary collection of art as a student than as a public spectator. When Dr. Albert C. Barnes established his Foundation in 1922 he designated it an institution concerned with education in art. But is took nearly forty years of litigation, first by The Philadelphia Inquirer, later by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to open the Foundation doors to limited public viewing.

Today one hundred people with reservations, and one hundred without, are granted admittance to The Barnes Foundation every weekend excepting the months of July and August when the gallery is closed. Upon registering at the gate and paying a one dollar fee, visitors may view the collection, half the gallery at a time, without guides, or catalogues, or even labels for the works of art.

But Barnes' collection is well worth seeing, for the art, and for the education. It includes two hundred Cezannes, nearly a hundred Matisses, over sixty Matisses and forty Picassos, all nearly impossible to find in reproduction. In the gallery, the works offer a wide survey of the artists' development. In addition, the gallery presents a range of art objects from antique to modern, and folk to fine.

The press and some biographers (Chanin, 1961; Harris, 1982; Schack, 1960) have often emphasized difficulties encountered with gaining admittance to the Foundation, with dealing with Barnes, and with the contents of the gallery itself. However, the borderline between art and education remains the focus of The Barnes Foundation: the instrumental value of art to education is intrinsic.

Barnes' art collection was instrumental to a realization of John Dewey's philosophical ideas about the science of the social and art as education. An historical description of the egalitarian and empirical aspects of the institution confirms this.

Art as Experience, Dewey, and Barnes

Albert Barnes established The Barnes Foundation in 1922, "to promote the advancement of education and the appreciation of the fine arts" (article II of the By-Laws of The Barnes Foundation, in Cantor, 1974, p.173). Barnes appointed John Dewey to its staff as Director of Education and endowed the Foundation with ten million dollars. A photograph of Dewey hangs in The Barnes Foundation office; it is inscribed, "To The Barnes Foundation which puts into practice my beliefs and hopes..."
for democracy and education."

Dewey attributed the presence of the paintings and other objects of art at The Barnes Foundation as one factor in the development of his aesthetic philosophy. When Dewey dedicated Art as Experience to "Albert C. Barnes, in gratitude" for their conversations "in the presence of the unrivaled collection of pictures he has assembled," Dewey noted, "The influence of these conversations, together with that of his book, has been a chief factor in shaping my own thinking about the philosophy of esthetics." (Dewey, 1934/1980, p. viii)

Albert Coombs Barnes (1872-1951) lived in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He shared an interest in art with high school classmates John Sloan and William Glackens. But Barnes became a chemist, not an artist. After attending medical school Barnes studied in Germany. There he met Hermann Hille, a chemist with whom he collaborated and later developed the patent medicine Argyrol.<3> When Barnes' Argyrol factory began to prosper in Philadelphia, he resumed his earlier interest in painting. But one day, realizing his own work was without merit, Barnes burned all 190 of his paintings (Schack, 1960).

Argyro made Barnes a millionaire while he was still in his thirties (Harris, 1982). In 1905 he built the house where the Foundation later was to be, on Latches Lanes, in Merion, just west of Philadelphia. That year too Barnes bought a small Italian landscape by Corot (Harris, 1982), and added to his collection by buying from conservative Philadelphia and New York galleries (Schack, 1960).

When Barnes renewed his friendship with Glackens some five years later, he was influenced to begin collecting modern art. In 1912, Barnes sent Glackens to Paris with $20,000 to buy works by Renoir, Cezanne, and other French artists (Schack, 1960). Barnes became a self-taught collector and critic; and, in an educational experiment begun in Argyrol factory, Barnes put into practice the social and scientific aspects of John Dewey's philosophy of democracy and education.

EGALITARIAN ASPECTS
The Educational Experiment: The Factory as Educational Laboratory

Although the Foundation opened in 1924, the start of the educational experiment with the Argyrol factory workers began a number of years earlier. It often happened that some of Barnes' employees got into trouble with the police. To solve the consequent problem of employee turnover, Barnes became personally interested in his workers' out-of-factory concerns. He attributed his worker's personal difficulties to the fact that their earlier education had been negligible, and he determined to rectify the situation.

So from the beginning the art in the Barnes Collection was used for educational purposes. The initial educational experiment emphasized discussions of psychology using William James' Principles of Psychology (1890). With the publication of Dewey's Democracy and Education (1916), Barnes was inspired to broaden the course of study to matters of economic and personal interest to his workers. Discussions included social conditions and evolution, topics taken from Bertrand Russell's Why Men Fight (1917) and H.G. Wells' Outline of History (1920). In addition, the environment was enhanced by original works of art. Barnes spoke of the origins of visual arts in his educational experiment as follows:

We always had pictures in the building. One fellow came to me one time with drawings of some of our pictures. And all the boys were excited. His name was
Theodore. We had half a dozen Negros around. I said, "What do you think of that thing of Theodore's?" I think it was very credible [sic]. I didn't want to give him any false opinion. I said, "Theodore, that is a good copy of what you have there, but what is the use of copying? I would not want to copy someone else. Why don't you do something of your own?" They got interested in pictures, and they studied them. (Barnes, in Cantor, 1974, pp. 81-82).

One of Barnes' assistants at the factory, Mary Mullen, planned the educational programs and led the discussions. She wrote of the lunch-time seminars:

At first the discussion was dominated rather by feeling than intelligence: imagination constantly tended to encroach upon the sphere of reflection. The leader of the group did not repress feeling and imagination but analyzed them when they intruded in the wrong place ... Thanks to the keenness of their interest, and to their powers of picturesque expression, the discussion retained a color, a vividness, and intensity which visitors to the class, men who occupy chairs in colleges and universities, declared to be a welcome contrast to the dullness and perfunctoriness characteristically found in the ordinary academic classroom. (Mullen, in Schack, 1960, p. 99).

Violet de Mazia provided more details about the educational experiment in her essay "An Experiment in Educational Method at The Barnes Foundation" (1942). The essay is included in Art in Education: A Collection of Essays published by The Barnes Foundation (1954). De Mazia wrote that two hours of each workday were set aside for class instruction. The tools necessary for "the experiment" (p. 136) were of two kinds: a)

paintings from Barnes' collection which covered the walls of the factory's six office rooms; and b) the workers' own curiosity and their practical duties at the plant. De Mazia wrote of the egalitarian atmosphere at the factory as a result of the class sessions:

In an atmosphere that was completely democratic, the workers developed initiative and found greater incentive to expansion of their individual abilities, which led to growing efficiency in operation and management of the plant, to increased financial returns for the enterprise and its employees, and to more leisure time resulting from both. The additional leisure was employed for further cultivation of the workers' interests, and was directed, in part, to discussing some of their personal problems with the purpose of inculcating the essential if sound thinking stripped of academic trappings. The fundamental concepts in Dewey's epoch-making books, Democracy and Education and School and Society, were simplified and brought within the comprehension of all the workers, no matter what their previous education. (1954, p. 136).

From Factory to Foundation:
Growth in the Educational Experiment

When practicing artists and students heard about the experiment and began to visit the collection asking to join the classes, it became apparent that the program and facilities needed to grow. Consequently the Foundation was formally organized in December, 1922. Thus it was that the earlier experiment in adult education provided impetus and philosophical direction for the educational institution that is The Barnes Foundation.
The by-laws of The Barnes Foundation stipulate that the appreciation of the collection shall indeed be egalitarian:
On three days a week (one of them shall be Sunday) the gallery shall be open to the public under such regulations as will ensure that it is the plain people, that is, men and women who gain their livelihood by daily toil in the shops, factories, schools, stores and similar places, who shall have free access to the art gallery upon those days when the gallery is to be open to the public. (from Article IX, paragraph 30, of the By-Laws of The Barnes Foundation, in Cantor, 1974).

Paragraphs 32 and 33 of the by-laws pay special regard to the Foundation's philosophy, "The establishment of the art gallery is an experiment to determine how much practical good to the public of all classes and stations of life" such an experiment will be; and the "purpose of the gift is democratic and educational in the true meaning of those words, and special privileges are forbidden."

In 1917 Barnes enrolled as a special student in Dewey's social philosophy seminar at Columbia University, commuting between Philadelphia and New York to attend. This marked the beginning of the lifelong friendship of the two men; cemented by shared interests in education, democracy, art, and scientific method. Their association was sealed with Dewey's appointment to the staff of the Foundation as educational advisor and consultant in 1922. The by-laws of the Foundation, Dated January 24, 1940, delivered to Dewey the sum of five thousand dollars a year for the rest of his life.

Dewey's conception of democracy as a mode of association which provides its members ample room for experimentation, opportunity, and growth through experience, is embodied in Barnes' experiment in an egalitarian approach to education in and through art. Democracy and education as philosophy and method were realized through the Foundation's effort to take art out of the esoteric world of the cultural elite and link it to the lives of the working class society. Even today, a pamphlet published by the Foundation notes, "Art is not a phase of life apart from the workaday world to which one turns in moments of leisure, or perhaps in the name of 'culture'. The Foundation's approach takes art out of its usually-detached, esoteric world and links it up with life itself."

**EMPIRICAL ASPECTS**

**Social Value of the Scientific Method as Employed by The Barnes Foundation**

Dewey considered his philosophical ideas part of a movement toward empiricism based on a new concept of experience, combining a naturalistic vision with an appreciation for the experimental method practiced by the sciences. As expressed in his books Democracy and Education (1916) and Experience & Nature (1925), Dewey's concept of empiricism is seen to be instrumental to social and intellectual progress utilizing a scientific model of inquiry.

In Democracy and Education Dewey wrote of the function of science in the school curriculum as an organ of general social progress. He saw instrumental value in the experimental method, praising the function it performs for the human race. According to Dewey, "in emancipating an idea from the particular context in which it originated and giving it a wider reference the results of the experience of any individual are put at the disposal of all men" (1916-1966, p. 230).

Further, Dewey wrote in Experience & Nature (1916) of the value of scientific method in releasing the mind from captivity to dogma. He
noted that Leonardo had said that true knowledge begins with opinion, thereby announcing the birth of the method of modern science: "Not that opinion or an unconfirmed and unwarranted surmise; but that such surmises may be used; when employed as hypotheses they induce experimentation. They then become forerunners of truth, and mind is released from captivity to antecedent beliefs" (1925/1971, p. 129).<4>

Scientific Method at The Barnes Foundation

Dewey was very concerned with educating the masses; he was seriously interested in bringing art to many people in a way that affects their lives, integrating the aesthetic with ongoing experience. Dewey's socially instrumental scientific approach to learning was the educational method at The Barnes Foundation. In his foreword to Barnes' book The Art of Renior (1935), Dewey noted that his own "educational ideas have been criticized for undue emphasis upon intelligence and the use of the method of thinking that has its best exemplification in science;" therefore he took satisfaction in the fact that an institution concerned with education in art embodied his educational ideas (Dewey, in Barnes and de Mazia, 1935, p. x).

This use of scientific method is discussed by Barnes in The Art in Painting (1928). The book was intended as a text to correspond to the method of education in art at the Foundation. Barnes wrote that the book was an experiment in the adaptation of the principles of scientific method to the study of art, and that as far as he knew, this was a new technique which owed its origin to Dewey's writings (1928, pp. 11-12). Specifically, the "method comprises the observation of facts, reflection upon them, and the testing of the conclusions by their success in application. It stipulates that an understanding and appreciation of paintings is an experience that can come only from contact with the paintings themselves." (1928, p. 10).

Dewey agreed that The Barnes Foundation exemplified what theory meant in practice (1954, p. 8). Learning took place in the experience of the object being studied, with the Foundation serving as the laboratory for the analysis of visual art. The art object was a source and a solution in a problem and student-oriented learning environment. But there were social as well as aesthetic goals in the learning laboratory within the Foundation walls.

Dewey wrote of the social value of paintings beyond being mere museum pieces isolated from a social context in his essay "Affective Thought in Logic and Painting" (originally written for the Journal of The Barnes Foundation, April, 1926):

"...paintings when taken out of their specialized niche are the basis of an educational experience which counteracts the disrupting tendencies of the hard-and-fast specializations, compartmental divisions and rigid segregations which so confuse and nullify our present life" (1954, p. 104).

Dewey expanded his thoughts upon the subject in Art as Experience. Presenting historic reasons for the compartmental conception of fine art, Dewey cited nationalism, imperialism, and the growth of capitalism (1934/1980, pp. 8-9); then he defined the solution to the problem as "that of recovering the continuity of esthetic experience with normal processes of living" (p. 10). Within The Barnes Foundation works of art are not compartmentalized according to artist, era, or even social caste, as with the separation of the popular and the so called fine arts.

The Contents of the Laboratory and Their Arrangement
Barnes' "unrivalled collection" of pictures (Dewey, 1980, p. viii), includes the work of the forementioned modern French masters. In addition, the collection ranges from American primitives to American moderns, and includes Flemish, early Italian, and Renaissance paintings as well. But the fact that these paintings share wall space with Pennsylvania German metalwork, pewter and pottery, antique desks and dower chests, indicates the educative function of the collection as Dewey would have it: without separating art from life, without pandering to the elite, and without being captive to the dogma of established aesthetic theory.

Critics of the display of Barnes' collection complain that the paintings are not hung in a conventional museum manner; they are crowded and in poor light, with modern and antique paintings and furniture juxtaposed without titles or dates (Harris, 1982, p. 18). Violette de Mazia, the current Vice-President and Director of Education of The Barnes Foundation, countered criticisms of the display of the collection by pointing to the explicit educational intention of the artworks through their arrangement. She wrote that a school such as The Barnes Foundation, "selects and assembles its materials primarily according to their ability to foster understanding of objective investigation and to help in demonstrating the principles of aesthetics." (1983, p. 2). Further, the arrangement of the paintings and other works of art is not static; the works are moved about for specific educational discussions.

De Mazia likened the walls of The Barnes Foundation to larger "wall-pictures" (1983, p.6). Characteristics from the works making up the wall-pictures promote "informed perception" on the part of the viewer who is "readily led to transfer qualities appearing in one item into the makeup of the others" (p. 6). In fact in the authors experience, this does happen. The viewer finds herself quite spontaneously sensing new relationships in colors, rhythms, patterns, and meanings. In drawing out relationships between groupings of works diverse in period or style, the viewer's experience is enriched by the discoveries and insights derived from the active and creative aspect of appreciation.

Also to promote the gestalt of an overall impression, labels of the artworks are purposefully absent from the walls, again an "intentional omission" to enhance objective perception of the works; and again, to enhance the educational function of the wall-pictures. De Mazia underscored the approach the Foundation takes to the viewer's education; by omitting titles for the works of art, the viewer's attention is not deflected "from any intrinsic aesthetic significance the makeup of the picture of object, as the thing it is, might offer" (1983, p. 11).

The Art Department of The Barnes Foundation continues to offer classes in the appreciation and understanding of art. The educational program continues to be based upon Dewey's philosophy of democracy and education. As egalitarian as always, participants include art students, artists, and laymen. A Foundation pamphlet lists the requisites for admission as "the assurance of regular and punctual attendance, and the possession of an open mind and of a genuine interest in taking an active part in the work and in doing all designated reading" (pamphlet published by The Barnes Foundation, no date). The annual tuition charge is $100, although full time students in high school and college are exempt from this fee. The two-year courses consist of lectures and seminar sessions; and observations are verified empirically, in the works themselves.

While The Barnes Foundation promotes itself as egalitarian based
on Dewey's principles of social democracy and scientific method, in practice there are two problems. First, the lack of identification of the artwork - the title, date, place of origin - removes the artwork from its social/genetic context. Therefore, the work of art loses some of the socially contextual value of the democratic education Dewey envisioned, disallowing the role of works of art as social artifacts. Second, although self-defined as democratic and egalitarian, it could very well be argued that the admissions policy of The Barnes Foundation even today is exclusionary and therefore as elitist as the high/fine arts milieu which Barnes stood against. But for those students or visitors who can get in, The Barnes Foundation continues to function as a public learning laboratory.

Aside from these contradictions, The Barnes Foundation continues to tie art to education, promoting a consequent enrichment of life, as Dewey would want it, by offering the aesthetic within the continuity of ordinary life experience.
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Footnotes

1 Black and white reproductions of some of the works of art are found in publications of the Barnes Foundation. The original edition of Art as Experience includes five reproductions from Barnes' collection.

2 Harris (1982) wrote that viewing Barnes' Matisseis is crucial to an "adequate understanding" of the artist's development; he added that the Cezannes
"constitute the most important single group of the painter's works in existence, its significance having less to do with the number of pictures involved than with their quality and representativeness" (1982, p. 14).

3 Argyrol is the precursor of the silver nitrate put in the newborn's eyes to prevent blindness caused by conjunctivitis neotorum.

4 When applied to aesthetics, Dewey's empiricism resembles Fechner's (1876) science of aesthetics, where induction replaces deduction, and individual aesthetic dogma. Fechner, the founder of psycho-physics, published a treatise about a scientific approach to aesthetics, "which should proceed by observation and induction, rising to generalizations 'from below' instead of working downward by deduction from metaphysics" (Munro, 1956, p. 5).
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Values Examination in Art Curricula Construction from Owatonna to Today

Carol S. Jeffers

In developing curricula and educational policy, arts educators must participate with students, parents and other members of the community in dialectic processes of values examination. Failure to do so can often result in the development of curricula and policies which send unintended and unacceptable signals about the purposes and importance of the arts in our society. A critical analysis of the Owatonna Art Education Project (1933-38), together with a review of current curricula and educational policies, indicate a need for the use of these processes, arts educators may be unaware of the signals that they are sending through curricula and policy.

Past and present educators have developed arts curricula and policies with the best of intentions out of the belief that the arts belong in the schools and in the hope of improving the aesthetic quality of life. Good intentions and high hopes are not enough basis on which to develop arts curricula and policies. Just as the good intentions of Melvin Haggerty, Dean of the School of Education, University of Minnesota, were not enough to guide the Owatonna Art Education Project to the goal of making art a way of life some fifty years ago, the good intentions of today's educators are not enough to guide their efforts toward developing curricula which meet the new fine arts requirements for high school graduation.

Educators intending to improve the quality and depth of arts programs are charged with the responsibility of understanding what they are communicating, indirectly or by implication, through various curricular emphases and legislative policies. In addition to addressing issues of how and why the arts should be incorporated into the school curriculum, arts educators must understand above all the aesthetic, educational, and social values which are being promoted.

Participating with students, parents, community leaders and others in dialectic processes of values examination, arts educators can address these how and why issues. Without provision for and participation in these processes, arts educators may continue to send unintended and conflicting signals about the nature, purpose, and importance of the arts in the schools.

Owatonna: What Values?

The Owatonna Art Education Project, a unique five-year study which was designed "to raise the aesthetic standards of a small community" (Eisner, 1965, p.80) some fifty years ago, did not provide for a much-needed values examination process. In attempting to address the issues of how and why art should be incorporated into the community and into the curriculum, Haggerty and local project director, Edwin Ziegfeld failed to consider whose aesthetic values were being promoted. Consequently, they more or less used art as an instrument for the inculcation of their own aesthetic values.

Guided by his belief that art could be made a way of life and by his desire to improve what he considered to be "the meager aesthetic quality of life on the Midwestern Plains," (Logan, 155, p.186), Haggerty conceived of the Owatonna Project as an educational study. According to Haggerty (1935), the
study "[sought] to discover how the art needs of current American life could be picked up and made the basis of a school curriculum" (p.1). Through school and community art programs, the project "dealt with human beings' efforts to enrich their lives, particularly to improve the environment" (Plummer, 1976).

Without an explicit values examination process to guide them, Ziegfeld and his staff proceeded to develop some techniques for the purposes of conducting a community analysis and for gathering evidence "on the status of art in Owatonna, a typical American community" (Ziegfeld and Smith, 1944, p.21). Using various surveys, questionnaires, and recorded observations consisting of subjective reports and five-point rating scale checklists, the staff evaluated the Owatonna homes, gardens, and places of business. Among the recorded observations were some rather disturbing judgments about the moral character, personality traits, and personal preferences of the Owatonna homeowners. For example, from the recorded observation of House No. 45:

"The owner and his wife are interested in art, but they are hampered, like so many people, by the idea that a thing must be revered and preserved because it is old, or because of certain sentimental associations it holds, rather than because of its quality. Perhaps this is why they have been unable to make changes and improvements, except in a superficial way" (Ziegfeld and Smith, 1944, p.17).

The observer, who was to evaluate the proportions, woodwork, textures and colors of the house - "the color schemes of tans, taupes, browns, and dull reds are in good taste, but innocuous" (p.17) - instead negatively characterized the owners, due to their alleged conservative lifestyle. This observation is both judgmental and elitist, and raises questions about the actual mission of the project.

Gardens were similarly evaluated. Garden No. 40, described as a "yard of flowers," was nevertheless, rated as ineffective because of the "distracting background and improper setting that failed to show off the flowers" (p.19). In the final paragraph of the report, the focus of the evaluation shifts from the garden to the gardener. Garden No. 40: "Dimly aware of some of the shortcomings in her garden, the owner, nevertheless, felt she has fulfilled her duties as a gardener by raising excellent perennials and annuals" (p.19).

These are just some examples of the many house and garden reports which clearly indicate aesthetic and social value biases. These biased reports can serve to remind contemporary arts educators that provisions for values examination processes must be made. As arts educators in many states are currently seeking to establish or upgrade fine arts requirements for high school graduation and to develop goals for new comprehensive K-12 art programs, the need for values examination is particularly acute. Important lessons to be learned from Owatonna are that the process by which these new program goals are developed is of paramount importance and that special attention must be given to understanding which aesthetic, educational, and social values are promoted.

Current Approaches: Values Clarification Through Wide Participation

As reported in The NAEA News (1985a), a plan for comprehensive arts in education was written by a "panel of twenty-one individuals or experts" (p.24) in Kentucky. The use of task forces, made up of arts coordinators, specialists, and university consultants, has been
typical of approaches taken by several other states as well. In some cases, the work of the task force was considered by an independent review panel. In other cases, state legislatures held hearings. The NAEA News (Irvine, 1985), reported on the wide participation which was achieved in New York when 15,000 parents, educators, members of professional associations and unions and "other concerned individuals" attended thirty regional conferences throughout the state.

These examples indicate a variability among approaches used to develop curricula, as well as a range in both number and type of persons participating in development processes. Regardless of the size or composition of the group involved in the process, a dialectic approach to aesthetic and educational values examination must be included. Dialectic approaches can lead to the inclusion of entirely new areas in arts curricula. For example, in North Carolina, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction appointed a committee of parents, teachers, administrators, and university personnel "to study the arts education program and to make suggestions for needed improvements" (Irvine, 1985, p.3). The committee recommended that folk arts be added to the existing areas of visual arts, theatre arts, dance and music.

Such dialectic process has the potential for enriching curricula with different, explicitly-stated value orientations. When such an approach is taken, it is far less likely that the arts will become instrumentalized for the purpose of inculcating unstated and unexamined values.

Mixed Messages in Curricular and Legislative Policies

Those arts educators willing to participate in values examination processes must be willing to examine tacit or hidden messages conveyed by curricular and legislative policies. In their zeal to improve the balance and quality of arts education through the development of new goals and the institution of new graduation requirements, some educators may be unaware that they are sending mixed messages about the purpose and importance of the arts. These messages, however unintended or subtle, can be quite powerful in terms of their impact on the schools and society.

In Rhode Island, the fine arts requirement for high school graduation applies only to college-bound students, in Texas to students in an advanced high school program, and to those students receiving an academic diploma in Tennessee (NAEA News, 1985b, p.2). Required in this way, the fine arts serve to further differentiate those students who are going on to college from those who are not. Drawing this artificial and arbitrary distinction between college-bound and noncollege-bound students sends a message about the type of person who will or will not find the arts useful or meaningful.

In spite of its policy requiring fine arts only of those students in an advanced high school program, the Texas State Legislature has designated the arts as "one of the twelve basic subject areas of the curriculum" (NAEA News, 1985b, p.2). The rationale for including the arts in the curriculum appears in the following resolution passed by the Texas Art Education Association, which reads in part:

"... The study of the visual arts develops children's higher level thinking skills and enhances confidence and self-discipline... provides the opportunity for developing perceptual awareness, creative self-expression ... promotes the development of non-verbal communication that can be greater than the spoken language" (NAEA News, 1985b, p.2).
This rationale, which is typical of those used by many states, does not differentiate between college-bound and noncollege-bound students. Instead, it is concerned with all students and their preparation for life. The obvious inconsistency between the Texas graduation requirement and the rationale on which it is based makes for an unsound policy. In human terms, it appears that noncollege-bound students will not have the opportunity to develop higher level thinking and nonverbal communication skills, nor will they be able to express themselves creatively or confidently. A hidden and elitist message conveyed by this policy is that a certain type of person needs to develop the skills associated with the arts and that only this certain type of person can benefit from studying the arts.

In several other states now requiring fine arts for graduation, legislative policies convey similarly confusing messages about the nature of the arts. For example, students in California, Illinois, Oregon and West Virginia must earn one credit in the fine/second language. Students in Georgia must earn one credit in foreign/second language. Students in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades receive instruction in many subjects from GT teachers in self-contained classrooms. However, instruction in art, music, and physical education is handled quite differently. For instruction in these subjects, the GT students are mainstreamed into the regular programs of the regular school.

There are still other educational policies, which through their inconsistencies, serve to subvert the status and importance of the arts. For example, The University of California and The University of Maryland systems will confer credit in the fine arts for courses taken on their campuses, but deny credit to applicants who have taken such courses in high school. As Eisner (1985) says, this practice is "an anomaly of the first order" (p.212).

This and the other anomalies cited in this paper illustrate how powerful, mixed messages are conveyed by curricular and legislative policies. Because these messages are themselves value-laden, they require close scrutiny. Educators, parents, and students are compelled to unearth and to examine the underlying messages and values embedded within past and present curricular policies.

hands, are assigned a lower intellectual status" (p.202). Consequently, schools have traditionally allocated fewer resources (time, staff, budget) to the study of the arts. It is ironic that because of low intellectual status assigned to the arts, less time is allocated for the development of the higher level thinking skills attributed to the arts.

The status of the arts conveys the message to students and parents that the skills associated with the arts are less important than the skills associated with other subjects. For example, at a center for highly gifted and talented children housed in a regular elementary school in Maryland, gifted and talented (GT) students in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades receive instruction in many subjects from GT teachers in self-contained classrooms. However, instruction in art, music, and physical education is handled quite differently. For instruction in these subjects, the GT students are mainstreamed into the regular programs of the regular school.

There are still other educational policies, which through their inconsistencies, serve to subvert the status and importance of the arts. For example, The University of California and The University of Maryland systems will confer credit in the fine arts for courses taken on their campuses, but deny credit to applicants who have taken such courses in high school. As Eisner (1985) says, this practice is "an anomaly of the first order" (p.212).

This and the other anomalies cited in this paper illustrate how powerful, mixed messages are conveyed by curricular and legislative policies. Because these messages are themselves value-laden, they require close scrutiny. Educators, parents, and students are compelled to unearth and to examine the underlying messages and values embedded within past and present curricular policies.
Curricular and legislative policies will reflect the values of the community and the larger society if these values are consciously examined and clearly stated.
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CRITICAL COMMENTARY

"ARTS IN OTHER PLACES": A CONFERENCE CRITIQUE

Doug Blandy and Kristin G. Congdon

In August, 1986, a conference took place at the University of California Los Angeles called "Art in Other Places." This article will critique that conference and make suggestions for further planning of art programs in non-public school settings based on 1) Wolf Wolfensberger's concept of normalization, 2) a recognition of the expressive forms that exist among various constituency groups, and 3) an analysis of long-range ramifications of decision making processes in art planning and programming.

Introduction

From August 21 to August 23, 1986, Susan Hill, the Director of the University of California Los Angeles Extension, Artsearch Program, coordinated a conference called "Arts in Other Places." A few hundred people attended and participated in the programs associated with the conference. Participants included arts administrators and artists from varying disciplines. The descriptor "other" in the title for this conference referred to arts programs which were implemented in settings other than schools and colleges. The participants in these programs were individuals who were described by conference speakers as inmates, the elderly, the handicapped, gang members and other differently labeled groups of people. We attended the conference to learn about the development and implementation of non-public school art programs and with the hope that those who coordinate these projects might learn to work with art educators and benefit from art education research and expertise. It became clear to us that art educators were not actively involved in this type of art programming. Because of this lack of participation, much of art education's valuable research and educational approaches are not being widely utilized. For this reason, our attendance at this conference encouraged us to respond and critique presented programs and to make some recommendations. It is our hope that more art educators will choose to become active in non-public school art programming in an effort to share and learn from those people labeled arts administrators and artists.

The two and a half day event began with a keynote by Lenny Sloan, a charismatic man who had obviously been instrumental in realizing much of the arts programming in California. The conference continued with methods workshops on music, dance, poetry and creative writing, visual arts and theatre, films/videotapes, and panels which highlighted model programs. It ended at the site where Judy Baca and her assistants work on their Los Angeles wall murals--the Social and Public Art Resource Center (SPARC) in Venice, California.

We are appreciative of the opportunity this conference provided in our work toward the development of arts policy for non-public school constituencies. It was good to have a space and time for sharing common goals, frustrations, and successes in this programming area. As with most first efforts of this kind, "Arts in Other Places" should be seen as a beginning for further dialogue. This critique will point out theoretical and practical issues which we believe
should be researched and discussed in planning, administering, and evaluating non-public school art programs. There is a real need for more art educators to become interested and involved.

The Constituents and Change

The organizers of this conference, the model practitioners they selected to present, and many of the conference participants demonstrated courage in working with their particular constituencies in the context of educational and residential institutions designed for persons who are experiencing disabilities, homelessness, harassment, abuse and incarceration, and which are notorious for their deculturating and dehumanizing approaches. Generally, the conference participants recognized these qualities and advocated changes in the offending human service systems. Art (the process and product) and artists were seen as vehicles through which change could take place. Specific alternatives to the status quo and strategies for making desperately needed changes were discussed.

Conference participants were very vocal in their belief that the constituencies with whom they work are abused and neglected in current human service practice. Consequently, we expected to see programming which would avoid abnormally etiological labels of disability or deviancy. Conversely we expected programming which would promote high expectations of people, the accessibility of arts environments, the integration of people experiencing disabilities with nondisabled people and goals for the general maximization of personal competence. Such approaches would be in keeping with Wolfenberger's (1972) "principle of normalization" as he formulated it for people perceived as being deviant and which has been widely used by special educators and is acceptable to groups advocating the rights of people with disabilities. The normalization principle advocates the "utilization of means which are as culturally normative as possible, in order to establish and/or maintain personal behaviors and characteristics which are as culturally normative as possible" (p.28). It assumes that persons providing services, as well as those institutions in which those services are provided, will act towards the realization of this goal. The "principle of normalization" demands that human service workers, including artists, arts administrators, and educators, provide services (educational and artistic experiences) in a way which disallows persons to act and appear in a way which is culturally inappropriate to them. This approach also suggests that program facilitators work within their educational settings, professional organizations, neighborhoods, communities, and other larger social arenas to activate and actualize normalizing circumstances for those persons perceived as deviant.

The conference organizers seemed to be largely unaware of the power and process of normalization. Print materials and formal introductions to presentations stressed etiological labels. For example, descriptions such as "emotionally disturbed," "homeless," and "incarcerated" were used as nouns rather than as adjectives which describe a person's present, but not necessarily permanent, experience. Concurrently, individual character and experience were de-emphasized in favor of broad stereotypic categories of deviance. We were pleased to see that the building which housed the conference was physically accessible; however, there was no evidence that an interpreter for people experiencing hearing impairments was available. In addition, to the best of our knowledge, conference materials were not available in large print format. However, it is to the organizer's credit that all conference sessions were made available on audio tapes.
The conference title "Arts in Other Places" was also troublesome. It implied segregation and separation rather than the integration of the constituencies represented by the conference represented. Few members of the constituencies represented by the conference title were in attendance. Rather, they appeared in films and videos and on slides which did not present them with the opportunity for dialogue or leadership. As long as those of us in leadership positions continue to speak for, segregate, and categorize people through the use of broad etiological labels of disability, we are not acting in a normalizing manner. The conference presentations showed program after program housed in separate settings without avenues of even minimal integration with the general public. Presenters appeared to urge program attendees to encourage others to give monetary support out of guilty feelings regarding those less fortunate. Such approaches do not promote normalization. They tend to sap the power of people to act on their own strengths, to remove themselves from a disabling label, or to overcome a handicapping condition.

In these ways this conference missed the opportunity to advocate the everyday involvement in the arts of those who experience disabilities, homelessness, advanced age, abuse, incarceration, and other difficult situations. Though the conference seemed to advocate social change for purposes of more expansive acceptance of art programming and funding, it underemphasized change in the quality of life for the people engaged in the art activities. That the conference leaders worked more to give their constituencies their ideas of art experiences, rather than pointing out how art can be a powerful tool to express individual and group ideas which the participants can identify and build on in order to change values and affect the quality of their lives was a central disturbing theme. We think that the form and content of an art experience should begin, in large part, within the experiential realm of the participants. In this way they may recognize and build on the inherent expressive modes which identify them rather than the artist/facilitator.

The majority of the programs that this conference identified as exemplary did not empower people. The prevailing model was one in which artists, largely funded by arts councils, acted on behalf of the designated constituencies by primarily involving them as assistants. Together they worked on projects designed by the artist. These artists were primarily from a fine arts tradition and this seemed to prejudice them against the aesthetic viewpoints of those people with whom they worked. Consequently, their approach was not always community based. In at least one case there was a stated rejection of a waterfront community's nautical aesthetic favor of a fine arts approach which glorified abstract sculptures. Ultimately, constituents were not perceived as partners or collaborators, but as additional hands working for the artist's purpose. Judy Baca and her work with the oppressed people of Los Angeles on The Great Wall was an exception. Hers was a collaborative piece that included her constituents' personal view.

Artists working for social change in the spirit of normalization (in both the product and process of the art experience) would not view their constituencies as extra hands, but as major contributors, collaborators and partners. An improved approach would view participants as developers and creators. Their art products would then act as tools for self-advocacy. The art workers at this conference gave the uncomfortable impression of being responsible first to their own art, secondly to
their funding sources and lastly to their constituencies. In most cases it seems unlikely that the constituents had a voice in the selection of their artist-advocate. In our opinion neither social change nor democratic artistic participation results from this state of affairs. What we saw was an affirmation of the status-quo, of a top-down delivery of human service and artistic process in the guise of social change rhetoric.

**A Top-Down Approach to Arts Programming**

The conference planners and presenters evidenced a top-down delivery of the Art World approach in their human service work and art educational approach. Art education programs in most public schools seem to promote the same artistic and political values. The sense that there are real artists and then there are individuals who are not capable of valuable artistic expression prevails in many settings. The notion that select members of the Art World can place almost exclusive value on art persists. The underlying message presented in the conference's so-called "other" art programs is that the artist cannot permit deviantly labeled individuals to participate to any large degree in the artist's values and creative process. The implied reason for such an elitist perspective is that the artist can make qualitatively better work in form and content than her or his constituent can produce. This approach is paralleled in the world of those grey-s suited white middle and upper-class politicians and bureaucrats who make policies to "deal with" the dejected of society. It is unfortunate that those in power do not often facilitate the free choice and activism potential of those they most often identify with stereotypical labels of deviancy. As Bersson (1983) suggests, if we as artists, educators and policymakers utilize the elitist or top-down approach, we must also look at the larger socio-cultural and political effects of our actions.

Advocating one person's artistic and ideological preferences (in this case the artist's) over those of a particular group of people, devalues and degrades what can artistically come from that population. It is likely that any individual or group of people told (in whatever overt or covert form) that they have no power, no valuable aesthetic direction, and no political or social statement of interest to make, will come to believe it.

The alternative is an empowered constituency able to comment sensitively and effectively on television, billboards, or welfare programs. They might choose to communicate their attitudes, values and beliefs by means of street theatre, murals or quilts. However, the choices should be largely theirs. Choices must not be made for them which reduce them to a position of passive compliance and facilitation of an artist's directive.

In order to effect an egalitarian approach, arts councils and other funding agencies must work to change the make-up of their funding panels and administrations. Art is political (Becker, 1982), and judgments made by funding agencies to support or reject certain artistic expressions are political decisions. Unfortunately, some aspects of the high Art World promote a "helping" or "giving" attitude suggestive of control over the differently privileged. Opposed to this philanthropic concept is a public recognition of the spirit, creative energy, and expression of all individuals including most notably those groups of people with whom these conference participants worked.

**Suggestions for Future Planning**

Thoughts on the conference "Art in Other Places," elicit the following suggestions for those currently
involved in arts programming:
1) All arts programming should be considerate of people who are experiencing disabilities, homelessness, economic depression and like life situations often perceived as being deviant. This approach suggests recognition of, and engagement with, the strengths and expressive potentials of all children, youths, and adults. Arts environments should be as accessible as possible to all individuals and reinforcing of personal competence.
2) Art workers should clarify their values on the expressive forms that naturally come from varying constituency groups. This clarification requires a recognition of the modes of communication which already take place in a community. This will determine how expressive forms can be used and expanded to communicate a concern identified by the group or individuals involved. Artists, art administrators, and art educators should facilitate rather than artistically direct.

3) The political ramifications of every step taken in the development and implementation of arts programming must be recognized. Values which are expressed when action is taken should be clarified and long and short term consequences of a decision questioned. Arts programming must be perceived as a force in enhancing or changing cultural and individual stability. Consequently, artistic directions must be continually questioned.

Conclusion
Dialogue on arts programming is critical. Our criticism of this conference has made us more aware of our own shortcomings in program planning. We hope that art educators and others involved with art planning activities will see this conference as a starting place for policy planning and discourse among educators, arts administrators, artists, and large numbers of community members.
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