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Selected Delegate Responses to "Men in Feminism"

Sara Snowden

In response to Ken Marantz's remarks, one woman questioned whether he was really "challenging us [women] to knock you off the mountain" because his own academic record revealed an acceptance of women. "This isn't a power struggle," Marantz replied, but added that he thought women could be revolutionaries, "otherwise they won't change the [power] structure much."

Mario Asaro complained that he felt like he was in church listening to sermons. He said there should have been an open discussion involving the audience; the panel members spoke for 80 minutes before there was a chance for dialogue. He felt there was a need for the panel and audience to reflect upon and discuss relevant points after each presentation. Panelists' points were "excellent" and "well thought out," but the delivery was dry and sometimes hard to understand, he added.

However, Linda Ettinger of the University of Oregon thought the presentations were "catalysts for thought," with each statement reflecting the character of the panelists in a way she had not seen before. She thanked them for conveying their "passionate" feelings about the topic and responding on a personal level. A second audience member added she too liked the diversity of thought reflected in the panelists' statements and would like to see them published.

Jan Jagodzinski then said that personal discourse often fails to historicize, remaining instead at a phenomenological or interpretive level. He said he wanted "to continue to problematize the discourse of feminism," whereupon an audience member asked what he meant. Amy Brook Sinder suggested "we speak so we can all understand." Jagodzinski countered that "difficult arguments can be slowed down by clear, easy language."

Another audience member wanted to know if competition is an issue with feminism, considering how pluralist theories open new ways of problem-solving, according to Kristin Congdon. Heather Anderson responded, "I'm not an Amazon or competitive; I only want some equality."

An audience member said he was disturbed that the panel had not expressed a more global outlook in their comments. But Jagodzinski said he thought that Karen Hamblen had addressed global concerns in terms of "eco-feminism." Marantz objected, saying the NAEA is an American institution which has a lot of problems, and "no way" can it begin to solve problems globally in a pragmatic way.
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One audience member identified herself as a high school teacher who had come to the session hoping to gain some direction for how her culturally diverse students can break gender barriers and be full human beings. She was seeking illumination, but after this presentation “I’m still just as much in a quandary.”

“It’s a paradox... in order to end oppression of women, we write about it and therefore celebrate it,” another person in the audience said. But Kristin Congdon disagreed. In viewing feminism as a pluralistic approach, the first step is to acknowledge oppression, and then to value women’s ways of problem-solving and creating within their limitations.

One self-described “action-oriented” listener thought the NAEA planners needed to be convinced that the imbalance of male and female conference presenters should change. But Marantz said he felt like an oppressed minority when encountering the “old-girls’ club” that has existed within the NAEA in the past.

An audience member said the panel should have considered class issues, not just gender, which is only one aspect of a total problem of oppression. But another individual challenged her, saying that oppression of women occurs worldwide in all classes.

Audience members were all given questionnaires which asked for responses and suggestions to current feminist issues within the field of Art Education.

---

**Examining Environmental Advertising Imagery Through Art Education**

**Tom Anderson**

This is an examination of advertising imagery in the United States, with particular emphasis on outdoor advertising, and a proposal for an art curriculum focused on advertising awareness. The method is socially-oriented art criticism funded by some history of advertising and the psychology and philosophy of persuasive, manipulative, and pecuniary symbolism. The intent is first to “decode the aesthetic environment” (Barbosa, 1988) and then present a structure that helps art students to do the same. The examination begins with the object and returns to the object for validation (Ecker and Kaelin, 1970), but “ends with an understanding of personal experience, values, and social attitudes” (Nadaner, 1985, p. 12). It is what Jagodzinski (1983) calls making the unconscious conscious.

A goal of art education is to foster general adult life competence (Broudy, 1987). This is partially accomplished through image literacy (Rush, 1987), not just of the so-called “high” or “fine” arts, but of all forms of human-made objects. In light of this goal, examination of the omnipresent commercial image is an appropriate task. Most people, including most art professionals, live most of their lives in the common realm of everyday life outside their specialized areas. It is this in-common everyday life which is most widely experienced and shared (Maquet, 1986). As an aspect of this shared experience, commercial images may, in fact, be more important to attend to than the traditional arts normally examined in the art curriculum. This view encompasses what Eisner (1985) would call the “social adaptation and reconstruction” view of curriculum development. The point is that through critical attention to what exists, students are empowered to act upon the world in an intelligent fashion, rather than being pawns, acted upon by the forces of their times (Freire, 1973).

**Advertising and the Built Environment**

The question to ask, from an aesthetic perspective, is why the built environment looks as it does. If the aesthetic is a significant factor in urban design why is Wilshire Boulevard (Tennessee Street, Biscayne Boulevard,) filled with such a jostling, crashing, brash, competing jumble of signs that have no integrative aspects or subtlety? Obviously something other than a traditional aesthetic sensibility is at work, or some other philosophical underpinning is dominating the aesthetic. Possibly it is both of the above.