Anthony Janson's art history survey textbook has marginalized women artists.

True to their belief that collaborative activity among scholars and practitioners in diverse fields could develop more inclusive aesthetic theory and support a broader range of art production, Bickley and Wolcott collaborated on writing their article and included personal communications with women in the arts from the United States, Scandinavia, and Italy. Bickley and Wolcott argue that feminist scholars have changed the discipline of art history and art criticism. The authors advocate a phenomenological critical approach to art in which historical knowledge is based in both male and female experiences of art and artmaking. This approach emphasizes art objects within their physical and social context without attempting to explain or politicize them. Bickley and Wolcott suggest that collaboration between cognitive scientists, anthropologists, psychologists, and art scholars and practitioners may help consolidate the various feminist approaches into a contextually-based and pluralistic theory of art. Bickley and Wolcott advocate the development of theory and practice in art that not only includes the social and political context of artmaking, but also seeks understanding that integrates both male and female phenomenological experiences of art.

The journal concludes with two book reviews. One book reviewer suggests that readers of Warrior for Gringostroika: Essays, Performance Texts, and Poetry by Gómez-Peña (1993) may be moved to action. The other review on Frida's Fiestas, contextualizes art with the substance of life—food—something shared by all in a variety of ways.

Liz Hoffman served as editorial consultant. She generously gave me advice and encouragement; and thoughtfully edited three articles (i.e., Bolin's, Jagodzinski's, and Gaudelius' and Moore's). She introduces these articles in her editorial and identifies youth as a theme that emerged in this group. Together, the nine authors and nine artists in this volume represent social action as they present the creative potentials of sparks, hot fires, and changing waters.

Editorial

Elizabeth Hoffman

Last week I was in a class with twenty-two 4th-graders, discussing how quilts can be like time capsules, linking people and place to a particular time in one's life. Using the heart-in-hand motif, students traced their hands on cloth, attached cut-out hearts on which they wrote their names and the date and then embellished their (cloth) hands with embroidery. The hands were placed on a larger fabric to create a quilt that will be used as a class portrait. We talked about the heart-in-hand motif, which is prevalent in quilt history. We decided that, basically, the motif means that you discover in your heart what you want to do, then you use your hands to make it happen.

Anxiously awaiting the responses to the theme for this year's journal—"social action through art"—I envisioned manuscripts from artists, educators, and scholars who were "making it happen." In readying three of the manuscripts for publication, I discovered that what I thought was a seductive "call for physical action" was interpreted in a much broader sense. The authors' expansion of the theme coupled with the complexity of issues presented make JSTAE 15/16 an exceptional issue.

I found the emergent topic of negative attitudes toward youth particularly significant. I attended lectures by two powerful, eloquent women this past year—Angela Davis and
Anita Hill. Though speaking divergently on a variety of topics, they both expressed similar concerns about today’s youth. Their focus was not aimed at the so-called Generation X, but at the Baby Boomers, who as a group have failed to not only understand youth but allow them their own voice.

Jan Jagodzinski addresses the “youth crisis” by suggesting that the “moral majority” are portraying (through popular culture media) teens in crisis (e.g., teen crime, delinquency, pregnancy, suicide, Satan worship, etc.) to maintain their own hegemony. Specifically, he is concerned that “the issues that surround violence veil broader socio-economic concerns.” Jan’s ideas caution us to thoroughly investigate the perceived issue before we propose social action. We need to first be aware if we are persuaded to act by the manipulation of popular culture venues (e.g., film, TV, comic books, talk-shows). He reminds us of the power of these media and the need to question the desires of those who hold the power.

Jan also reports on the emergence of “girlie culture” and its German counterpart Emma Töchter. How shall we attend to this fresh, youthful voice in a “postfeminist world”? Images of women are in flux and can be explored through negotiation. Paul Bolin asks us to take action by evaluating classroom materials by examining images and depictions of women in major art history texts such as H. W. Janson’s History of Art (with subsequent revisions by Anthony F. Janson). Not only does he question omissions from this text, but he analyzes the language used to describe the work of those women artists who are included.

Yvonne Gaudelius and Juliet Moore carry this discussion into the classroom by encouraging educators to juxtapose images from customary slide reproductions such as The Rape of the Daughters of Leucippus with contemporary feminist artists’ works that address violence against women. They report the urgent need for the adoption of this type of classroom practice by comparing divergent class responses of students using feminist criticism rather than formalist models. I ponder what would happen if Aeon Flux (MTV) or Tank Girl (comic book/film heroine) met Titian’s Rape of Europa on the college slide screen; these are provocative pairings to consider!

Many JSTAE readers are art educators associated with academic institutions. We share ecocritic Cheryll Glotfelty’s fear that some “scholarship remains academic in the sense of ‘scholarly to the point of being unaware of the outside world’ (American Heritage Dictionary).” Pedagogy that promotes social action in the “outside world” is being practiced. For example, recently a week-end seminar titled Power and Place was held on the University of Oregon campus. The planning committee was a collaborative effort: Doug Blandy (Arts and Administration Program), Stan Jones (Landscape Architecture), Fred Tepfer (Campus Planning), Polly Welch (Architecture), and Linda Zimmer (Interior Architecture). As part of the focus on inclusivity and universal design, teams of student identified a space on the University of Oregon campus that they deemed not inclusive, and implemented an intervention/installation that addressed the workshop focus. Through artistic expression, students portrayed concepts including gender differences in relation to power, metaphors for barriers, perceptions of individual differences, self-definition, sensory perception, sites for multiple identity, and play. Evaluations by participants were overwhelmingly positive. This type of experiential learning challenges us to consider other configurations of this year’s JSTAE theme (e.g., art through social action).

Finally, I congratulate all of the authors and especially Karen for a job well done. One always receives more than one gives when working on a project of this type. I look forward to continued discussion at our next caucus.

Notes


2. Contact Doug Blandy at the University of Oregon in Eugene, OR for more information about this unique seminar.