

S = self I = interest
C = culture / object / civilization...

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rjvp20

Responses to the essay 'Integrated Foundation Studio and Art History at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago'

James Elkins, S. F. Kislev, Yanai Toister, Matthew C. Hunter, Mark Piucci, Clare McCracken, Lucia Fagen-DeLuca, Sarah Magnatta, Anna Tahinci & Marion S. Lee

To cite this article: James Elkins, S. F. Kislev, Yanai Toister, Matthew C. Hunter, Mark Piucci, Clare McCracken, Lucia Fagen-DeLuca, Sarah Magnatta, Anna Tahinci & Marion S. Lee (2024) Responses to the essay 'Integrated Foundation Studio and Art History at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago', *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 23:2, 139-163, DOI: [10.1080/14702029.2024.2360787](https://doi.org/10.1080/14702029.2024.2360787)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14702029.2024.2360787>



Published online: 12 Jul 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)





View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Responses to the essay ‘Integrated Foundation Studio and Art History at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago’

James Elkins, S. F. Kislev, Yanai Toister , Matthew C. Hunter, Mark Piucci, Clare McCracken, Lucia Fagen-DeLuca, Sarah Magnatta , Anna Tahinci and Marion S. Lee

ABSTRACT


Eight responses, from India, Canada, the US, and Australia, highlight pedagogical issues that are raised in the essay ‘Integrated Foundation Studio and Art History at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago’. The comments includes questions of practicability, history of pedagogy, similar initiatives, and philosophic assumptions.

KEYWORDS

Art history pedagogy; art historical method; comparative art education; decentring pedagogy; diachronic; experimental pedagogy; foundation course; methodology; practice and theory

This article is in response to the article, ‘Integrated Foundation Studio and Art History at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago’, published in this same issue of *Journal of Visual Art Practice* (Vol. 23, No. 2), doi:[10.1080/14702029.2023.2184975](https://doi.org/10.1080/14702029.2023.2184975).

Taxonomies, surveys, rudiments and compounds: four questions

S. F. Kislev and Yanai Toister 

Shenkar College of Engineering, Design and Art

1. Can we taxonomize strategies for combining theory and practice in art education?

The described experiment at SAIC attempts to bring art history into dialogue with studio practice for freshmen students. While this may seem pedagogically progressive, it reflects and reiterates an age-old, constitutional aspiration of the art academy as such. Not only twenty-first century art students struggle to mediate between studio work and reflective thought: sixteenth century students at the first academies were subjected to the same demand in different guises. The tension between practice and theory has been constitutive of art education ever since academies took the duty of training artists over from the guilds. ‘While the apprenticeship taught the essential skills, the academies concentrated on what they considered to be loftier topics, because one of their key functions was as a vehicle to

raise the status of artists above those of crafts practitioners', writes Nicolas Houghton of the early academies (2016, 110); and Neil Mullholland argues that art schools were, from the very start, diglossic – speaking at once the language of craft and the language of thought (2019). Seen in this light, the experiment described above is another proposed mediation attempt in a centuries-old tension between the two major goals of the art academy – technical mastery and reflective thought. It is preceded by centuries-worth of experiments trying to bridge the gap between theory and practice in art education. Can we see the SAIC experiment in a wider historical context of attempts to integrate theory into art education? Can we list, organize and taxonomize this history of such experimentations?

2. Why does the 'Art History for Artists' survey still exist? What use do art students have with art history?

Why should young practicing artists be made to know the history of art? This is far from self-evident. (a) It is not commonplace for a field to mandate knowledge of its own history as part of its initiation processes. Physicists, computer scientists or lawyers are rarely made to study the history of their disciplines in any kind of serious detail. Why must artists? (b) Art cannot be unproblematically narrativized as a continuum. There is too little continuity between Benin bronzes, pre-raphaelite canvases and contemporary participatory performances (let alone cohesion). Even the broad category of 'visuality' fails to unite them; they are bound only by the frail, fuzzy and ever-expanding category of 'art'. Whereas the complex material and conceptual history of twentieth century art can reasonably be said to bear on the practice of budding artists, the further back one goes, the more disparate it becomes with contemporary perspectives of art. Art historical material is all too often experienced as 'general education' – bearing all the problems and complexities of this charged term – or trivialized as 'visual inspiration'. With the deluge of visual material available online, why prioritize a specific type of visual material – deemed 'art historical' – over others? And why study this kind of source material systematically, placing it within 'the story (or stories) of art'? Are art-historical stories conceptualized as coping strategies for artists with the flood of available visual material, or are they simply remnants of old and sometimes pernicious ways of thinking?; (c) The art history survey is infamous for its various biases. It is riddled with 'endemic problems', as the authors put it. What makes it worth saving? Why bother with the diversification of the art history survey, rather than treating it as an unsalvageable relic of a nineteenth-century style of thought? (d) There seems to be no clear reason to prioritize art history over other kinds of knowledge. A case can be made that sociology, for instance, offers a more useful knowledge field than art history for most budding artists today; histories of science and technology may be said to contextualize human creativity better than traditional art history surveys; and so forth. If, following Louis Camnitzer (2014), we imagine art education evolving into a kind of omnivore 'meta-discipline', art history becomes but one of many potentially relevant fields of knowledge.

3. What (if anything) ought to be considered elementary in art education today?

The Elkins, Wong & Briggs paper gives a relatively rare report on the build of one foundation year for one BFA cohort within one BFA program. Not all foundation years are alike (not even at SAIC), but the data about how different institutions structure their foundation

courses is difficult to find. We know that many components of art education that have at one time or another been deemed 'foundational' or 'elementary', have fallen into disrepute; that 'in the present-day art school there are ever more things that could be taught without there being anything which has to be', as Houghton puts it. We also know, on the other hand, that most components that have been considered 'elementary' are still in wide educational circulation. Take drawing, for instance: once considered a universal tool for art education, it now has a 'twilight existence' in art schools, according to Elkins in one of his lectures on concepts of art for art students described in the paper (H26). Drawing is, perhaps surprisingly, absent from the large foundation course experiment described in the paper, but it is still a required foundation at various other institutions (see Hunter below): at the RISD, the SVA, the Cooper Union and the Städelschule in Frankfurt, for instance, drawing remains a first-year requirement; at the Chinese CAFA students are required to take no less than four different kinds of drawing courses (drawing, fast drawing, traditional line drawing and calligraphy). Other institutions – like the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, the Hochschule Luzern, and most art schools in the UK – have omitted the foundation year altogether, and seem not to consider anything in art education as foundational enough to merit a strict requirement. How do we account for these differences? We need more data, collected from papers such as this, to obtain some kind of general view of the current understanding of the so-called 'foundational' art education course.

4. Are large compound courses effective?

Elkins, Wong & Briggs describe a compound course which brings together different goals and pedagogical methods; a single course that binds together at least two (and probably three) different courses. Moreover, each of the two courses it compounds is in itself a compound course. In a conversation printed in *What Do Artists Know*, Elkins lists the conflicting goals and methods that somehow coexist in the foundation studio art course: it takes (1) the centrality of drawing from the Baroque academy, (2) the notion of subjective expression from Romanticism, (3) a variety of formalist concerns from the Bauhaus, and (4) discursive practices, including 'the fascinating problem of deskilling', from postwar academies of the 1960s and 1970s (Elkins 2012, 60). Clearly, then, the foundational studio course is itself an aggregate. In the same text Elkins distinguishes between four large areas which together constitute the entire first year curriculum common in many art schools today: (1) the art history survey, (2) 'basic things like form, color and space', (3) the teaching of theory, and (4) studio work. In the experiment described in the current paper, the authors attempted to bring all these together into one large, conglomerate, holistic and somewhat 'baroque' course.

Different curricular strategies for the orchestration and coordination of multiplicity in art education can be proposed. An axis can be drawn, with standalone courses interacting only in the student's mind on one end, a network of semi-coordinated courses which communicate with each other through some kind of institutional mechanism in the middle, and a large compound course which includes other courses as sub-modules at the other end. Each curricular strategy has its own merits and difficulties. The first risks problems of segmentation and dismemberment (without serious attempts to coordinate the courses, the different ingredients can fail to intermix); The network approach must provide communication routes between courses which might turn, in themselves,

to baroque mazes; and the compound course – such as the one described above – faces its own pedagogical and administrative concerns. The problem boils down to this: Can students gain sufficient mastery of both craft and historical context in one stroke? Or do they merely apprentice in the conduct that Thierry De Duve (1994) disparagingly called an artistic attitude?

Drawing for art historians

Matthew C. Hunter

McGill University

McGill's Department of Art History and Communication Studies (AHCS) presents a kind of inverting mirror to the situation described by Elkins, Wong and Briggs at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. Not counting graduate pedagogy, AHCS offers four undergraduate programs in art history (major, minor, honors, joint honors), but no survey. The University has no studio program at all. We have neither studio-art facilities nor dedicated art-making materials. The classrooms used by our department come in two typologies: seminar room and lecture hall. Neither is easily adapted to teaching artistic practices. Unlike the School of the Art Institute which takes its name from a world-class museum, McGill does not have an art museum or gallery; we have a visual arts collection, works from which are variously installed around campus. And our organizational conditions are very different from the 239-contact-hour, nine-week course taught to fourteen students by three instructors and three TAs described by Elkins, Wong and Briggs. Our courses are limited to 39 h per semester. TA hours and employment are not flexible; they are bound by a collective agreement. Our syllabi are also effectively contractual; the kinds of ongoing revision of the syllabus described by Elkins et al. would be possible only with 100% consensus from the student population of each course.

Consequently, what our students know about the practical making of art might be supported by student-run clubs, galleries and other voluntary initiatives. But, that knowledge is largely acquired before the students arrive at the university – not at it. These standing institutional obstacles to studio-based/practical knowledge of art were made much worse during the COVID era when visits to museums, galleries, studio facilities at neighboring universities, or even the downtown campus became impossible. Watching pre-recorded lectures, participating in virtual seminars, reading PDFs, looking at digital images: those were the ways to learn about art.

'Drawing for Art Historians' was first offered in 2022 with the aim of bringing modest redress to that dismal situation. While the seminar (capped at fifteen advanced students, but oversubscribed in the two iterations I have offered) has been framed in relation to influential figures in the history of science such as Pamela H. Smith, William R. Newman and Sven Dupré, the course is motivated by a longstanding desire to integrate my own studio background more substantially into art-historical practice as well as to reclaim method from its compression into 'theory' as favored by the 'New Art History'

generation. The seminar requires students to make drawings in response to weekly prompts, and then to write brief entries about what they do – or don't – learn as art historians from the making enterprise.

Using the chronological demarcation provided by a pre-existing course code entitled 'Studies in Late-18th/Early nineteenth Century Art', the course seeks to highlight the breadth of drawing practices operative in the eighteenth century. I purposefully omit the 'fine arts' model of pedagogy centered around life drawing, which persists both in my introductory lecture course on eighteenth-century art and, more uncomfortably, in contemporary studio contexts (see Elkins et al. 10). Exercises in the seminar have centered around silhouetting, marbling, cosmetics, drawing for silk weaving and, per below, 'risk diagramming', along with practices closer to academic art history: ink blotting, watercolor (and alum-gelatin sizing of paper for it), and pastel, among others. I typically introduce these topics with brief (20 min) lectures situating a given practice in historical context. However, to make these lectures most useful to the students, they would ideally be delivered a week *prior* to the class dedicated to each technique/material since our weekly, three-hour classroom meetings are used for showing and telling about making experiences, not the making itself. In a different direction from the study sheet included in Mark Piucci's response, working out a standard grading rubric that would allow me to evaluate drawings and writings by fifteen-plus students on a near-weekly basis was a crucial prolegomenon to offering the course. What follows are some excerpts from the syllabus and an example of one weekly prompt.

'Embodied knowing'; 'artisanal epistemology'; 'maker's knowledge': terms like these (along with some lavish funding) have recently drawn many historical researchers to forms of practice-based investigation. By recreating production techniques used in the past, so historians of art, science and neighboring fields have argued, investigators can pose new questions. Insights can be gained about artworks and the cultures from which they emerged in ways that are simply inaccessible to conventional academic methods, which continue to privilege text-based evidence.

This seminar seeks neither to critique nor to historicize recent scholarly efforts in making-as-knowing, although we will engage with some critiques and historicization. Nor does 'Drawing for Art Historians' aim to teach drawing skills in the manner of an art-school class. Instead, this course uses the foundational practice of drawing at a moment of its rich, variegated spread in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century for methodological purposes. Considering the work of art historians who draw (for example: Hamilton 2018; Racette 2016, 223–229), we will put graphic practices to some gentle tests to pose the following question: what, if anything, can art history learn by doing?

'Drawing for Art Historians' is an experiment on many levels. We will be joined by several interdisciplinary guests. Further, reading and writing – cornerstones of assessment in a seminar – will command complementary status here. Privileged instead will be acts of making and demonstrations (in exercises, writings and contributions to class-time discussion) of ability to reconcile material techniques into the domain of art-historical knowledge production. To stress: our brief is not just to experiment with drawing materials. No 'artistic ability' is expected or required for success in this course. Rather, our aim is to consider how, where and why trials of material techniques might or might not enrich the steps and procedures of art-historical knowledge-making. You will succeed in this class to the extent you are willing and able to reflect upon how practical making can/cannot advance, inspire or re-route art-historical method.

Sample exercise: risk diagramming

Insurance seems abstract. Stationed somewhere between intangible commodity and service, insurance resists vision and easy comprehension. Yet, by the late eighteenth century, underwriters and their agents had begun using numerous visual schemes for rating, ranking and pricing risks. How can a risk be diagrammed? And what exactly does such a diagram visualize?

This week's défi asks you, first, to read through the instructions (both textual and graphic) given to agents by Aetna, a leading fire insurer in the nineteenth-century United States. Then, using the graphic conventions specified in Aetna's 1857 manual, draw a risk and price it. Next, write a journal entry (single-spaced, no more than one page) specifying how you chose your risk and what kind of paper/mark-making materials you used to render it (and why). Were Aetna's instructions sufficient for rendering and pricing your risk? If not, what was wanting and how did you deal with it? Finally, reflect on the kinds of skills expected of insurance agents producing such graphic techniques and the possible insights (if any) that art historians might glean from practicing them.

The international K-12 perspective

Mark Piucci

Northglenn, Colorado

I developed this first as a personal study sheet when I was studying artists. I then included it when I taught art students, first at the Cultural Center Oumarou Ganda, Niger; then at Chilchinbeto, in the Navajo Nation; and finally at Northland Pioneer Community College, extension course in Humanities taught at the Monument Valley High School.

Having noticed that most K-12 schools don't have active scope and sequential learning processes, nor a sufficient amount of certified Art Teachers, I attempted my darndest to come up with a simplified study sheet to enable those involved in the learning processes to have a short way to comprehend what is known and for to understand their own perceptions of art works. An easy peasy way of recording what the learner has perceived as factual belief, and what has been experienced, discovered and explored. I did this while working with a dozen or more apprentices at CCOG. Hanging out with craftsmen behind the zoo in Niamey. Living with a tribe for a week in the tropics, making Batiks. It incorporates observations I made about their various art practices.

French West African schools did not have room for individuals who could not conform, even if they were unique and special in their own way. All that also encouraged me to develop the personal study sheet. It was most unfortunate that the system wouldn't allow me to choose women for the studio in West Africa. Some of what is part of the study sheet may overlap with concerns developed by other respondents to the Elkins, Briggs, and Wong essay, and I hope it may encourage diverse thinking and discussion.

Personal Study Sheet

Title _____

Artist _____

Date _____

Medium _____

Dimension _____

THE ARTIST'S SELECTION PROCESS :

Motive

Inspiration

Training

Technique

Circumstances

Economics

Social prestige

Production

THE ARTWORK'S FUNCTION :

Symbol of Unity

Mytho-religious

Power Structure

Social Cohesion

Didactic

Prestige

Public Display

Burlesque

Entertainment

Disjunction

Academic

YOUR OPINION:

What motivates a learner or Artist to make a 2D or 3D artwork? Are there practical reasons that have to do with survival in the third poorest nation in the world, maybe job related, for pure enjoyment? For one circumstance, the apprentices in my studio didn't have cars or bicycles. Those individuals live in clan situations and took what they learned from inventing things in their childhood. Finding assortments of wire, for example, to emulate forms such as their perception of what is a car, truck, airplane and either found a very tiny motor or had a long wire to push it.

Where does the individual or individuals get the want and need? The family, the clan, the institution? Expressing a need or desire maybe for food to contribute to the family?

Does the artist involve themselves in some sort of training? From a guild, a technique handed down by a clan or family? Does the artist just happen to make something because they have to eat or do they get kudos from making something that a social class commands some sort of object or event? The Peul or Fulani were making bracelets out of milk of magnesia bottles and selling them to the tourists like hotcakes. Not too far from their attention to attitude toward color. The more stuff they can fit on the camel that has value gives them social status. Perhaps the learner could find an object and repurpose it.

Jeff Koons, for instance, hires a group of fine artists to discuss and fabricate what they may think society would accept, like his metallic dog in the form of balloons. Does that acquire some sort of social prestige?

The Hopi and Navajo make kachina dolls from a certain kind of wood. One piece might express social cohesion, and another control of the marketplace. I was told in Moencopi, near Tuba City, Arizona, that white man could not make Kachina dolls or they'd be cursed. Until one family of Hopis found that I was a fine artist and educator; then they invited me to participate in the fashioning of kachinas. Sitting in a room with others in an oval, passing the kachina around. They were chill (chanting). Each person doing a specific part of the evolving kachina. So in a foundation class, learners could discuss what to construct for whatever reason and then proceed to create a figurine together relating similarities and differences, and discussing possible functions.

They practiced writing their thoughts and feelings down using their own selection processes and their artworks' functions, documenting what they had experienced, explored and discovered. They worked together in groups to understand and involve the surrounding cultures – enacting 'indigenous knowledge systems through art' in Clare McCracken's words, working like the 'Drawing for Art Historians' class mentioned by Mathew C Hunter.

Having personally experienced doing Batik in a community inside the thick tropics in a village that made their money from doing batik, I saw how learners could pick aspects of culture and experience, and explore and discover new images. After that, reporting on their artworks showed them how they functioned in their particular society.

Integrating theory into studio classes

Clare McCracken

School of Art RMIT, Melbourne/Naarm, Australia

We are undergoing a significant restructure, including our Art History and Theory department (named Art + History + Theory + Cultures at our School). As we go through this process, I have been reflecting on our School Vision, which asks the question: what does it mean to practice on unceded land in the context of the Asia Pacific and global networked culture in a climate emergency? Also contained in the School Vision is the acknowledgment that our students and staff come from diverse communities from all parts of the world and that we are therefore committed to critically reflecting on our histories, problematizing knowledge, and situating multiple perspectives through an inclusive curriculum and praxis-based pedagogies. So, to fulfill our School Vision, Art Theory in our context must acknowledge and celebrate Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander sovereignty, decentre its understanding of the cannon to teach non-western traditions, problematize the role of art in histories of dispossession and violence while also acknowledging the critical role that artists play in shaping and reshaping the contemporary world in the era of climate change. It must also be taught with the student's practice in mind, which is most pertinent to this discussion. While this restructure provides us with the opportunity to rethink how we have been teaching Art Theory, it is occurring after ten years of significant change (undertaken by four different Art Theory Coordinators), all of which has shifted the content of our offerings to reflect the question in our School

Vision as well as addressing what was seen as a gap between Art Theory and what our students were doing in the studio.

As Michael Carter has observed, art theory is often viewed as having almost a ‘parasitic’ relationship to practice, with practice being the ‘real thing’ we are at art school to do. In contrast, theory is done ‘postproduction to justify or frame what has been created’ (1990, 31). However, as Robyn Stewart has noted, the reality of contemporary art practice in Australia is that our students must be ‘articulate practitioners’ who can ‘analyze and write about their practice’ (2001, 1). In the third year (our final year), all students do a course called ‘Contextualising Practice’. This course differs from their earlier Art Theory courses as it is dedicated to developing how they critically frame and discuss their practice. Over 12 weeks, we present 12 one-hour lectures devoted to different theoretical lenses of relevance to contemporary practitioners in Australia, including Indigenous ontologies, Decolonizing and Settler-colonial Theory, Critical Race Theory, New Materialism, Marxist Materialism and Posthumanism, Queer and Feminist Theory, Psychoanalytic Theory, Media Theory, and others. These lectures, presented by practicing artists, introduce the artists’ practice before articulating how they have used theory to elucidate or shape what they make and how they make it. In other words, the lectures explain a research journey and that journey’s relationship to a person’s practice as a way to avoid the ‘post-production’ theoretical justification. The 12-week lecture schedule is supported by 12 workshops that include class discussions where students unpack the lecture content and readings in relation to their practice, develop a practice-led research question, analyse each other’s work, and build a vocabulary to discuss their practice and process. The course culminates in an essay written by each student that applies critical theory to their practice and/or process. The assignment encourages students to break some of the traditional rules of academic writing by considering how writing may become a method to unpack and understand what they are doing in the studio. Fifteen of the best essays are published each year in our Graduate Profile, which documents the creative practice of every graduating student. Art Theory had never had a presence at graduation; by publishing the essays, we articulate the importance of theory to the development of creative practice (last year’s essay can be seen here).

Contextualizing Practice is a popular course with students and studio leaders. Student feedback, collected through a voluntary Course Experience Survey (CES) that students are asked to complete each semester, regularly acknowledges it as a particularly successful Art Theory course. However, ‘Contextualising Practice’s’ ability to permeate the culture of the studio is also linked to the efforts of studio staff who diligently review the course content and lectures so that they can discuss them in class. ‘Contextualising Practice’ and the core studio courses have aligned assessment tasks. The first assignment in Contextualising Practice is an annotated bibliography where students annotate four texts that elucidate or inform their practice. In their studio course, they write a studio proposal allowing them to discuss these texts again and how they inform their understanding of their practice.

In foundation Art Theory, which we are writing now, I will be bringing the studio into Art Theory rather than Art Theory into the studio. The course will be called ‘Place and Contexts’. It starts with a First Nations first approach, foregrounding Indigenous knowledge systems through art. It helps students understand their position on stolen territory in the Asia Pacific, in a networked world, during the climate crises. Each lecture does this through art, and we hope to have a mixture of long-form lectures and on-site lectures

that use new technologies like sound walks and augmented reality. The assessment tasks include the development of traditional research skills using databases and archives, as well as assignments that encourage students to use sound recording, photography, and drawing as research methods. We will ask through some of the assignments: what do creative methods offer Art History and Theory? We hope this will help students understand the importance of art theory to artists and innovative, creative methods in art history and theory. By the end of this class, students will have developed a positionality statement that they can use and grow throughout their degree.

After foundation, our students choose from electives that address our School Vision. These courses have gradually moved away from a traditional art history model of a weekly topic dedicated to a different movement to a framework that highlights key artistic methods across history as a way of helping students understand the links between studio practice and Art History and Theory. These courses are decentred from the western canon, presenting detailed analysis of alternative histories, contemporary art and futures. As such, they problematize Art History by unpacking the role of art as a colonizing force and some of the key assumptions of the discipline. These courses include 'Art, Society and Politics', 'Making Art on a Changing Planet', 'Reshaping Worlds', and 'Matter' (which is currently being written). Finally, it should be noted that 'Reshaping Worlds', which focuses on the diverse range of contemporary art practices and curatorial approaches in the Asia Pacific, has directly influenced the studio practices of many students. In their article on the success of the course, Nguyen, Leong, and Sharp (2024) discuss the considerable impact of 'seeing oneself' in the curriculum, with one student noting that the course had a 'profound impact, not only [on their] artistic practice, but on [they're] acceptance within [their] cultural identity'. The student noted that '[g]rowing up as a Vietnamese-Australian girl in Wurundjeri Country in predominantly white neighbourhoods, learning about white history with white teachers had subconsciously instilled an insidious sense of inferiority towards [their] race' (2024). By directly confronting this, 'Reshaping Worlds' helps all students understand the value of their voice and creative practice.

In conclusion, I'd like to note that I use the term 'decentred' rather than 'decolonized' as the Art History and Theory coordinator simply because we are a settler-colonial state. As Patrick Wolfe noted, settler-colonialism is not a single event but a structure; in our context, that structure is ongoing (1999).

Toward the diachronic mirror

Lucia Fagen-DeLuca

California College of the Arts

The curriculum must mirror the students. As an art historian with a Ph.D. (not an MFA) teaching studio/theory hybrid courses in an art school, I have spent the past four years honing material interventions for the harm caused by a canon in which I was trained, in which I have felt left out, and which I have also perpetuated in various ways over

the past twenty-five years. But teaching studio/theory hybrid courses such as the Upper Division Interdisciplinary Studio (UDIST) course I designed for CCA students is not about me, it is about them.

As first years, undergraduates in my sections of the team taught ‘Global Introduction to the Arts’ (IA) do a Diachronic Creative Project; as sophomores, my students dabble with postcolonial theory and media studies in Eye Openers; and in their last gasp before graduation, they arrive in UDIST and want to do what they want to do. In each of these very different art school courses, taught in History of Art and Visual Cultures (HAVC) and UDIST it is often the assignments more than the didactic lectures and demos that have allowed my students to shine. The results are currently under revision for a new textbook which will feature their work alongside other older, dead, or famous artists of the past named and unnamed.

Whereas learning outcomes, rubrics, critiques, and textbooks can be used as bandages for the many flaws of the discipline, for me it is the *verbs*. Action is the essence of the answer – the cathartic aspect that creates a dialogue between past, present, and future without slipping into the amorphous abyss of ‘futurisms’ or other vague utopian/dystopian versions of the tired old *au de la*. Rather than what to include or exclude, whether we read bell hooks or Sarah Ahmed on summer break, it is the *how* more than the *what*. And, as I recently encouraged Ph.D. students at Tribhuvan University in Nepal during a Hindi/English lecture translated on the fly – *lila*, or play, the play of the gods, playfulness, hovering with feet a bit above ground – we must turn to the idea of *lila* as ‘divine play’ but also as playful. Theory requires agility – it is now the purview of multilingual binational dyslexic artist practitioner scholars trained in South Asian art histories like me, it is now the mandate of the Global South, and it is now the joy to have praxis and theory finally collapse into feminist and post-binary female forms of knowing. Together we globally throw Descartes and Calvin by the wayside, ecumenically, culturally, spatially, dynamically, and forcefully.

Each student picks their verb, toolbox, attributes, weapons, and vehicles to engage with the past on their own terms. My syllabi include this central invocation: ‘Your project might perform one or more of these acts: *critique, echo, conjure, heal, dream, determine, deride, revisit, celebrate, mourn, memorialize, lament, or revel* to engage with the history of art in a way that feels empowering to you.’

This *diachronic method* offers belonging because students negotiate those verbs on their own terms – not as dictated by me as their professor. As many places in the US reexamine their institutions in terms of DEIB, defining terms such as *diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging* becomes more and more complex.

At CCA, Tricia Brand leads us with ideas such as: (1) inclusion is not a natural consequence of diversity and (2) a sense of belonging is relational, reciprocal, and dynamic. Any art historian or artist who is a professor at an art school must also consider their own labor conditions, as well as the future conditions of their own students. ‘We need a gender furlough in pandemic,’ I rant to Anu on FB; Anu suggests a manifesto that two tired moms don’t have time to write; and Badly keeps them going as part of their asynchronous Girded Loin Society. An institution is an abstraction, a thing no one wants to seem to own, but it is a dynamic thing we make in our own image. Plant a garden when you are in a food desert, dance when you have no gym, collaborate when you have no childcare, sew masks for the rez when the gov forgets to care – shine bright like a diamond, burnout like a star. Both. Fight chromophobia in color, and let the line never crawl too straight.

If we consider diversity as representation, say by making visible statistics on faculty, will *unseen* elements of diversity be included, such as ethnicity, culture, sexuality, gender, and neurodiversity? They should be, but then again ... What if public diversity is too dangerous or puts people at risk for harm, or what if its lack perpetuates endless cycles of violence? What if hidden ones aren't included and then we are included with our own oppressors. How can we do art history without harm? Can we? Art history was a taxonomy (a positivist colonial malady, an 'archival fever' in Derrida's terms that does anything but dance), but it can instead be Pandora's box – an open ended endless version of possibilities where Persephone doesn't have to go to hell and Adonis still is worshiped in the fields. How wild can we be, how truthfully can we publish in 2023 – after a pandemic when we and our students and our families almost died. Is it really just Greek? And what was that really like, after all. Who gets to define the 'fente' (is it only Fontana?), and do you have to actually have one to speak to the picture plane? Will z be enough to get us past x and y?

If we consider equity as action, then what if art schools practiced the 10:1 ratio between the top paid employee and the bottom paid employee, or even better 7:1 as a more radical union member of mine likes to remind us? I think there should be a 10:1 ratio between the top paid employee and the bottom paid (an 'adjunct 1', who teaches just one course). So for example if that person makes 10k, then the top salary should be capped at 100k. That would be ethical. It is not ok to consider a full time artist who teaches even one class as not worthy of basic needs like housing or healthcare. If that person makes 15k then the top would be 150k. That is what 10:1 looks like.

I like how the original article considers *labor* in relation to teaching art and art history, because after all we are teaching not just content but also we are modeling how to be in the world – what we accept, what we change, what we dream, how we configure our own liberation; or, how we remain in the situations we are in to negotiate our own existence as thinkers and makers alongside the next generation rising alongside us. In an abundance model, it might look like 60k to 600k. Which interestingly would put the bottom employees right into a living wage in San Francisco, albeit technically below the HUUD poverty lines for low income.

I like Brand's idea that 'inclusion is culture' – absolutely so for better or for worse. Like it or not, part of my culture as a biethnic person is *kvetch*. Like the stitch 'n' bitch taught in my Diachronic class at CCA (see 'further information'), *kvetch* is the yiddish word for bitchin' and the therapeutic pull of needle piercing taught fabric echoes the new canons that we bring into the decolonial room. What if the grandmother comes into the room? Shy Pacheco Hamilton reminds us to imagine in the Decolonial School she co-founded with Juan Carlos Rodriguez Rivera. Shy's manifesting matriarchy should be scaled to envelope the entire universe. On a more personal level, like Virginia Woolf and yet totally unlike her in so many ways, I must return to my own conditions as a writer – not to navel gaze, because I am not alone. I am one of masses and masses of adjunct professors just like me. It is hard to have the time and energy to enjoy inclusion or to participate in a citizen way in my institution when I have to work two jobs teaching 8–9 classes per year to make a living wage with inflation in the Bay Area. The burnout is real based on my health, my writing, my art, my family, my students. I want to be included in a way that is economically just. I didn't sign up for extreme austerity. Full

disclosure, I am both overjoyed to be included in this publication alongside my peers and unpaid for this piece of writing. This is a feminist problem, and also a Marxist one intersectionally. Virginia Woolf did not just have a room of her own, but also time to be in it writing, or in the case of artists, time for studio practice. Our students also work two or three jobs to fund tuition that is part of a much larger debt problem accelerating as we write. How do we teach art and art history under these economic conditions that impact their time so unevenly?

Brand shared the idea of belonging with us in the formula: ‘Belonging is the ethos’. What is ethos, I asked myself (an art historian who routinely deconstructs gender, Greek democracy, and art every fall as a South Asianist art historian and Italian-American Jewish artist and theorist teaching Global Intro to the Arts). I should know what ethos is – I scold myself in a language not Sanskrit; I’m better versed in the Indian aesthetic text of the *Natya Shastra*. ‘Why have you not studied Latin?’ my fifth-generation Harvard advisor wanted to know when I was in grad school somewhere else. ‘Because I studied Hebrew, and now I know Sanskrit,’ I answered plainly as we bumped along a twentieth-century road in an Ambassador car in Madhya Pradesh, India. I was remembering how hard it was to acquire a heritage language as a Bat Mitzvah survivor given the short passage of the 10 commandments in a language with letters different from English that are written in the opposite direction. Why would I have been taught Latin, the language of the church, in high school? I went to an alternative school where we read *La Nausée* in French, and I did independent study in Italian to read Dante’s *Inferno* in the original. ‘Perseverance is the only way to survive,’ this dyslexic author wrote in her high school yearbook. ‘Enough’, my colleague Anne Wolf stitches, so many ways to say it, as many as there are Jewish heroines in my life whom I etch into clay, but are there ever enough ways to say enough, and what does it really mean? Hebrew and Sanskrit are enough, Hindi, French, Italian, Tibetan, Sign Language, Clay, Oil Paint, and Stitch are enough. I am enough, she is enough, the union is enough, you are enough, the institution is enough, the students are enough – and if we do it wrong, which we all mess up all the time, they won’t know – what if the students don’t realize they are ENOUGH, more than enough? That in the words of Jeff Cheng, ‘They gonna be alright’, that in the words of Andrea Long Chu, ‘We are all female.’ Studio theory hybrid art and art history must ingrain in students that they are enough, their making is enough, their past, present, and future is enough. And make spaces for them to say when, enough is enough.

But I digress, *ethos*. Is ethos like *zeitgeist* without the nineteenth century Geist? Are we haunted or is that just more romantic conference talk? According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, ethos is ‘the characteristic spirit of a culture, era, or community as manifested in its beliefs and aspirations’. Ooo la la, we have manifestation (think both ontological and on strike!), we have belief (do we still even try to separate church and state in the classroom, or our own heads? – Dude, admit it: 85% of you is part of the hegemony, ha), and we have aspirations (breathe, no pressure folx ... oh and have you vacuumed lately? How do *you* aspirate? Or does someone aspirate for you? A lung, a carpet, a c-pap machine). If ‘Belonging is the ethos’, I belong by participating, by writing, by thinking, by being, by doing, by saying, by making – and as a professor, I invite my students to do the same.

'I'm going to say something enticing, then make you wait ...' a brilliant and kind administrator recently opened a meeting at one of the two schools where I teach – her hook was irresistible ... the whole zoom room palpably leaned in to hear what might come next. I'm going to borrow that, I thought – so this Diachronic Mirror Missive benefits from the loose joy of the writing classes I teach but also from my mentor's audacity, both bombastic and quiet. My forthcoming textbook will include the how to, but for now let us conclude the journey and then finally turn to the mirror.

From shame to resistance, from exhaustion to existence. One step at time, from shame to resistance to audacity to pride to radiance (the frustration always remains) – but this student's comment in my teaching evals from a state school was a first – 'I think one of her strengths is her dyslexia. Her knowledge, educational skills, and wit make her a brilliant professor. I think for someone who isn't familiar with topics concerning Art History, I believe her passion and expertise, alongside her personality, make it to be a fun and thought-provoking experience for anyone. Overall, fantastic professor!' My neurodiversity brings agility, resilience, tenderness, creativity, fear and overcompensation. We are more often in prison than college professors, but *not in art school*. The misfits, the alternative people, the ones with a dream, every cliché about art school, but that said – it is true that what studio practice gives us is the ability to express ideas beyond words. This cathartic liberation is what is at the heart of *diachronic practice* as an art historical method for art school.

Our job in a studio theory/hybrid setting is to make the past, present, and future speak beyond words – through images and ideas, multisensory experiments, and ways of learning beyond the cortisol-fueled grind. In the pandemic, the whole country ran out of meds. My students suffered, their work suffered, people I knew suffered, professors I know suffered. And yet, we must pretend like everything is ok, like we all just go on. Some address racial inequity, others trans rights, some talk about 'what is happening' and others do not. One of the ideas the original article addresses is that of 'social history' more broadly and how it intersects with 'formalism' to put it in 1970s terms, or in more recent (and somewhat self congratulatory terms) the melancholic triumphal 'Farewell to an Idea' or the 'End of Comparative Lit' published by the enshrined famous greats. Studio practice leaned historically toward formalism, but could also do social history. Art history could go either way, both rooted in the visual, and unable to let go of the story in its very name (despite multiple attempts – Visual Studies, Visual Culture, Material Culture, Media Studies, etc).

It would not be an uncommissioned publication if I did not give myself the luxury of concluding with Lacan. He defines the mirror phase psychoanalytically as the developmental stage when humans figure out self, other, intersubjective and more by looking in the mirror. When the baby looks in the mirror, does it understand its reflection as part of itself? What is the role of the mother in mirroring Melanie Klein or Winnecott might ask ... 'And, after analysis?', someone like Jaleh Mansoor might push us, reminding us of systems vs the individual in the pathologizing gaze of psychoanalysis. Beyond any of these authors or their theories, the metaphor of the mirror is useful. It is a reflection. This prompt asks us to reflect. Like the endless mirrors held by the Naykas in 15th-eighteenth century North Indian painting (see Molly Aitken for more on that), our job as educators is to hold up a mirror so that our students can better see themselves and each other – not to teach them what they are, or we are, or were or will be.

Further information

The Diachronic Radio Show, CCA Community Radio
<https://www.cca.edu/newsroom/diachronic-embroidery-a-stitch-in-time/>

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all of my chairs, deans, and the amazing staff at CCA who introduced me to the studio/theory hybrid model in UDIST, allowed me to play to my strengths as my true self, and to go the extra mile in the pandemic to support me in throwing embroidery supplies over walls like a newspaper route from my car. I would also like to thank my colleagues and chairs at the state school where I get to teach exactly in my field of South Asian Art History, to decolonize teaching Korean, Vietnamese, and Philippine art histories, and to teach GVAR a writing course where 85% of my art students also overcome a variety of disabilities like me. This writing is dedicated to all of my students at both schools over the past 7 years – each of the 100–200 of you per semester has changed my experience of the world and how I imagine our collective visual futures. Thanks also to both of my college/university presidents who teach me how to lead but also who mirror to me things I didn't even realize until I saw through their eyes. Shout out also to many of my amazing, creative, and supportive colleagues—it is a pleasure to work as and among artists and art historians in person, and on social media more broadly.

Case study: an artist-adjusted assignment

Sarah Magnatta 

University of Denver

As the art history instructor of one of the contemporary art courses required for our studio art undergraduates, I struggle with how to best incorporate conversations or class exercises that more directly reference or impact our students' own practices. Our art history and studio art courses remain quite siloed, and so I am working within a largely traditional system that retains many of the problems listed by James Elkins, Maggie Wong, and Troy Briggs in their linked report.

I am wowed by the authors' complete overall and rethinking of what a first year studio art student's experience might be; however, the logistics and limitations of our institution prevent any such overhaul, at least at this point. The experiment and results have, however, inspired me to continue grappling with how to best serve the studio art students in my contemporary art history courses. Here, I would like to share a very simple (but effective) modification to a fairly standard art history paper/presentation assignment. It may be of help to those of us unable to enact major changes in the department curricula at this point, but nevertheless would like to better serve the studio art students in our art history courses (first-year or otherwise).

The original assignment calls for students to either write a more straightforward paper (I now ask them to consider a 'lens' rather than asking for an 'argument', as the slight change in language seems to result in less confusion) or an exhibition proposal. Both

require the same number of pages and both ask for a specific lens/theme to be emphasized. One of our texts is always Jean Robertson and Craig McDaniel's *Themes of Contemporary Art: Visual Art after 1980* (2022), as the students find the chapter divisions by theme to be easily accessible and relatable: identity, the body, time, memory, place, language, science, and spirituality. Most students stick with one of these lenses in their papers/exhibition proposals, but some go beyond, or craft papers/exhibitions that explore more nuanced readings of their chosen art/artist(s)' works. The flexibility herein allows for the vast range of experiences in the classroom (some art history undergraduates, some graduate art historians, many studio art undergraduates, and a few who have no art/art history background whatsoever).

As a side note, I should mention that we spend quite a bit of time speaking about *how* to use these themes and related sources in their writing. Many students enter the class with the notion that each of their bibliographic sources must pertain directly to their chosen artist or work (and thus, I've had students say 'I wish I could work on so-and-so artist, but there isn't anything written about them!') Students struggle to move away from this 'summary approach;' they have often been trained to just gather as many sources on the related topic as possible and summarize. We thus discuss at length how a theme, lens, argument – however you want to call it – can be applied to any work of art as an original perspective. By using the theme/lens assignment and encouraging students to choose artists who do not have any (or many) sources written about them (Instagram is a great resource for this!), students begin to appreciate how their own voices and lenses can be applied to looking at and writing about art.

For the case study I share here, one of my studio art undergraduate students, Alex Blom, used his chosen lens of queer spirituality to discuss works by Andy Warhol, Robert Gober, Ryan Driscoll, and others. His paper, as he proposed it to me, would include 'both well-known works and pieces from emerging, current artists ... to provide a holistic and comprehensive narrative of queer, "other" spirituality ... The resulting collection of works defines a pseudo-renaissance of self-love and expression in an age where the Catholic churches continue to invalidate our existence'. Alex then suggested that he incorporate his own artistic practice and artworks into the study. I was initially hesitant; however, he convincingly communicated his desire to contextualize his own works into the conversation of his chosen modern and contemporary examples. I thought of the writings of Amalia Mesa-Bains, including her chapter *Domesticana: The Sensibility of Chicana Rasquachismo* in Gabriela F. Arredondo's (ed.) *Chicana Feminisms: a Critical Reader* (see link below). In future iterations of this course, I may include this text as required reading as it so seamlessly pulls together art historical and personal studio art theory and praxis. I'm also quite intrigued by the SAIC experiment's use of personal 'reversed' timelines for art students; I may incorporate similar reflective practices as a preliminary step prior to the paper in the future. In addition to serving as a thoughtful exercise for all students, the reversed timeline and discussions of personal influences might be useful in breaking down insecurities students arrive with to the classroom: namely, that there are 'correct' influences to have, or 'correct' artists to like and discuss (I also appreciate the 'boxes' assignment/ assessment for likewise encouraging student engagement with works they connect with, not ones deemed acceptable by art world gatekeepers.)

Alex ended up developing a wonderful paper and presentation. What's more, the other students were heavily invested in his presentation and asked numerous questions about many of the works shown. This simple tweak in assignment – the allocation of space for studio art students to incorporate their work into their broader research projects – produced an impactful class session. Alex's presentation (link below) was later chosen by the entire department for a state-wide symposium and his artwork was exhibited shortly thereafter at the Vicki Myhren Gallery on campus in a wonderful 'real-world' combined display of art historical and studio art virtuosity.

My proposed (and, optional) assignment modification is perhaps obvious to many instructors who are reading this. If not, however, this is a minor adjustment that could be incorporated into many 'traditional' art history courses that are currently unable to offer the 'deconstructed and merged' format of the SAIC classes. I'm now considering a similar addition to assignments in my World Art survey courses. Though students may be writing about cave wall art, for example, perhaps they pull in their own experiences doing local murals, who knows?! My thanks to the instructors and participants of the SAIC experiment for sharing the results of their intensive project and inspiring us to continue thinking through these connections.

Further information

Alex Blom's presentation is here (<https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1UG5y3gqJeKX-BRgsUG1Vg82S4S00irLU/edit?usp=sharing&oid=106433610353804996665&rtpof=true&sd=true>). Thank you to Alex for permission to discuss and link the work. Amalia Mesa-Bains' chapter *Domesticana: The Sensibility of Chicana Rasquachismo* in Gabriela F. Arredondo's (ed.) *Chicana Feminisms: a Critical Reader* is here (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NAdoqjoxMG3e2dSnM5th76TvcF12UC2/view?usp=sharing>).

Art history tools in an artist's toolbox

Anna Tahinci

The Glassell School of Art, Houston

I teach Art History at the Glassell School of Art, the teaching institute of the MFAH (Museum of Fine Arts Houston). My colleagues are artists, and I am the only full-time art historian in a studio school that both belongs to a museum and serves as the studio school of the University of Saint Thomas. I have encountered the problems discussed by James Elkins, Maggie Wong, and Troy Briggs. My suggestions are based on successful methodological practices and assignments. I have no real criticism, rather answers to the question 'What (if anything) is missing?'

My Art History students are a mix of art students and continuing education/lifelong learning students. I have a varied academic background in the humanities, the outcome of my European tuition-free education (archaeology, museum studies, comparative literature, PhD in art history). I teach four art history courses every semester: Western

art history survey in two semesters (from Cave to Medieval and from Renaissance to Contemporary), Global Art Appreciation (formal elements of art, principles of design, and arts media), courses on one specific artist (my own art historical expertise in on Rodin and his lifetime collectors), women in art, French art and literature, and contemporary art in Houston. I also design and offer special courses in conjunction with temporary exhibitions at the MFAH and lead Study Abroad programs to Greece and France with contributions by studio colleagues. As part of my professional development, I am taking one studio class every semester to keep learning about how artworks are made.

Student-centered learning is key when teaching Art History in an art school and I have fine-tuned the content of my courses to my students' needs and wants. Based on my experience, first-year studio students benefit more from taking a Global Art Appreciation course before a chronological Art History Survey. Art Appreciation and the step-by-step study of formal elements of art (line, space, light and color, form, texture, and pattern), principles of design (balance, scale, proportion, rhythm, unity, and variety), and arts media (drawing, painting, printmaking, photography, sculpture, craft media, and architecture) seems a more meaningful initial approach. Art Appreciation textbooks are more tailored to art students. I currently use Henry Sayre's *A World of Art* but have also considered *Gateways to Art* by Debra J. DeWitte, Ralph M. Larmann, and M. Kathlyn Shields. Once future artists have studied Global Art Appreciation, they can study Art History chronologically in order to learn the 'what' and the 'when' in order to better understand the 'why' and the 'how' across space and time.

I appreciate very much the idea of boxes (a Box of Art History, a Box of Ideas, and a Box of Materials) and would add more Art History tools in the artist's toolbox. I think of tools as keys to open doors of appreciation and discover new doors to open. Instead of focusing exclusively on artists' skills I would emphasize meaningful visual storytelling and creative problem solving from cave to contemporary.

Art history tools in an artist's toolbox: visual thinking strategies, visual analysis and synthesis

Future artists need visual literacy in the form of a vocabulary to go from seeing to saying, from visual to verbal. A linguistic approach has proven very helpful, one word at a time, so that students can use those newly acquired words first in a sentence, then in a paragraph, and finally in a short essay. An ability to go from observation to interpretation is vital: What do you see? How do you interpret what you see?

Philip Yenawine's Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS) has proven a helpful methodological tool that can be applied to virtually any artwork: 1. What is going on in this artwork? 2. What do you see that makes you say that? 3. What more can we find?

I have developed and fine-tuned an equation for both visual analysis but also synthesis: *Subject Matter (Content) + Style (Form) + Context + Function (Purpose) = Meaning* (ideally multi-layered meaning). I have adapted the French 'dissertation' methodology (thesis, antithesis, and synthesis) to a color scheme (black, white, and shades of gray).

Towards the end of each lecture my students do an in-class practical exercise engaging with one object from the MFAH collection. Students practice Slow Art, VTS, and visual analysis and synthesis.

Further information

Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS): <https://vtshome.org/>

Anna Tahinci, "Subject Matter + Style + Context + Function = Meaning", in *ARTlines2 An Anthology*, Public Poetry, 2015.

A survey in global visual culture: work in progress

Marion S. Lee

Ohio University

My 'comment' below is in two parts: A. Writing assumptions that are essentially responses to both the integrated course offered at SAIC and in these responses, and B. Organizing points behind part 2 of the survey foundational course that I teach at Ohio University. Afterward, under heading C., I'll consider our four writing assignments.

A. Working assumptions/caveats

1. General comment on the 'integrated studio and art history' course, offered at SAIC and described in the article.

I have found the overall mission of the class at SAIC 'a coherent first-year experience' 'foundational year', along with the enabling four-part structure – the studio component, the 28 Concept (short 10–25 min) Lectures, and the 28 History Lectures along with 'the Boxes of Ideas' (including the link) deeply admirable and thoughtful. I am also in agreement with the 'Seven Problems' concerning the world art history survey and foundational year, stated at the beginning of the Article.

2. 'Intended' students ('audiences') in the survey/foundational years offered

Echoing analogous points in these responses, I would like to mention the point of intended students, in consideration of the two-part art history foundational course (recently revamped) that are offered at the School of Art and Design (hereafter as Art + Design), Ohio University, titled 'From Caves to Calligraphy: Global Art + Design 1' and 'From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art and Design 2.'

The intended students are in Art + Design (art history, studio, and design [respectively graphic and interior]) within the College of Fine Arts, as well as other majors on campus.

In the class ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’ that I taught last Fall, 22 percent of the 96 students enrolled in the class were in Art + Design. 78 percent were majors in other schools within the College of Fine Arts (dance, film, music, theatre, interdisciplinary), as well as schools/departments that are in for the most part, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Communications, professional Health Sciences, and Engineering.

3. Considerations of ‘place’ and ‘fit’

Here I would like to suggest the six descriptions of classes in the survey/foundational year may intersect in two compelling points, about place and the consideration of fit.

(a) Place (and space)

The point about place is stated in the article: ‘The fundamental strategy is to break up the large art history lectures into 10 and 20 min mini-lectures, which are given in the studio and lead directly to studio work.’

Another point made concerning place is in the comment by Clare McCracken, School of Art RMIT in Melbourne, ‘In foundation Art Theory, which we are writing now, I will be bringing the studio into art theory, rather than art theory into the studio. The course will be called Place and Contexts.’

The foregrounding of ‘place’ (physical and/or metaphorical) seen in these instances may help to rupture on the one hand, what has hitherto been the entrenched demarcation between studio (and design) and art history, and on the other, to further both ‘coherence’ between studio and art history/theory, and the ideals ‘global, integration, inter-dependence’, all pointing to possibly part of the shared mission in foundational classes.

(b) Individual fit

Descriptions in the article and in these responses show the inclusion of requirements, conditions, available resources, and (specified) missions that are behind the individual foundational classes, devised and offered on six campuses across the world.

The foundational class at McGill is a ‘Drawing Course for Art Historians’, devised in the absence of a studio program, that Matthew C. Hunter relays in his description.

At Cal Arts in the description by Dr. Deborah Stein of ‘Towards a Diachronic Mirror’ is founded on two among other factors. One is a conscious interrogation of the canon if you will (‘As an art historian with a Ph.D. not an MFA teaching studio/theory hybrid courses in an art school, I have spent the past four years honing material interventions for the harm caused by a canon in which I was trained, in which I have felt left out, and which I have also perpetuated in various ways over the past 25 years.’). The second factor is the ideal of belonging (‘My *diachronic method* offers belonging because students negotiate those verbs on their own terms – not as dictated by me as their professor.’), suggested by another faculty at Cal Arts to be ‘relational, reciprocal, and dynamic’. I discuss below under the same guiding points, place and fit, factors and conditions, reasons and considerations

that are behind ideas and points, constituent of the class, ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’ that I teach.

B. Organizing points and areas in ‘From Google to Gutenberg: Global Art + Design 2’, offered at Art + Design, Ohio University

1. Place (and space)

Regrettably, the three areas, art history, studio, and design were siloed in Art + Design until about two years ago, the exception being that faculty in art history had sat as ‘external members’ on the committees of students in the MFA program. In the last two years, faculty in art history began to be more involved in the BFA and MFA programs in studio, in matters concerning curriculum and ‘training’.

As a corollary, what may continue to be absent is generally, working consensus, if you will be concerning topics and matters of common interests, between and within the three areas in Art + Design. For example, in the art history area, starting in the coming academic year, a textbook is adopted for the two-part foundational class in art history. In teaching the second of the two-part foundational class, ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’ in the Fall, I shall replace the assigned textbook with readings from a range of sources (for reasons that include the second point mentioned in the ‘Seven Problems’, in the Article).

2. The consideration of fit

I would like to reiterate the two-part foundational class in art history is intended for students in studio, design, and art history in Art + Design as well as undergraduates in other majors on campus. Under the circumstances, I have designed the class content for the established enrollment of ‘mixed majors’, in the attention paid more to ‘visual and material cultures’, for want of a better general description, guided by the following points/considerations:

(a) The absence of chronology

- After an introduction to ‘what is art history’ and eschewing the dominant presence of chronology in hitherto art history classes, the class ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’ in the Fall will begin, as usual, with the topic global contemporary, for discussion on material and technique, ‘vision and visibility’, the involvement of relevant particulars in matters of the historical (consideration of political, economic, and local) and social, when discussing specific topics.
- Here, I tend to push as hard as I am able, the ideal of global art, in the attempt to probe and rupture the notion Westernization and Westernized art/art history.

(b) Timeline yoked to topics seen in the 28 Concept Lectures, within the integrated foundational class offered at SAIC

In the same class, I shall continue to discuss a large chunk of Western art history, from the Renaissance through to Impressionism in lectures that are yoked to ideas

and concepts, including those listed as topics of classes from the 28 Concept Lectures, part of the integrated foundational class offered at SAIC and described in the article.

The points/titles that are of interest include ‘the gaze’ (the history of spectatorships when considered alongside relationships between art makers and viewers), ‘representation and mimesis’, ‘politics and art’, ‘time and narrative’, ‘identity and gender’.

(c) A Westernized environment

- For a number of reasons, I shall continue to work with the assumption that the place and space in which the class ‘From Gutenberg to Google; Global Art + Design 2’ takes place is Westernized that is the West remains the standing ground and guiding reference, if you will.
- Under the circumstances, the mention and discussion of anything non-Western would and could (only) be a mark of difference, a distraction, and a relief, rather than the non-Western be constituent of the visual environment.
- The point of Westernization being the basis and environment of the two-part art history foundational class is clearly stated in the first parts of the given titles of the two foundational classes, ‘From Caves to Calligraphy: Global Art + Design 1’ and ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’. In the art and cultures of Japan, Korea, China, and India, the earliest art forms did not appear in caves, which took place only in the West. Neither did the invention of printing on moveable press happen in mid-fifteenth century in any of the non-Western cultures mentioned above.
- In addition to continuing to note and discuss, refer and allude to aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in lectures throughout the class, I plan to discuss DEI yoked to the notion of performativity, in a lecture in the class that is based on a recent published book chapter, on disability and geopolitics, centered on medical portraits done in oil, by an artist in southern China, during the nineteenth century.

(d) The intervention against ‘Art’ in the attention paid to the visual

The leading point of influence in the class that I offer is the emphasis placed on the visual, positioned as being away from the notion of ‘Art’, considered overall by most of the enrolled students to be unnecessarily self-conscious and elitist.

Relevant sub-points that are stressed throughout the class include:

- art is woven into the fabric of daily lives
- the imperative of looking and seeing
- the importance of ‘seeing’ material objects in the lives and environments of individuals
- the ability to analyze and read visual objects, formally, ‘semantically’ and conceptually, that are encountered *ad infinitum* daily.

3. Topics of the four writing assignments in the class:

Assignment 1: Please choose an object or ‘thing’ that is of interest to you for whatever reasons (such as like or dislike, feeling of intrigue, or from memory only if you have kept a photo of the object). The object could be in your possession or not.

Please ‘present’ and discuss verbally the object of choice in two parts:

- (a) Description of the chosen object
- (b) Reason(s) of your choice of the object

Assignment 2: Please choose a standing all-round sculpture, a piece of furniture, or part of a building, all located on campus that has been of interest to you, for whatever reasons, and with which you have experienced frequent or regular interactions (physical, mental, psychological).

Assignment 3 (writing): Please choose a ‘thing’, a standing sculpture, a bench in a park, a piece of furniture outdoors, or a building, all located away from Athens and OU, that is *not* in your personal possession or collection (‘personal’ vs familial, relatives, etc.). Provide a short description of the chosen object and the direction that you plan to engage in for discussion of the same object in Assignment 4.

Assignment 4 (essay): Please let your essay be guided and informed by Assignment 3, in the subject and content that is regarding the chosen ‘thing’ as the subject and the direction mentioned, for discussion.

The essay is a longer and elaborate discussion of the subject in Assignment 3, filled with more pieces of information and details.

Conclusion

This response exercise has provided a welcome opportunity to review, think about, and articulate points and parts of the foundational class ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’, which I continue to teach and whose syllabus and content I revise and change, in varying degrees, every time it is offered.

Last Fall, I taught ‘From Gutenberg to Google: Global Art + Design 2’ for the first time without TAs, and it remains my favorite, hands down.

A note: I thank the staff in the University Library and members of the Chinese University of Hong Kong community for making possible my stay as Visiting Scholar, during the summer of 2023 in an ideal place for engagement in projects, including this writing.

Notes on contributors

S. F. Kislev heads the multidisciplinary school of art at Shenkar college of Engineering, Design and Art. He is an artist, a scholar in the history of philosophy, and a games enthusiast. His book – ‘*Hexagonal Lobes and Other Riddles*’, was published in 2022, and he has recently exhibited an artwork in outer space.

Yanai Toister is an artist, writer, and educator serving as Associate Professor at Shenkar College of Engineering, Design and Art in Tel Aviv (where he also chaired the unit for History and Philosophy between 2017–2022). Toister’s artworks have been exhibited in numerous exhibitions (including: Sandroni.Rey; Dvir Gallery; Kunstahalle Luzern; Bolsky Gallery, Otis College of Art and Design; Maison Européenne de la Photographie; the 11th International Architecture Exhibition at the Venice Biennale; Kunstmuseen Krefeld, Haus Lange; Israel Museum). Toister’s scholarly writing has been published in various books and journals (including: Digital Creativity; Flusser Studies; Journal of Science and Technology of the Arts; Philosophy of Photography; Photographies; Ubiquity). Toister’s book *Photography from the Turin Shroud to the Turing Machine* was published by Intellect/University of Chicago Press.

Matthew C. Hunter teaches in the Department of Art History and Communication Studies at McGill University. Trained in studio art, Hunter researches visual art and architecture of the long eighteenth century, with particular emphasis on their interactions with science and technology. His publications include *Painting with Fire: Sir Joshua Reynolds, Photography and the Temporally Evolving Chemical Object* (University of Chicago Press, 2019) and *Wicked Intelligence: Visual Art and the Science of Experiment in Restoration London* (University of Chicago Press, 2013). He is an editor of *Grey Room*.

Mark Piucci is a retired teacher and artist, with exhibitions at Miami Artworks, curated by Michael and Joanna (2020), Northeastern Pioneer College while teaching on the Navajo Reservation; Phoenix Art Link (1990–2010), Stone Park Italian Cultural Center and Festa Italiano (1987), Chicago Heights Radio Talk Show with Dominic Candeloro (1986), Peace Corps, Niger (1981–1985), Government Art Studio at Cultural Center, Oumarou Ganda (1981). A first exhibit at an Aurora Art Center with two other artists and another at Hubbard Street which is now some sort of restaurant/ bar.

Clare McCracken is a site-responsive artist, early-career researcher and the coordinator of Art History, Theory and Cultures at RMIT University in Naarm/Melbourne. Her practice-led research sits at the intersection of art, human geography and urban theory. She employs innovative, performance methodologies to research how mobility systems coproduce space, place and landscape across generations in Australia. Recent publications include *Liminality When Grounded: Micro-mobilities in contemporary art practice during the COVID-19 pandemic* (2024) and *Killing Snowmen: Big Things and Rural Australia's Existential Crises* (2022).

Lucia Fagen-DeLuca teaches under her matriarchal art name at California College of the Arts and her given name at San Francisco State University. Trained as an art historian of medieval Indian Art and Architecture, she is the author of *The Hegemony of Heritage: Ritual and the Record in Stone* (UC Press 2018; Mapin 2019). She has lectured internationally in Hindi, French, and English and is the author of several peer-reviewed articles. She is also a practicing ceramics artist in San Francisco, where she shows her work and makes art in multiple collectives. Her work will be included in the first California Jewish Open at the Contemporary Jewish Art Museum in San Francisco under her Hebrew name. Recently she has collaborated with the Auroville Film Institute as part of her international think tank, the Université Imaginaire. The author is grateful for the friendship of Jamilla Moore who encouraged her to write her truth in honor of Moore's niece and all the others who may follow us someday. Contact Lucia Fagen-DeLuca at lucia.fagen-deluca@cca.edu to learn more about her forthcoming studio/theory hybrid textbook for art schools.

Sarah Magnatta is an assistant professor of global contemporary art and museum studies at the University of Denver. She has curated several exhibitions, including *Tenzing Rigdol: My World Is in Your Blind Spot* (2018) and *Gonkar Gyatso: Intimacy and Immediacy* (2023). Her essays and artist interviews can be found in *Art Journal*, *Journal of Aesthetics and Culture*, the *Routledge Handbook of Asian Transnationalism*, and *Yeshe: A Journal of Tibetan Literature, Arts and Humanities*. Her current book project explores contemporary art of the Tibetan diaspora.

Anna Tahinci is Professor of Art History at the Glassell School of Art at the Museum of Fine Arts Houston. A native of Greece, she studied History and Archaeology in Athens, and spent a total of eleven years in Paris, where she studied Art History and Comparative Literature at the Sorbonne (Ph.D. on Rodin's collectors), and Museum Studies at the Ecole du Louvre. She has worked at the Musée Rodin, the Musée d'Orsay, the Louvre and the Harvard Art Museums. She has taught at Boston University Paris, at the University of Minnesota, at Macalester College, and at the Minneapolis College of Art and Design. She co-curated the sculpture exhibition that was organized in Athens for the Olympic Games in 2004 and the exhibition *Rodin and America* at the Cantor Arts Center, Stanford University in 2011. She teaches a wide range of Art History courses from cave to contemporary in conjunction with the MFAH permanent collection and temporary exhibitions. In addition to nineteenth and twentieth century Art History, French Literature and Culture, her research interests and publications include *Women in Art, Collectors and History*

of Taste, Comparative Literature and Ancient Greek Mythology, Paris in Literature and the Arts, French Museums and Globalization, and Public Art. Since 2016 she has been leading the Glassell School's Study Abroad Program, bringing students to her hometowns of Athens and Paris for 'behind the scenes' visits to museums and sites.

Marion S. Lee teaches visual culture/art history in the School of Art + Design, Ohio University. A current area of research interest is nineteenth-century China, located in a global perspective.

ORCID

Yanai Toister  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5605-5233>

Sarah Magnatta  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1385-377X>

References

- [Aetna Insurance Company]. 1857. *Instructions for Agents*. Hartford: Aetna.
- Camnitzer, L. 2014. "An Artist, a Leader, and a Dean Were on a Boat" *E-Flux Journal* #55.
- Carter, M. 1990. *Framing Art*. Marrickville: Southwood Press.
- De Duve, T. 1994. "When Form has Become Attitude – and Beyond." In *The Artist and the Academy: Issues in Fine Art Education and the Wider Cultural Context*, edited by S. Foster and N. de Ville, 23–40. Southampton: John Hansard Gallery.
- Elkins, J. 2012. *What Do Artists Know?* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Hamilton, A. 2018. *Scale & the Incas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Houghton, N. 2016. "Six into One: The Contradictory Art School Curriculum and How It Came About." *The International Journal of Art & Design Education* 35 (1): 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jade.12039>.
- Mulholland, N. 2019. *Re-Imagining the Art School: Paragogy and Artistic Learning*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nguyen, T., J. Leong, and K. Sharp. 2024. "ReShaping Worlds: Thinking with and Through Positionality for Thriving Futures." *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education*.
- Racette, S. F. 2016. "Pieces Left Along the Trail: Material Culture Histories and Indigenous Studies: Sherry Farrell Racette in Conversation with Alan Corbiere and Crystal Migwans." In *Sources and Methods in Indigenous Studies*, edited by Chris Andersen and Jean M. O'Brien, 223–230. Abingdon: Taylor & Francis.
- Robertson, Jean, and Craig McDaniel. 2022. *Themes of Contemporary Art: Visual Art After 1980*. 5th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, R. 2001. "Practice vs Praxis: Constructing Models for Practitioner-Based Research." *TEXT* 5 (2): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.52086/001c.35795>.
- Wolfe, P. 1999. *Seler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell.