

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 017 063

24

EA 001 133

DISSEMINATION OF SOME RESULTS OF THE SEMINAR ON RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ART EDUCATION. FINAL REPORT.

BY- MATTIL, EDWARD L.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV., UNIVERSITY PARK

REPORT NUMBER PROJ-5059

PUB DATE MAY 67

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-8351

GRANT OEG-1-6-068351-1829

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.12 26P.

DESCRIPTORS- #INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, #SEMINARS, #EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, #ART EDUCATION, TAPE RECORDINGS, SOUND FILMS, #CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, UNIVERSITY PARK,

MATERIALS FROM AN EARLIER PROJECT, "A SEMINAR FOR RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ART EDUCATION," WERE PREPARED FOR DISSEMINATION AND EVALUATION IN AN INTERDISCIPLINARY SEMINAR ON PROBLEMS IN ART EDUCATION. DISCUSSIONS DEALT WITH PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL QUESTIONS, CONTENT, PROBLEMS OF LEARNING AND TEACHING IN ART, AND QUESTIONS DEALING WITH CURRICULUM AND RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY. AS PART OF THE SEMINAR, 16 MAJOR PAPERS WERE PRESENTED BY NATIONALLY KNOWN SCHOLARS AND A PANEL WAS HELD WHICH SUMMARIZED THE MOST COGENT ISSUES. THIS DISSEMINATION PROJECT INCLUDED-- (1) TRANSFER OF THE 90-MINUTE SUMMARIZING PANEL FROM VIDEO TAPE TO 16 MM SOUND TRACK FILM, (2) TRANSFER OF THE 16 PAPERS TO 3.7 AUDIO TAPE RECORDINGS, (3) PRESENTATION OF THE SOUND TRACK FILM AT THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION BIENNIAL CONFERENCE, MARCH 1967, (4) MAKING AVAILABLE COPIES OF THE FILM AND TAPES THROUGH THE AUDIO-VISUAL SERVICES OF THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. AND THE FILM LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, AND (5) PREPARATION OF AVAILABILITY NOTICES OF THESE MATERIALS. THE CONTENT OF THE FILM AND TAPE RECORDINGS REPRESENTS SOME OF THE MOST ADVANCED POSITIONS REGARDING BASIC QUESTIONS IN ART EDUCATION. (HM)

DOCUMENT FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BR. 6-8351

PA 24

ED017063

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 5059
Contract No. OEG-1-6-068351-1829

DISSEMINATION OF SOME RESULTS OF THE SEMINAR
ON RESEARCH AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT IN ART EDUCATION

May 1967

RECEIVED

MAY 23 1967

ARTS AND HUMANITIES - BR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 001 133

Final Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Project No. 5059
Contract No. OEG-1-6-068351-1829

Edward L. Mattil

May 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

University Park, Pennsylvania

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Method	3
Summary	5
Appendix A, Kinescope Panel Discussion	A-1

Introduction

From August 30 to September 9, 1965 an interdisciplinary seminar entitled A Seminar for Research and Curriculum Development in Art Education was held at The Pennsylvania State University with support of the U.S.O.E.

The intention of this seminar was the stimulation of research and curriculum development. The problems of the planners centered about the identification of the most critical broad areas of concern in art education, the selection of those persons in and outside the field of art education who could effectively come to grips with problems, on both theoretical and practical levels, and the designing of a functional structure which could meet the objectives of the seminar.

The initial focus on the broadest areas of concern seemed to cast most problems into five major problem-areas which, for lack of better terms, were called: (1) the philosophical or the "why" area, (2) the sociological or the "to whom" area, (3) the content or the "what" area, (4) the educational-psychological or teaching-learning area, and (5) the program or curriculum area.

The rationale for including these definitive areas was stated simply:

Philosophical inquiry is primarily concerned with the significance of knowledge for the value problems of men, the evaluation of the adequacy of value judgments and generation of proposals for what ought to be. Philosophical methods are analytical, critical and speculative. It is essential that art education seek the means to make more explicit its underlying value assumptions to define their structural relationship through philosophical methods.

In order to develop curriculum, it is essential to have a sound understanding of the cultural and social differences as they exist among students. Differences in values, attitudes, aptitudes, readiness for varying types of motivation, and the needs from education all develop within the social milieu of the students' backgrounds. This suggests that one of the foundation areas is the sociological and anthropological study of American society.

Art education derives its language, concepts and processes from the fields of art history, art criticism and studio practice. These areas provide the primary source of content in art education.

In terms of what is to be learned, what the learner is like, and how learning takes place, art education must face a systematic review and critique of aspects of theories of learning and instruction applicable to the teaching of art on all levels.

Since the realization of those ends which art educators seek to attain must be accomplished through the curriculum, developing a curriculum which is effective is a necessary condition for the field of art education. There are many useful ideas in the field of curriculum -- concepts of continuity, sequence, integration -- which could be utilized in developing the art curriculum. Teaching and learning in art present unique problems which must be resolved with respect to the particular characteristics of art and learning

in art. Thus, to be effective art education must begin systematic and sustained inquiry into the area of the curriculum.

Research must be the legitimate concern of art education. Theoretical thinking in art education will produce little without accompanying rigorous investigation which produces the necessary data to validate theories. Uncontrolled observation is unreliable and experience alone can be both fragmentary and subjective. There is no universal road toward a research foundation for art education, but important paths seem evident in empirical, historical and philosophical directions.

From this base a program was structured, covering a ten-day period. The seminar began with twelve papers, each answering specific charges laid out by the planning committee. Each paper was followed by intensive discussion. From each major area of concern, a paper was presented by an "outside" specialist such as a philosopher, sociologist, art critic or psychologist. This paper was followed immediately by one given by an art educator concerned with the same general area but who responded to different charges. The content area had three specialists representing art history, art criticism and art studio. The days following the initial twelve papers were taken up with intensive small group discussions, utilizing the specialists as consultants. These discussions focused on specific research and curriculum development proposals which had been prepared by the participants in the months prior to the seminar. The specialists also provided individual consultation for each of the participants in the form of criticism and assistance in further developing the proposals. The participants reconsidered their initial proposals in light of the group and individual criticisms.

Following these meetings, the specialists interacted as a panel on the concerns of art education and, still later, presented individual summary statements in which some of the main concerns were reconsidered. A comprehensive evaluation of the seminar was presented by Dr. Asahel Woodruff, the seminar evaluator.

The second week opened with three papers on various approaches to research. The first was oriented toward philosophical research, the second toward empirical research, and the third toward curriculum research. These specialists served as consultants, specialists and critics of the various participants' proposals in terms of research design. The research specialists presented a comprehensive criticism of the seminar and of research in art education.

During the final days, each art education participant presented a final report of his revised research proposal to the entire seminar and of research in art education.

The small audience who heard these presentations considered this to be the most outstanding collection of new ideas and fresh approaches available to the field of art education or, indeed, the fields of the arts in general.

These talks and panels were recorded on sound tapes and one major panel was recorded on video tape. A review of these materials by several audiences indicated the need to reproduce these materials and disseminate

and interpret them as quickly and as widely as possible. The most apparent audience consists of classroom art teachers from all levels of education. The largest group of these teachers that can be reached directly is the membership of the National Art Education Association. This group consists of approximately 6500 art teachers from the elementary, secondary and college levels. This group also includes many practicing artists.

The seminar papers have, of course, appeared as a final written report, but the widespread coverage essential for grass-roots change is unlikely to occur by that means alone.

The technical quality of the recorded material ranges from fair to excellent, but the content can be described as uniformly excellent.

The objective of this project was to reproduce the audio tapes and to transfer the video tape to 16 mm film, making copies of all materials readily available to those who can use them.

Method

The following lectures were recorded as they were presented to the Seminar on Research and Curriculum Development in Art Education.

Philosophic Inquiry into Education in the Arts

by Dr. Francis T. Villemain, Professor of Education, University of Southern Illinois

Some Problems of Art Education: A Methodological Definition

by Dr. David W. Ecker, Associate Professor of Art, The Ohio State University

The History of Art Education

by Dr. Joshua Taylor, Professor of Art and Humanities, University of Chicago

Criticism and Its Premises

by Mr. Harold Rosenberg, Art Critic, New York City

The Creation of Art and the Creation of Art Education

by Dr. Allan Kaprow, Associate Professor of Fine Arts, State University of New York at Stony Brook

The Plastic Arts, History of Art and Design -- Three Currents Toward Identifying Content for Art Education

by Dr. Jerome J. Hausman, Professor of Art, The Ohio State University

Social Change for Education

by Dr. Melvin M. Tumin, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Princeton University

Society, Art, and Education
by Miss June K. McFee, Director, Institute for Community Art Studies,
University of Oregon

Learning Theory, Cognitive Processes, and the Teaching-Learning Component
by Dr. Dale B. Harris, Professor of Psychology, The Pennsylvania State
University

Sketches Toward a Psychology of Learning in Art
by Dr. Kenneth R. Beittel, Professor of Art Education, The Pennsylvania
State University

Concepts, Issues and Problems in the Field of Curriculum
by Dr. Elliot W. Eisner, Associate Professor of Education and Art,
Stanford University

Curriculum Problems in Art Education
by Dr. Manuel Barkan, Professor of Art Education, The Ohio State
University

The Examined Curriculum
by Dr. Asahel D. Woodruff, Dean, College of Education, The University
of Utah

Methodological Inquiry and Educational Research
by Dr. Nathaniel L. Champlin, Associate Professor of Education, Wayne
State University

Description, Prediction, and Explanation: An Empirical View of Research
by Dr. Robert L. Lathrop, Associate Professor of Psychology and
Education, The Pennsylvania State University

Educational Innovation and Art Education
by Dr. Arthur W. Foshay, Associate Dean for Research and Field Service,
Teachers College, Columbia University

A 90-minute pannel discussion was recorded by means of video tape, in-
cluding the following participants:

Dr. Kenneth R. Beittel
Dr. Elliot W. Eisner
Dr. Dale B. Harris
Dr. Allan Kaprow

Mr. Harold Rosenberg
Dr. Joshua Taylor
Dr. Melvin Tumin
Dr. Francis Villemain

The project followed these procedures:

1. Transfer of the 90-minute summarizing panel discussion from video
tape to 16 mm single sound track film. Preparation of titles,
credits and an audio introduction.
2. Transfer of audio tape recordings from 1.7 speed to 3.7 speed.

3. The 16 mm sound film was shown twice at the National Art Education Conference in San Francisco, March 1967.
4. Dr. Kenneth R. Beittel who directed the panel presented the sound film and led the discussion regarding the content.
5. Four copies of the film and two copies of each tape have been placed in the Audio-Visual headquarters of the National Art Education Association in Washington to be used by anyone requesting them.
6. One copy of the film has been retained as a master copy and one copy for distribution from The Pennsylvania State University Film Library.
7. One copy of each tape has been retained by The Pennsylvania State University for use by anyone requesting them.
8. Information regarding these materials and their availability have been published in the NAEA Newsletter, Studies in Art Education, and the NAEA Journal at regular intervals to encourage the widespread use of the film and tapes. Information regarding the sound film will appear in the catalogue of the Film Library of The Pennsylvania State University.

Summary

This project was completed in April 1967. It represented the transfer of taped speeches and video taped panel discussion to more usable forms. These materials are now available for use. Copies have already been used at a number of institutions of higher learning and requests are now coming in for future use at State Association meetings, college meetings and for college classes.

This was a relatively low-priced project for the large amount of good material made available to the education field. With continued publicity from the National Art Education Association, it should receive wide usage.

APPENDIX A

KINESCOPE PANEL DISCUSSION

Mr. Beittel: My role is to moderate this panel but I am going to play it as openly as possible. Our role, as I understand it, is merely to interact, that's all the program says. Now if I may borrow a concept from Barkan and Ecker, which I don't understand, I am going to throw it open by asking you to comment on what the "pervasive quality," as they put it, of the conference is at this point. What are you sensing after three days here, having given your papers and thought toward the charges and having interacted with some of the participants? Such a broad question, I know, is hard to start on but let's begin there. We'll get specific later.

Mr. Villemain: I've sensed a great deal of excitement and vigor here, and as I contrast the meetings that I have had over the last ten or fifteen years with art education, it seems to me that there has been a great deal more substance and intellectual sophistication exhibited at this meeting than any I am familiar with in the past, and it seems to me that the men who have been involved here have been quite excited about rubbing elbows with various specialties and various fields.

Mr. Taylor: I suppose part of the excitement also comes from the fact that everything has not progressed along a neatly constructive path -- there has been construction, destruction, conflict, etc., and I think that probably at this moment we have reached a point where everything is up for grabs, but it's up for pretty good grabs -- and we have some sense of what the grabs might be like. But that's very good because it means that certain sorts of standard holds have been broken ---

Mr. Beittel: It's up for grabs, but all ideas are still in, so to speak.

Mr. Taylor: Exactly, and everybody seems to be quite excited about the possibility now of bringing some shape to it.

Mr. Harris: I was interested in the fact that this morning things exploded a bit. We've gotten well enough acquainted so that we don't have to be polite any longer and this is about par for the course.

Mr. Beittel: As a Social Psychologist you could have predicted this at a certain point?

Mr. Harris: At a certain point this usually happens, and I think it's healthy.

Mr. Beittel: Why is this, psychologically, can you give us a little cue on that?

Mr. Harris: Well, it's merely that we do get acquainted and let ourselves go with our real feelings and real viewpoints, where we have been more formal and polite and academic up to that point.

Mr. Rosenberg: What do you do if this doesn't happen?

Mr. Harris: Then the conference is pronounced dead.

Mr. Kaprow: Then we have to have "a happening."

Mr. Taylor: Of course, part of it is a matter of some of us getting used to the language and the ideas -- that takes a bit of time. Then when you decide you really know what people are talking about, you are ready to object to it.

Mr. Villemain: To follow along with that thought a little bit, it seems to me this is one of the sobering problems that I had not thought about prior to our conference, that has emerged after these few days -- that is, that I think we need to learn how to better utilize our various talents. I'm not sure we have thought this through quite as fully as we need to, in the variety of specialists that have been here -- to think more carefully how we can work together.

Mr. Rosenberg: Who should think about that? I mean, should I think about how to use your talents?

Mr. Villemain: I think the art educators who originally invited us here need to think about that more.

Mr. Rosenberg: I should think so, yes, you are probably right. The organizers of the conference should have a concept of how to use the talents that they invite. I assume that they may have done this in some underground way. They are responsible for our creeping up on ourselves in such a way that we ultimately become useful to them. I wouldn't like to feel that this comes about purely through accident.

Mr. Tumin: I think the formulation that came out this morning, I think it was Harold's formulation, of the threefold goal of art education, specified the three main sets of interests that ran through the audience, or through the seminar group during these two days: the interest in the teaching of art in order that art shall be known and understood; and the interest in teaching art to children in order to help them grow, be creative, open, etc., and the use of art as a source of knowledge. Part of the difficulty in our conversation was that we were criticizing each other for not being relevant to a goal that some were not trying to be relevant to, and I think coming out with these three goals was a terribly important thing. I think it marks, at least so far as I can see, from the fringe position in conferences of this kind I have had in the past, a kind of new awakening in art education about the wiseness and the breadth of its goals that I think is extraordinary. I think it is also noteworthy that ten years ago people like Taylor and Rosenberg didn't go to art education conferences, as far as I know. They were known as distant figures, not as intimate people who could be used; and I see a remarkable growth in the understanding of the way in which to use talents of this kind. I think it ought to be remarked, Ken, too, that your kind of paper, and Elliot's paper, and Manny's paper this morning, which moved directly at operationalizing certain important problems, instead of sloganeering about them. This is a whole new development in art education. Research is not simply a model, now, research is really a goal. This seems to me to be the stuff and the excitement of the conference.

Mr. Beittel: I detect, along the same line, some of the rumbling questions that we hit during coffee breaks. One relates to the type of structuring that Elliot gave us this morning, in his three foci, which he said were the societal, the subject, and the child. On the side of the subject, I believe one of the concerns was how to utilize the three gentlemen in a row here, Josh, Harold and Al, who represent the discipline core of art, as it exists as a subject. How can we think about them just in a subject context for a minute, and then perhaps draw in Mel and Dale and our Philosopher for the other two dimensions. One confusion may be this changing from level to level. The question is, what is the content part? Josh talks about three types of art history, I think Harold would delineate approaches to art criticism and I'm sure Al's paper gave us a big spectrum of the types of art that exist and the problems that this generates in specifying the individuation that Mel talked about. Could we talk about this topic generally? How do you see the content part?

Mr. Taylor: One of the startling things, I think about the whole conference is that we are all devoted to art, one way or another, in our own way and in our own terms, and then you suddenly discover that somebody equally devoted to art is using terminology that's going in a direction that to you doesn't even spell art. That's part of the problem I think we have engaged in the last couple of days and is part of the problem that is beginning to come out very clearly. I am a historian, on the other hand, my goal, actually, I think the goal of a historian, is to understand as much as I can about art as (I hate to sound like Dewey) an experience. To me history is one very sound way of going about it, as I consider the end of history not losing yourself in the past, but rather the end of history is bringing as much from the past as possible into our present consciousness. To me that is extremely important. I consider history everything that has been done in art up to today, and I am a little resentful of supposing that I can talk only let's say up to 1900 and beyond that I have to be a critic to talk about art. Even you, Harold, talk about history so I can talk about criticism. In fact, I think

the two are very close except that the critic normally spends most of his time on what's happening at the moment, although drawing on the past. It seems to me the historian, if he is alive, is quite aware of what is going on at the moment in order better to illuminate the study of the past I'm highly suspicious of historians who don't have some consciousness of what is going on at the moment. Now, so far as this is a subject for the child, I'm quite aware that you can't teach history in this sense as a body of subject matter. That is, you should not teach art (that is, works of art) as simply being elements in a structure without having any quality in their own right. Panofsky points out very clearly that a work of art, to be a work of art, is an object which is a thing you can pat or touch, but also that a meaning is associated with it and without the meaning it is not a work of art. There are lots of objects left in this world which once were works of art and aren't now; and part of the job of the historian is to restore them as works of art.

Mr. Tumin: Will you explain what happens -- how do they become non-works of art?

Mr. Taylor: Let me cite an example -- people get quite exercised these days about early Medieval art -- they think it's pretty fine. About 125 years ago it was considered curiously child-like, and collected, if collected at all, simply because it was mnemonic, it conjured up a past period and was looked at as exotic. It wasn't looked at as art in its own right, yet the object was there, just as much there as it is now in fact, some of them more there than they are now. To restore it to a work of art you have to get rid of this exotic business, it seems to me, which is quite false -- it didn't belong to it initially and is something we have coated it with like an over-enthusiastic patina on bronze -- and somehow to restore it to a living existence, a genuine living existence, not this fictitious one. Similarly, I think Chinese painting in the 18th century was looked upon as coy and very clever and strange. Now we look at it as being profoundly moving and genuine art, but the object was still there. So, what I'm getting at in this long-winded statement, is that if you are going to use these objects, then I can't be unconcerned about the child, because I have to worry about how he is going to be able to give his experience to the work, and then, in reverse, the work can become part of his experience.

Mr. Beittel: In terms of your paper and the way you developed the concept building process in the child or the student, would the art historian and the critic be almost synonymous with the young child in this sense?

Mr. Taylor: I said that the critical aspect of the historian could, carefully programed, become available to the child. The historian's function is to gather the material that allows him, or directs him, toward a critical kind of judgment. It's not one that will snare him back to get involved in a pseudo-historical pursuit, that is, to pretend that he is being an historian.

Mr. Beittel: You defined this through the personal experience of the child, which I think is how Harold defines the critic's role, utilizing all things but going through his own subjectivity, if I understand you correctly.

Mr. Rosenberg: Yes, I think it's good enough for kids.

Mr. Villemain: Josh, could I ask you a question -- there may be a moral there that I had not thought about before -- that is, if I understand you correctly -- you are saying that an art historian may bring into the orbit of what constitutes art history, things that had not been so conceived in the past --

Mr. Taylor: The orbit of art.

Mr. Villemain: Yes -- rather than as an object of historical scholarly attention. Should the field of art education, therefore, try to leave open the door as to what is to be included as art so that future generations of art historian and art educators who come along will have an opportunity to reassess and reintroduce things that, perhaps, in our cultural effort we don't think of as constituting art?

Mr. Taylor: You're baiting me, so I'll rephrase the question. The door must be left open for new interpretations of art, even art that we have known for a long while. To force upon a child a way of looking, only one way, or a series of words you have to use when you talk about 15th century painting, etc., is to deprive him of the pleasure of the works, it seems to me, rather than to enhance it. Furthermore, it means that he has no place to go; you see, once he has learned the 15th century, he has no place to go except to the 16th century. And it's too bad because he ought to be able to go back each time and to have a richer experience. Now that's one way of leaving the door open so it can enlarge us gradually. Now you were getting to another point, that is, if we taught them only in painting and sculpture and architecture would this, then, close the door so that they could never apply these qualities that they are developing, the perceptions, etc., to furniture, to advertising art or to anything else. I have no feeling about restricting it. I think here you are restricted chiefly by the matter of time. If you have to choose that which is going to be most important and have the greatest impact, I don't think you are going to choose a group of kitchen chairs or axe handles in order to get across the emotionally evocative quality or idea-embodying quality of a form or work of art. I think it is wise, and it's especially true when you are talking about paying attention to particular levels of students, not only in age but also in terms of their environment, I think it is exceedingly important that they realize that part of what they are learning about great works of art, that is, established works of art by artists, is also to be discerned in other things around them; otherwise it's likely to be a bit of dreaming and won't last. In architecture, as I think I suggested, regardless of where they live, they could be conscious of certain elements around them that they could begin to see in the way they would look at a work of architecture. At the same time they shouldn't abuse it -- I object very much to the notion that studying the funny papers is one step removed from studying the drawings of Rembrandt -- the step's too big.

Mr. Rosenberg: I think this is an important point -- that, somewhere, you have to restrict the field. Otherwise there is the danger that you would go off into things that never were art -- you're talking about bringing back into art things that were art but which cease to be art because of changes in taste and understanding, but the field probably should be restricted to art by artists and not the things that came into existence either accidentally or through some other purpose. Of course, we can't restrict that absolutely because there were societies in which there was no such thing as art, in which everything, in other words, was art; so that there is a kind of hazy area, and maybe the best way to draw the distinction is practically, as you say, to consider how much time you have to go into it.

Mr. Tumin: For a layman like me, unfamiliar with the world of painting, etc., relative to these other people, that gives me no guidance at all; and I think you have now come right to the point of the two questions which may seem to you like such elementary or rather silly questions that you don't care to answer them, but they are the pressing questions for me and for a number of other people. First, what do you mean when you say "art" and I would at least like you to try to say it without saying "Oh, it's so obvious" because it isn't obvious to me. Second, how do you, by your own standards, judge good from bad, better from worse, in the world of art?

Mr. Rosenberg: Do you think it is pertinent to this

Mr. Tumin: Absolutely. I think it is.

Mr. Eisner: I would like to endorse that as well. I am very sympathetic to what you have just expressed, Harold and Josh, however, there are other ways in which the field would be sliced by different people and these are viable ways, these are defensible ways. One could deal primarily with notions about art concerning phenomena in the cities, relationships among people, artifacts which are created for everyday use, the use of advertising, etc. The point that I would make is that I believe that one could develop a justifiable position concerning this kind of orientation in our education as well as the one which you've described. So there are competing alternatives which somehow need to be selected on the basis of one's conception of, not only the nature of art, but the

role of art in education and can't merely be dismissed by using the works of artists as the subject matter of art education.

Mr. Rosenberg: But you can't define art on the basis of the needs of educators.

Mr. Tumin: Do it in your own terms.

Mr. Rosenberg: Well, for one thing, I think both Josh and I would agree that the framework of the problem is given by history. If you go far enough back you don't have a division between high art and craft but get into the history of the Renaissance and since the Renaissance, as well as in some other cultures, then there is this distinction, which we didn't make up and which is not based on theory -- it is based on the facts of cultural life. To narrow the field down to the West, since the Renaissance we have had art and craft divided. The artist has become a recognized individual who creates in the world of meaning and ideas, whereas, let's say, the furniture maker is a craftsman and doesn't attempt usually, although today there are new complications, as we do begin to get craft that pretends to be or intends to be art, usually a chair that you can't sit on, for example, -- but we ought to put that aside -- there is, in other words, historically a body of work called art as distinguished from other things and these works are the works of artists.

Mr. Tumin: Called by whom art? You're only deferring the problem.

Mr. Taylor: Let me see if I can start on a different basis, which I always tend to do as I move back into what it means to you when you look at it, and I think that ultimately that's the only way you can tell a work of art. It is very subjective, to use an old-fashioned useful word, and I'm proud of it and don't apologize for it. Now when you look at a beautifully formed chair you are delighted by it -- this is one level of delight. When I say level, I don't necessarily mean that this is going to be a scheme, like 17th century schemes of subject matter in painting -- the high to the low. But this is one kind of delight. When you look at certain kinds of painting which are a little bit like a lyric poem, you delight in their color, you delight in their lines, they hold your interest just in that world of sheer lyrical delight. This is another kind of pleasure. If you look at some paintings, however, they do catch your eye but at the same time they hold your mind and engage it with a problem that is far more penetrating than that -- they don't let your mind alone. Rather than making you satisfied with the beautiful proportion of the object, the lyrical motion of the design, they suddenly begin to question rather fundamental bases, fundamental questions, regarding you and your lives, your judgment of things. I don't mean this necessarily through subject matter, in fact, I don't think it has anything to do with subject matter. It may have to do with subject matter or it may not. I think this is true in some paintings that are basically non-objective -- they can suddenly make you sense forces and qualities. Let me sight for example, looking at a painting by Franz Kline. You might talk about one of Kline's painting in terms of its black and white pattern. This, I think, would do extraordinary injustice to Kline because what I think you really get out of the painting when you look at it with sensitivity is a curiously hard to describe sense--almost a sense of tragedy. There's an extraordinary sense of vitality and emotion which you feel a part of as you look at it. Now you can't equate this experience with the experience you get from looking at a well planned chair. There's a difference in kind and I think that difference in kind is extraordinary important in education. It goes back to something this morning, when talking about education, art as part of our humanistic knowledge, part of our humanistic culture. It has to do with our evaluations of ourselves, of our fellow-man, our sense of tradition of the past, our sense of continuity, and the sense of humanity that spreads into our own time. I don't mean by any means that you interpret paintings in these sorts of words but these kinds of values do, indeed, come out of the paintings, and are part of the paintings, and if you think of them, then, in these terms of value, I think you would have a hard time justifying using, let's say, certain kinds of the vulgar arts in lieu of the arts which in our culture have become the most refined and sophisticated statements of those problems which go most deeply into our very lives.

Mr. Tumin: Can everybody in your judgment be taught to feel that about a Franz Kline painting?

Mr. Taylor: Not necessarily about a Franz Kline.

Mr. Rosenberg: Let me talk about that a little bit in relation to Franz Kline. In addition to what Mr. Taylor has said, when we look at a Kline today we have in mind also the whole continuum of art which confronted Kline when he painted that picture and how he dealt with the problems of painting as he discovered them fifteen years ago, which in its own way also comprise the situation of society, of education, of culture in general. All this comes into our evaluation of that Kline as an important work of art. Now, one could say every profession has similar problems -- that is, somebody who could say, "Well, I am confronted with the problem of making a new kind of glassware," has to take up the difficulties of creation in the realm of glass. But when you consider the fact that the history of painting includes all these works, which come to us from the Greeks through the Renaissance -- that is, with all the great thinking of art you have a problem very similar to that in a new idea in philosophy, that is, you can't philosophise without philosophy, and when somebody has made a contribution to philosophy we see it immediately on two planes, that is, what it does in philosophy and what it says to us as laymen. Now, I think that that is true about a work of art, and it is not true about a chair.

Mr. Taylor: You sound like a historian -- you're stealing my stuff!

Mr. Beittel: Is it because of these cultural discontinuities that ascribe the lower status to the craft? I can envision a potter saying this about pots, if you allow for the discontinuity.

Mr. Rosenberg: I could envision it too, but I would then want to know who the great potters were, who had created pots of such vast significance, that their problem should necessarily involve my interest simply as a human being, not as somebody who wants some pots.

Mr. Beittel: I was thinking in reverse fashion, that there you would evoke the image of the concept of work and even of anonymity in relation to an object which is formed and fashioned again, and again.

Mr. Rosenberg: That's a subject that we could probably talk about for hours.

Mr. Beittel: You are picking out, as I understand it, the prime exemplars of this type of thing.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, it is much harder to look at a pot as a humanistic project than it is to look at a painting.

Mr. Tumin: Why?

Mr. Taylor: First, it takes two things. It takes an extraordinary eye to determine the difference between one pot and another. Now, I don't mean that in a simple-minded way. For example, the pot from one of your early Mexican pieces, hand done, not done on a wheel, done with an extraordinary feel of the hand, is entirely different from a 5th century B.C. Greek pot. This is a distinction you can make on technical terms very quickly and very easily. There is color difference, difference in form, one is completely symmetrical, the other is not. These kinds of external difficulties get taken care of very quickly, but at the present time I think we probably have a far greater feeling for looking at the Mexican piece and saying, "yes, you see, it has the hand." We have been taught that way. It has what Mr. Fry calls "sensibility -- it has the imprint of the thumb, somehow, and that brings us into contact with the human being. I like these pots, too; but 5th century Greek pottery with its extraordinary perfection of form, demands a kind of concentration and it demands, also, a sense of what it doesn't do, a sense of tradition -- that this is an extraordinary refinement of a formal

tradition and to understand the consummate place that this piece holds, requires an extraordinarily schooled sensibility, I think.

Mr. Villemain: There's a greater wealth of meaning in some of these objects.

Mr. Taylor: I think it is more accessible-- not any greater, but it's more accessible.

Mr. Rosenberg: As a matter of fact the problem that you are raising is vast but very much related to the problem of art. That is, the problem of the crafts, since we entered into the industrial era, in which things are turned out without creative application by the maker, has put a new emphasis on the kind of work which we call art. Art is, after all, a kind of work, but it is a kind of work for the worker, primarily -- that is, it is primarily art for the artist, and there is a kind of utopian view that ultimately all work will be done for the worker. This would be the society of the future, and there is quite a strong tradition that looks forward to that eventuation of the machine or mechanized industry. In other words, it is a point of view contrary to the idea that in the automated society there will be no work. On the contrary, the idea is in the automated society everybody will work for the sake of their own development.

Mr. Beittel: They'll all be artists.

Mr. Rosenberg: They'll all be artists. Now, you keep that in mind as a definition, I think it gives you a perspective on why art is so important in the school; that is, these kids who may not have to do work, let's assume that some won't have to do work and some won't be able to do work, that is, are going to be unemployed, could work for the sake of themselves if they understood what the work of art is, namely, what kind of work is involved in art. It's work that goes back to transform the person that produces it. I think that is one of the reasons why it is so important to take up the problem.

Mr. Harris: Is that your criterion of art -- it transforms the person who produces it?

Mr. Rosenberg: Yes, I would make that into one of the ways, at least, of distinguishing real art from art which is simply the production of artifacts under shop conditions, like the man who works, let's say, in a design factory.

Mr. Taylor: We'd have to extend that to the person who looks at it, too.

Mr. Rosenberg: And the person who looks at it participates in this enterprise.

Mr. Taylor: Everybody, you see, would have to be his own fabricator.

Mr. Eisner: What you have just developed, as I take it, is a theory of art. And I would suggest that there are other conceptions than the one you have suggested.

Mr. Rosenberg: You don't have to suggest that -- it's a fact.

Mr. Eisner: It's a fact. And since it is a fact, these other conceptions which are respectable would have different implications for the teaching of art in the public schools but over and beyond that if you examine the history of the teaching of art in the public schools you will find that the goals of art instruction are not simply a matter of relating the instruction to a conception of art but rather using art instruction to meet the other kinds of needs perceived to be important either by the society at large or by the people who are running the schools. For example, in the 1850's we had a conception of art instruction in which children were taught to draw systematically and in which art was conceived of as drawing. In the 1870's you had a conception of art instruction whereby it was considered important to the preparation of skilled craftsmen who could go into the industries. In the late 1880's, by virtue of the child study movement, you had a beginning interest in the unfolding development of the child and the use of art in order to better understand his development. In the 1910's you had a conception of art in terms of picture study -- sort of a "great looks"

approach to art education, toward understanding the art of the past and the great moral lessons that it preached. In the 1920's you had a conception of art education which again see the child as an unfolding organism and which say his art as a projection of himself whereby his potentialities could be unfolded. In the 1940's you had the influence of a materials approach to art education whereby the work of the modern artists began to enter into the school program, and the notion was to somehow sensitize children to a variety of materials. In the 1950's you had the growing interest in using art in creativity. We get notions by Herbert Read of "Education through Art" not education in art but education through art. Manuel Barkan "Through Art to Creativity" and many other such conceptions of the proper function of art in the public school. And now in the 1960's we're beginning to look at art, I believe, in terms of helping youngsters to begin to develop the kind of awareness that both of you have talked about; and the only point I would like to make is that it is not simply a matter of using the subject matter to determine what it is that ought to be taught, there are a multiplicity of factors operating in the whole social schema, which affect the content of art and the way in which it is going to be taught and these simply cannot be dismissed, because they are empirical.

Mr. Rosenberg: Do these stages divide themselves neatly into ten year packages, that way?

Mr. Eisner: No, I did.

Mr. Tumin: I think Al Kaprow's ideas are very relevant here, because if I'm not mistaken, now, you say almost anything can be used to get to the goal, let's say, of opening up kids and making them feel creative and making them feel more alive. It doesn't have to be acknowledged works of masters, to do so, right?

Mr. Kaprow: That's one way of looking at it because I was going to suggest that art is, in addition to the body of work that exists from the past up to the present, what a man calling himself an artist does. Now, that which he does may be a variety of things, and in fact, startle the public at a particular time by its novelty or even by its former status being reconsidered, as for example, the use of commercial art themes today. But in addition to that, to bring in the issue of self-transformation, which Harold mentioned a moment ago, it is perfectly obvious to everyone that when one is going to a party and puts on one's best suit, one is obviously transformed by that new guise, one looks at one's self in the mirror and says "by golly, I look marvelous -- I'm going to have a good time" - in the same way that other costumes may depress one, as at a funeral, where one dresses soberly. Now, the real issue is not self-transformation alone but critical self-transformation. It's a matter of issue, in the long run, which involves another part of what you have brought up, I think, and that is a sense of what the whole history of culture has meant in terms of its contending with concepts of reality, its sense of what the past has done to present concepts of reality, how this interchange takes place and finally what this does to the individual. It's a kind of transcendent activity but not necessarily in the "heaven-sent" sense. I don't think that we are now in such a comfortable position (and here is where crisis enters into present concerns with art) we are not in such a fortunate position as some of the people in the past who thought that through art is a better and better way of life. It may, in fact, I've seen this happen amongst some of my colleagues, make one feel miserable.

Mr. Beittel: I take it you wouldn't like the word, perhaps, "the humanistic inquiry," to be imposed on your work?

Mr. Kaprow: I could if you take the word humanistic as involving tragedy, too.

Mr. Beittel: I wonder if there is any conflict between these ideas.

Mr. Rosenberg: No, we agree.

Mr. Kaprow: I think Feldman's word "humanistic study" is perfect.

Mr. Taylor: As long as it doesn't mean a sort of dry taking away from your experience but rather making you feel a part of the "humanistic study."

Mr. Rosenberg: As long as you are sure he doesn't mean putting a lot of human beings into the paintings? Which is what is usually called humanism in art.

Mr. Tumin: Here we are on the verge of at least suggesting a theme which runs contrary to one that was coming through strongly at the conference. I sensed during the conference that there was emerging a kind of consensus, either willing or unwilling, that it was best to start as early as possible with great works of art in order to achieve the three goals of art education whatever they might be, not just art for its own sake, but out for the kids own sake, art for knowledge; but that a primary instrument would be works of art. Now I am beginning to think that we ought to entertain the possibility, and I mean this seriously, not just for discussion here, that you might better be able to come to the goal of the appreciation of works of art, not by starting with works of art but by getting kids involved in things that you would call, if you will, artistic experiences, of their own, where they are beginning to develop a knowledge of certain kinds of feeling that happen to them when they are engaging in certain kinds of activities which they then, by analogy later on, begin to see are present also in the works of art. To start the other way with the work of art to try to cultivate the feeling, I think, would leave you remote from the child.

Mr. Rosenberg: Why would you call that art education? Aren't there other ways and other means by which you could create the sense of apprehension of environment and do all sorts of other things with children in order to give them a sense of physical and sensual apprehension? The minute you bring in the possibility of getting to art with things that have nothing to do with art, believe me, you'll never get to art, and I don't see any reason in the world for calling this art education. Certainly every child needs to be, as we have been using a phrase here -- "opened up" and made to understand how life isn't purely a matter of abstract ideas -- it is also apprehension through the senses, etc., but why call it art education. It could be called psychology -- it could be called . . .

Mr. Eisner: Why not call it art education?

Mr. Rosenberg: Because it has nothing to do with art.

Mr. Taylor: I think we're getting into a conflict which doesn't need to exist. I think that you are quite right that the child has to begin with the kinds of experiences he might anywhere encounter. You can't expect a small child to distinguish between an experience he gets from a picture and an experience that he gets from an object -- I don't think he does. This doesn't mean that you don't use great works of art for children. You just don't tell them they are great works of art and I don't think you would object to this.

Mr. Villemain: You might not want to ask them for a mature reaction.

Mr. Taylor: Absolutely not. If they talk about the most beautiful paintings in terms of their subject, etc., this is all right. But, at the same time, I think you have to reach out and use those kinds of materials around them that will be useful in building precisely those kinds of sensibilities that will eventually allow them to get into the work. Here, I think, we probably disagree because I do think that there is this kind of training that can go on. I share your feeling of danger that this kind of training might be assumed as quite self-sufficient, that if this training is taken care of, then automatically you see, they move into art -- there is no such thing. It always has to be done hand in hand with art and with great works of art.

Mr. Tumin: Sure. And we are even suggesting this really as an instrument for getting to great works of art in a way that might be easier than you, Harold, seem to have been suggesting here, not in order to duck the issue.

Mr. Rosenberg: You yourself said that you don't have very much familiarity with works of art but you do have familiarity with all kinds of other experiences. Now, why didn't you get the art by these other routes? And what makes you think that once all kinds of techniques have been evolved for performing these functions that you want performed, and believe me, I'm not against their being performed, at what point will you get to art? You are actually assuming that the relation is one between the organism and nature or various kinds of experiences, and that art, somehow, is simply, there.

Mr. Taylor: I think that a kid when he begins, has to be sharpened in terms of everything -- sharpened to make him aware of things, to make him respond -- this has nothing to do with art. Although it is necessary. He can't look at art later if he can't respond to things sensuous and worldly.

Mr. Villemain: Make discriminations --

Mr. Taylor: Make discriminations, yes, and I was suggesting that this be carefully studied to make sure that it is as broad as possible, not limited, as I said yesterday, to red, yellow and blue and standard little block toys and that kind of thing. It has to be broad. Suppose you begin there -- that's his total activity as a child. This is kindergarten, let's say, I don't know where this fits, but it's very early, but it becomes a decreasing kind of tendency. Just as a child scribbling is perfectly happy but very quickly has to do something about it, has to use it, has to put it into form, has to give it meaning, etc., so that this simple sort of vegetable experience isn't going to be satisfactory very long anyhow; but at this very same point supposing that we start with that much of this kind of general looking and a little bit of art in there too. Looked at almost the way he looks at nature or anything else and it might be abstract art or non-objective -- in fact, I think preferably. It doesn't matter. Supposing that that get larger and larger, that increment, and the other gets smaller and smaller. Now at a certain point in his life, and I think this is natural whether it is built into your curriculum or not, it's going to work because he is going to drop the serious interest in the extra art, in the physical activity, simple sensuous activity, etc., and give himself over to the other experience.

Mr. Rosenberg: I think you are too optimistic for one reason -- you are leaving out the presence of specialists who could extend this extra art training to the most complicated course . . .

Mr. Taylor: I was talking about, you know, how you move from modeling clay into making free-form jewelry to burning your fingers in the kiln -- this is exactly what is happening now, this is what I don't like, because instead of the minds being developed and the hands developed, we get waylaid, and that's not going to move you into art.

Mr. Eisner: But on the other hand (I hate to be playing the devil's advocate) but I don't think, that it's right to dismiss such "art activities" as the making of free form jewelry. There is a very serious sense in which an adolescent, for example, can involve himself in the making of a painting or a piece of sculpture, which, for him, truly is a moving aesthetic experience even though the product that he makes might not be hung in the museum of art now. I would say that if art education has erred in the past, it has been in the direction as you suggested. As a matter of fact, a Franz Cizek would preclude from his classroom adult art, period, because of a concern with influencing the child. He didn't want to influence the child and I think if the field has erred it has been in that direction, but I don't think it will be a virtue to err in the other direction either.

Mr. Rosenberg: But I think it was made clear by somebody during this conference, I think it was you, wasn't it Professor Taylor, that a clear distinction should be made between what children can understand and what they can do and, if one required that they should create works that reach a certain standard, obviously the whole idea would be destroyed.

Mr. Tumin: He's saying something else, that in doing you come to a kind of understanding.

Mr. Rosenberg: We all agree about that, but I think he is also saying that we cannot require that in the doing certain standards should be set that will say, "if it isn't a work of art, don't do it." I think we all agree about that and it's an important point.

Mr. Taylor: Very early the student has to learn that what he is doing may present a satisfactory experience to him but he also must have the "out" that this experience leads to something more -- that's beyond his manual capacity.

Mr. Villemain: I think this can be researched and I dare say we haven't done an adequate job of it. I would, for example, like to know on empirical grounds, just what it is that a child can get at various ages from a Matisse or from an Athenian pot. I don't think we can do anything at this point but guess. It's fairly obvious that a Shakespearian love sonnet is going to be nonsense to a child of five. This is a kind of a gross observation to make. The mature meanings that are available there, are simply not available to the child. So we should really research this matter. There are two things that need research here, whether or not we can successfully move from axe handles, or what have you, to paintings and sculpture -- how we can systematically and with assurance move from these to what we want to call great works of art. We need to research that and I think we also need to research just what it is that we can properly expect from very young children in their responses to historically excellent art.

Mr. Rosenberg: Would you include the differences between the nonsense of a Shakespearian sonnet to a child of five and other forms of nonsense, I mean like the nonsense of a comic book? That would be a legitimate study. There may be some kind of residue in the Shakespearian sonnet nonsense, in the sense that it is nonsense to this child, that could turn out to be quite valuable, I think.

Mr. Villemain: But if there is, we ought to discover it.

Mr. Taylor: This is an exceedingly good point because I am convinced (and you know I am an amateur, I can project this, I don't have to worry about it -- I can go back to my history of art) that when I mentioned about children being read to things they couldn't read or things they couldn't write, I am all in favor of children having Shakespearian sonnets read to them -- they don't have to know all about universal love, there is something very wonderful about it, in the sound. Furthermore, I am all in favor of having small children having poetry read to them in other languages, which they don't understand. This is not nonsense in the comic book sense, but real quality that you are building upon. Later they will come upon it and say, "Oh, it has this extraordinary level of meaning to it." It hasn't been falsified you see.

Mr. Villemain: We are all also familiar with what has happened to so many of us, and maybe it happened to Mel, I can remember in public school days when I was exposed to certain symphonies -- well, it took me years to get over what happened there -- there was a miseducation going on.

Mr. Beittel: There is a certain platonic overhang here though, is there not, assuming something such as Plato, or later Read, via Schiller, that "forming" has this positive influence on human beings. This is why I understand Montaigne was awakened by the violin. I don't know how he felt about that in his later essays, but this was a fact, this was practiced in various periods in history. We don't know really about this assumption, do we? You're suggesting we research it.

Mr. Rosenberg: I agree there ought to be a lot of research in this field provided we can establish good hypotheses.

Mr. Beittel: Elliot brought up a question, which I would like to bring back to Al, concerning the "out" which is in going back to the work of art, which can be apprehended much beyond the level of performance. It is not quite resolved for me, at least, what role the performance plays. In other words how these two things stand in relation to each other. Now the tradition has been in art education, as I think Elliot pointed out, more in the performing, and now we want to expand this notion, and you gentlemen are

helping us do this nobly here. I am still concerned about the role of the performing -- both in relation to and separate from, if I may put it that way -- what you gentlemen represent. I wonder if Al would address himself to this or if any of the rest of you would.

Mr. Kaprow: Well, I think Harold before referred to how if methodologists or technicians or specialists get hold of certain basic tools for the young child's use as an artist, this could be immediately turned into a vast program of complications, just for the sake of testing. You could direct it away from the purpose which is to let this kid become acquainted with art by doing it. On the other hand, there is a specialist called an artist who, if he is gifted at teaching, in the presence of that child might turn those very same materials which at that early point are not necessarily great works of art, or not associated as materials with the making of art, for instance, they might not be paint or wood to carve; they might be nuts and bolts or strings or whatever, just by his very presence and let's say more than merely intuitive grasp of his teaching job; but I think by a sense of the theatre of his presentation, he could very likely turn this activity into a profitable one that if it doesn't verge on art, actually is art. And it's at that moment no different than the explorations of modern artists with their own new visions. Even if it is only on a very rudimentary level for the kid -- it might be just as intense. So I am willing to imagine, because I haven't seen enough evidence of this in the schools, that if we were able to stimulate more artists to enter into especially the lower grades to teach or set by example a tone, we might begin to come close to this kind of broad idea that you are referring to, Mel, where it doesn't have to be only a great work of art that is shown a child, though I certainly would want that there too, but it can be something we call just life itself and at that point maybe a chair which a child might make could be a totem as much as something to sit on, could be "magical" as I like to put it. I have seen it happen in little classes here and there in out-of-the-way places but I think it could happen much more broadly in the United States and so I suggested, and I hope we can pursue this in some way, that more artists who are gifted and interested in the teaching area be brought into the schools as examples, as teachers, as artists in residence, if you want, and I think it might be very stimulating.

Mr. Beittel: We are moving toward the questions which I sense are in the minds of the participants at the conference, that is, what are the exemplars, or archetypes, or whatever you want to call them, that you gentlemen represent, which we should try to build into our curricular activities? For instance, when Bruner tries to exemplify with some educators and with some mathematicians, what it is to think like a mathematician, we can follow his reasoning here, he sets up a rather constrained environment in one way but an environment in which key things are about to be discovered. He is saying in essence that eight year olds can discover the law of quadratics; and this is a key concept to mathematicians. I think one thing that art educators would like to know is, what are some of these key concepts, are they verbalizable; if not, can you represent them? I don't think we would mind if they had to be acted out, or even "danced," as Mel put it. What are some of these key notions that we can focus on so that we don't dissipate our energies in all sorts of useless and unrelated activities?

Mr. Taylor: I'm aware that the difficult point in the program I suggested is precisely the swing between these two areas and this is the very tough point. You can argue the virtues of doing and you can argue the virtues of studying the painting -- it's in terms of the teaching now -- at what point does this transference begin to take place, and I can't imagine a greater help in this than the artist, not so much as the teacher, but the artist as a kind of model of the operation. I think it is asking an awfully lot of the artist to ask him to teach. I think you are asking him to take on a great deal of responsibility that most artists are neither prepared or willing to take.

Mr. Rosenberg: When we talk about artists who will turn the tables that way, I quite agree with you -- you are not dealing with materials of art in the sense of pictures or sculpture, etc., and the artist was taking pieces of paper or something else and doing something with it, how would you define an artist? What makes this fellow an artist? Is it the fact that he has been concerned with painting and sculpture and that he, in a

way, becomes an exemplar a type that has all or some large amount of art in his mind? Isn't that what is involved here? I mean he is like an embodiment of art history, in a sense, in a living sense, and he has made himself into the present moment of art history, so if he starts fooling around with cigarette packages, etc., art history is speaking through him. So in that sense he becomes the ideal teacher, but if you want to get rid of him or put him on the side lines you have to fill in for him and then you have to take art and put it in there instead of him. Isn't that the way it goes?

Mr. Tumin: I think it may be a serious mistake to assume that artists are good examples of art in action or that writers are good examples and models to put in front of kids of what writing is about, because the disparity between the activity and the product and the external presentation of self of the person himself, can be so great as to throw kids off. And this leads to a very important sociological problem, insofar as art education is concerned, part of which is reflected in the attitudes the boards of education take to art education as a frill subject. Art is defined as effete -- it's feminine -- it's sissy stuff -- it's for exotic people, that is, queer people. What in the world can be done in the schools, if anything, to make art masculine, strong, popular, in a sense, like athletics (I don't ever expect it will be like athletics for young kids) but what can give it a better place in the culture of manhood in American society today -- is there any hope for that? Has anyone found any ways of getting it into the kids?

Mr. Eisner: That is precisely the kind of question I would like to ask you, as a sociologist.

Mr. Tumin: I am just encountered with despair -- the definition of art as feminine and effete.

Mr. Rosenberg: I don't think this is as true as it used to be. Back in 1936 the Van Gogh Show at the Museum of Modern Art drew a bigger attendance than the Yankee Stadium. Up till then that had never happened and the situation has been quite different in the past thirty years.

Mr. Tumin: That datum sounds just like the one I had thrown at me when we were despairing about the non-reading habits and the non-music listening habits of Americans, someone said "More people buy symphonic records in a given year in the United States than attend baseball games" but what does that mean?

Mr. Rosenberg: It means the decline of baseball.

Mr. Kaprow: You know one simple explanation or possible solution to this problem is to let people see an artist.

Mr. Tumin: Most artists I know would be horrible to bring into a classroom.

Mr. Kaprow: No, I don't think so. I know quite a few artists that would be perfect for the job. Actually, one of the greatest fears the people have had about something they don't know about is that they don't know about it. You know, a Jew has horns, etc., etc., and then somebody at last meets one and he finds out that he has other things wrong with him. So at least he doesn't fit the category. Now I think that the assumption of a great number of people about the artist, that he is effete, strange, unreliable, etc., simply doesn't hold up when, in fact, they meet this person. He may become more dangerous to them for different reasons, but in other cases he might become a great relief to them, and I think that my suggestion here, insofar as it can be put into operation, might help.

Mr. Eisner: The concern of Bruner, I think, is not so much the introduction of the scientist or the artist into the school, but rather establishing those problems in the school curriculum that will engage the student in the kind of activity that the critic, historian and artist engage in. So that if one took this model as a way in which programs might be organized, we would be in a sense going to the historian to find out about the kinds of problems and materials that perhaps could be simulated and given to

youngsters, let's say at secondary school level, into which they could inquire in order to arrive at a product which would be kind of quasi-history, in order to learn something of the procedures that the historian engages in and we would be setting tasks for them so that they could function in a way like a critic functions, and in other tasks as an artist functions. Now this is one kind of rationale for educational planning, but I would like to add that the notion of art instruction as adult intervention is to children's and young adolescents' art activities was itself a questionable enterprise in the last twenty years, so that it may be erroneous to assume that in most classroom students received art instruction. They may have been engaging in activities but they may not have been receiving instruction. Now if one established an experimental situation whereby students truly received instruction in the making of art and if this was tied with the looking at great art, we might reap consequences that are exceedingly valuable. As yet, I think this has not been done.

Mr. Harris: It might reap consequences that you wouldn't want, too, because you would build criteria and the individual would discover that he isn't up to those criteria, his own performance can't match those criteria and he will reject the whole works.

Mr. Taylor: This is the question I was going to ask you. We have been talking about, I think the kind of disaffection that sets in somewhere along the line with small children. Small children don't consider art effete or effeminate. And at some point they begin to. These days it is not only the young gentlemen, it is also the young ladies who begin to look upon it as beneath them. I am curious as to what point this is, and whether it is simply a matter of growing up, and I think not, because people don't grow up that innocently, or whether it is what they engage in. My own sort of simple-minded and cloistered theory is that quite possibly at a point in which they feel that in terms of art they are inadequate -- and someone else is good -- one argues, in the normal way, that then naturally what I do is virtuous, what I do is the masculine way, what he does, then, must be the effete way. And they sometimes don't get over this. I know that first year students coming into the university still hold this notion that to be open in discussing art and what art forces them to discuss, still has this lingering sense that it belongs to other people. They quickly get over this at the university, you can trip them, but this shouldn't have to happen.

Mr. Tumin: You have the support of "culture" in the university, that you don't have in the peer groups of adolescents.

Mr. Eisner: There is empirical evidence regarding the effeminate aspects of art and aesthetic values. For example, on the Alport, Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values you find that the aesthetic value for women is significantly higher than for men.

Mr Taylor: But how is aesthetic judged there? You see, you get back to the rhythm-balance-harmony school -- that's exactly the point at which a serious kid is going to drop off because to him that is peripheral and then pretty phoney -- he doesn't really care about the tidy universe at that point. He is interested in other things though, that are much more germane to art than a tidy sense of order. And as long as you stick with only order as the element in art, which I must say in most art it isn't, there may be an ingredient but it certainly doesn't stop there, quite naturally he is going to consider that out.

Mr. Beittel: In other words what you are saying is that in a degree the art presented him was, indeed, effeminate.

Mr. Taylor: Curiously, it's truncating. Instead of opening up experience and challenging his mind, instead of making him realize that there are big problems, which I must say most kids like, the earlier they can be treated like adults and think big, I don't mean falsely big but I mean really engage themselves -- and I think the kids nowadays engage themselves very early. After all they learn most not in the classroom but outside. You talk about adult intervention -- indeed, adults intervene long before they get into school and all the way through. You can't pretend, you see, that they are not influenced constantly all the way through.

Mr. Villemain: There's a sociological consideration that I wish Mel would talk about a little bit, if he would, to help us think about it. It is tied up with the phenomena, or the problem you have already posed. One thing we certainly have learned, haven't we, about curriculum change, and that is it is wound up with social, economic, political -- economic vested interests are involved here, the publishing world, and power structures, and status symbol systems. So there is a sense in which the U. S. Office of Education was utterly naive in spending its monies to bring a group of scholars together to talk; if they want curriculum change maybe they should have given the money to some office on Madison Avenue and had it railroaded into the schools, you know. But there is a serious question here, it seems to me, to address ourselves to, and that is what the strategy, above and beyond contemplating and discussing, deliberating and writing and researching together? What is the social strategy for bringing a more secure place for not just the one art but the several arts?

Mr. Tumin: I think it is terribly important when you ask that kind of a question, to state what are your reasonable expectations; and I would like to offer this formulation. It is reasonable to expect only the tiniest portion of the population will ever be gifted artists, it is reasonable to expect that a somewhat larger portion of the population, but not by any means the overwhelming majority, will come to a fairly deep and sensitive appreciation of the arts; and it is reasonable to expect that the vast majority can come to have some kind of experience that we call "art experience," if you will, without ever getting to art, except on the fringes. Though one can strive and struggle always toward bringing them to art, one ought not to feel that his art education program failed if he didn't bring them to art, if he has managed to bring them at least to those kinds of experiences we talked about as developmental experiences. I'm going to call this art education because it overlaps with the very same sense of responses that you get when you do come to art.

Mr. Rosenberg: Would you say this about everything, I mean any subject that's taught?

Mr. Tumin: Yes, I think there are natural gradients of responsiveness.

Mr. Rosenberg: In other words, you are going to have a vast majority of people who will simply not know anything very well, is that what you've been saying?

Mr. Taylor: That these others know that it exists is terribly important. I think this is, at the moment, of growing importance. A lot of people look at the gaudy pictures in Life Magazine, they don't know what it is about and most of them don't even use it for name dropping or cocktail conversation, and yet they take comfort in the fact that it does exist and they can believe it is worthwhile even though they can't quite sense the nature of that worthwhileness.

Mr. Tumin: From these experiences you come to know the things that you can't do that others can do that involve skills

Mr. Taylor: Provided it is not in opposition and you don't resent it.

Mr. Tumin: I want to get to the point where people no longer say "Oh any kid can draw that Paul Klee." If only that could be eliminated from the thinking; and you can get that from people who really don't know art but only know it from the outside, actually.

Mr. Eisner: This is a question that Francis raised, that is, given the current situation, what do you do to develop a more secure place for the arts in American public schools?

Mr. Tumin: For education or for the arts?

Mr. Eisner: Well, he had broadened it to include the arts, perhaps we could deal with art education more specifically. One of the things that has been done in the past -- there are in this country fish-bowl schools -- schools that serve as lighthouses, as paradigms for other school districts and other schools. Institutions of this type could

be used to develop really innovative programs which would serve as exemplars to other school personnel and could serve to influence them. This is only one way of doing it. The U. S. Office of Education has taken a different kind of route. The history of the Office of Education in previous years has been one of data collection and data dissemination. The current practice of the U. S. Office of Education is far more than that. It's innovating in education and the provision of funds for this conference is one such effort. Now the question of efficiency and effectiveness as compared to Madison Avenue, vis a vis this conference is an interesting one. I think the U. S. Office of Education was right. But I think there are many routes to this. The construction of materials, the establishment of research centers, the development of fish-bowl programs in the visual arts in certain schools, the publication of research reports and articles, by the way, in journals, in the field of general education, which are virtually absent of anything in the field of art education. About a month or two ago I did a little library research. I went to the three major education journals in the field of education, The Harvard Educational Review, Teachers College Record and The School Review, Chicago, Harvard and Teacher's College, Columbia -- and I looked up from the 1920's to the 1960's the number of articles in each of those journals dealing with the role of the visual arts in education; and perhaps over that period there was something like fifteen articles published from 1920 to 1960 in these three major journals, so that one of the things that we do in this field, and I think other people in other fields do as well, is to talk to ourselves, but we don't make much of an effort to talk with people outside of our own field in terms of the kinds of things that the field of art education has to offer. I think this would be one other kind of mode.

Mr. Taylor: I would like to point out that two things that seem to be acting at the same time here in terms of public relations in places where they count, that are sort of puzzling. I am judging this from students who come into the university having had what education they have now. One is of course that very few universities recognize for credit courses in art. So one place you have got to look to and look fast is the creation of programs not patterned after what the universities tell you, because they don't know what is right, but by creating a program that is so good that you sell them that it is right, so that it will be respectable for those students, the best students, who are in strong competition to get into college.

Mr. Tumin: Make it a major subject which anxious parents will let their kids take.

Mr. Taylor: Now the second point to this seems to be the difficulty because it is rare that you find a brilliant student who has any training in this area at all, simply because he wasn't allowed to, and he didn't dare to. Now this is a kind of pessimistic view for me to disclose. At the same time over the last ten years there has been a fantastic growth of interest in exhibitions at museums, the attendance has swollen tremendously, the general publication of art, in terms of books and general periodicals, etc., has increased incredibly, in terms of only ten years ago. A lot of this is for the wrong reasons -- I think this is irrelevant, the fact is, it's there and people are aware of it. So that on one side you have the hardest situation to face, in which you are forced to the possibility of being crowded off the field entirely. On the other hand, you have the public accepting more and more the existence of art, and difficult art, no longer just happy things in big, gold frames that they can go and not look at, but really willing to work at it and they want to. They go to an exhibition of contemporary art and talk badly about it while they are there and the next time they have an exhibition of contemporary art they go back to it and they talk badly about it. I don't care whether they talk badly or they don't, they go. So, you have, one, a willingness of the family, and the family is important, to accept art as a fact. Now, somehow, this has to be tied in with what goes on in school, and at the present time I don't think it is, and on the other side you have to fight on the competitive, academic credits side, so that the two things can come together.

Mr. Eisner: This is something of a social paradox that's happened in this country and I couldn't agree with you more. The national merit scholarship program and the college board examinations, for example, have no sections on art. The difficulties in testing in the field of art are enormous but one of the things that colleges "go by" are certain

kinds of test scores, certain kinds of standardized procedures whereby they can become quasi-objective about who gets in and who is excluded. In Tests in Print, which is a book listing all of the tests that are published in this country and in Europe, there are about 2100 such tests listed. In the fine arts, that is in art, music, literature, etc., there are 26 sets out of the over 1200 tests. In the visual arts there are 10 such tests, and of the 10 tests in the visual arts, six of them were published in the 1930's, so that we have a situation which is in a sense of reflection of the fact that art can't be measured, and it can't be standardized, and the fact of the matter that these kinds of conditions, that is the absence of a viable test program, because of the absence of standards and because of the conception of the proper function of the arts in education, has served to reinforce the current minor position of the role of the arts in secondary education and in the colleges. In addition, in a study that was done by Lawrence Downey a couple of years ago dealing with the tasks of American education, he asked well over 5,000 people throughout the country on a stratified sampling basis to rank order a number of tasks for elementary and secondary education, in terms of if the budget had to be cut should come first and what should come last. Well, there were sixteen such tasks, sixteen such subject matters or areas that people ranked. Out of the sixteen, aesthetic education was ranked 14th by non-educators and 12th by educators, and in no case did it break into the upper half of the list, although it did rise somewhat with increased education.

Mr. Tumin: What came off worse than aesthetic education?

Mr. Eisner: I don't remember.

Mr. Villemain: That's true. There is evidence of this lack of concern in the professional literature, I think Professor Harris would support me in this, both found in educational philosophy and in educational psychology. I don't think the literature of educational psychology displays a great interest in the psychology of the aesthetic experience and what can go on here. It has been, as with educational philosophy, largely preoccupied with the learning that goes on in connection with cognitive enterprises and certainly this is true in educational philosophy -- it has only been within the last few years really that educational philosophers have been at all preoccupied with the nature of the aesthetic experience and its place in the hegemony of education generally. But this interest is growing rapidly in both areas.

Mr. Harris: The point was made very clearly that it can't be measured, that we haven't established criteria; and educational psychology for sixty years now has been preoccupied with measurement, as we were discussing the other day.

Mr. Tumin: Professor Harris, wasn't the same despair felt about the unmeasurability, let us say, of literary appreciation twenty years ago and isn't it a fact that they decided to try to measure it -- doesn't that finally begin to produce results? Another thing, there is an ultimate unmeasurability to the things we are interested in.

Mr. Rosenberg: It has produced very bad results.

Mr. Tumin: We can make progress as being as bad as all the others.

Mr. Taylor: But I think that there is another reason -- this isn't the only -- and I think you have got to take the responsibility for it. But if I were asked by my University whether we should give academic credit for the programs coming from most high schools, I would say no.

Mr. Tumin: How about programs in history coming from most high schools? Wouldn't you be a little bit dubious about those, too?

Mr. Taylor: That's out of my area.

Mr. Beittel: Gentlemen, we have some little uncertainty here -- and yet I know that at the end of Dale's paper he spoke for uncertainty as we try to get status and resolve our

lack of clarity. I know when Al talked to us too, he say it as an important ingredient in the history of art, and also maybe in the complex types of learning such as we deal with here. Could you speak to that for a moment, Dale?

Mr. Harris: Well, I was just referring to the fact that it had been increasingly evident recently that too direct a leading from fact to fact in linear programming, for example, may lead to learning but it also leads to satiety very, very quickly, and if you build in some complexity and make the individual search a bit, such as by other types of programming, so-called branching types, the interest is held and in the long run the individual stays with the material and learns it perhaps more effectively.

Mr. Beittel: This isn't against measurement, this is just one of the conditions with which we must contend, you're saying. Well, Gentlemen, I'm afraid our time is coming to an end. This is not the last supper - you have a chance again tomorrow to ceremonially talk to the whole group.

Mr. Tumin: When is the crucifixion to occur?

Mr. Beittel: The crucifixion will not occur until after you go, I understand.

Mr. Rosenberg: Crucified in absentia!

Mr. Beittel: This concludes, then, the interaction session of the outside specialists who represent disciplines we feel of moment to the interdisciplinary field of art education, A.D. 1965. Thank you, Gentlemen.