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Background

Prior to the late 1960s an education in the visual arts was based on the assumption that art dealt with a specific body of knowledge and certain processes and skills. If one chose to study sculpture, the processes consisted of modeling in clay and subsequent casting in bronze, carving in stone and wood, and perhaps some of the newer media such as welding and working with plastics. If one studied painting, the media would be oils or acrylics painted on canvas or any flat, two-dimensional surface. Whatever the form, the visual arts encompassed only a limited number of processes and possibilities.

Graduate students generally studied with artists whose work they admired, and criticism of their work tended to be a reflection of the personal views of their instructor who, quite frequently, was content to have his students simply emulate his style. At this time criticism centered around a formalist aesthetic.

The atmosphere in the 1960s was highly competitive. One's art was strictly a private affair; one's ideas were guarded and seldom shared. One of the primary objectives of graduate study in art was the eventual teaching position at a college or university. Yet teaching was seldom the ultimate goal and, ironically, nothing in the graduate
program dealt with teaching. Teaching was regarded only as a vehicle for earning a livelihood which, in turn, permitted one to pursue his own work in his particular art. The concept of a concerned, dedicated teacher was regarded as an unhealthy if not injurious attitude for the artist; such an attitude was considered incompatible with the goals of the artist - it would dissipate his creative potential and dilute his talent. The artist was first and foremost an artist who perhaps spent a little time teaching. His only legitimate place was in the studio.

In the hierarchy of the arts, art education - the training of art teachers for the secondary schools - ranked at the bottom, a secure niche for mediocrity, for those who could not make it as artists. Many art instructors conveyed this attitude quite bluntly; there was simply no room for dedicated teaching since one's artistic energy was limited. If used for teaching, it diluted creativity and sapped the artist of his reserves that should be channeled more profitably towards his main function as an artist.

Such a philosophy posed a contradiction for me. I had returned to graduate school after teaching art in the secondary schools for a number of years. My intention was to return to secondary school teaching since I believed there was a pressing need for excellence in teaching at this level. But it soon became apparent to me that to be taken seriously
in a terminal degree program in sculpture required total dedication to sculpture alone. Thus I chose to follow this avenue and devoted full time to my sculpture. It was not a comfortable decision, however, since it left unresolved the dichotomy regarding the artist as teacher and the teacher as artist. I was struggling to develop a meaningful relationship between the two; but in the context of my graduate study in sculpture in the mid 1960s, no solution seemed possible.

As a teaching assistant and subsequently as a faculty member upon completing my graduate work, my teaching focused on conveying the same information I had been taught and in a manner similar to the way it had been presented. This dealt with a specific body of knowledge about art and a definite aesthetic approach. Temporarily this recycling of the teaching-learning process seemed adequate, but soon obstacles began to emerge.

Most important was the change in attitude of the students. In the late 1960s, graduate students were less competitive and far more inclined to share and exchange their views and ideas. In this new climate evolved group shows and participatory works; formerly the one-man show was the manner of exhibition. The type of work being produced also changed. The making of permanent art objects became less important and the process, the working procedure, was emphasized, resulting quite naturally in works of limited duration and transient structure.
What accounted for the new trends? As with any new movement involving attitude change, it is difficult to isolate specific causes or to dissect human thought and behavior. However, the overall conditions which affected these changes are now becoming clear. Information was the catalyst for change; the manner in which information was collected and disseminated profoundly affected the thinking of artists. The proliferation of the computer with its information-gathering potential, and other technological advances in such areas as videotape, produced the information revolution. Vast sources of information became readily available in both written and visual form on a global scale.

The issue for artists has always been information. When information was limited and developed at a slow pace, the work of artists quite naturally reflected this, and did not change very much. The artist, as a mirror of his culture, reflects the information available to him. The contemporary artist is usually a few steps ahead of the overall population - the interpreter of what is to come. Artists in the 1960s were fully aware of the effects of the massive infusion of information into our society and their work naturally became involved with this new phenomenon.

Artists began to talk about their art as systems of information. Viewing or participating in art became a system by which the artist communicated or transferred certain information to the viewer. The "conceptual" art movement
which peaked in the late 1960s regards the idea as paramount in art. Skills are the tools needed to present ideas, but it is the idea that is the content of the art. Within such a flexible philosophy the limits of art become greatly expanded. The artist becomes a communicator and may use any means at his disposal as a basis for his communication. Many argue that this brings art into the realm of philosophy, a statement that most conceptual artists would not dispute. As an example, a group of conceptual artists are currently working with language systems, another group alters the environment with their earth works, while still another segment deals with communication and considers educating the public as the basic function of their art.

From the above emerges the potential for the artist/teacher. The connection and merging of art and teaching begin. The artist/teacher becomes one entity, wherein the artist is communicating and the classroom is the forum for such artistic communication. His teaching is not now foreign and separate from his art but an integral part of it. If in fact the arts are considered as information and communication systems, the dedicated artist/teacher can be regarded as the avant-garde in art, and the commodity of the artist/teacher can become his teaching and not the material object, as was formerly the case.

The implications of these new ideas for art and education are very important because what emerges is an
expanded definition of art that transcends art as decorative object making and views art as a broad communicative system inseparable from social, urban and global conditions. In this context the artist/teacher takes on a new and exciting role. The potential of this new role forms the subject of this work.

This dissertation fills what I consider to be an important and growing need. Many young art teachers are uncomfortable in their traditional roles of teaching skills and techniques. They face administrators who, because of their own art education, view art as the making of decorative objects. These young teachers need support for their ideas. At this time such support in written form is non-existent. By documenting the thinking of a group of innovative artist/teachers who are in positions of importance, this study will provide such support in written form.

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine two major trends in art and the issues involved in those trends. The first is that the artist/teacher in the light of contemporary artistic thinking is providing a new philosophy of art education and as such should be regarded as the avant-garde in art. The second trend will deal with the need for curriculum change in art education. Connected with the first trend, it will focus on the thinking and resultant philosophy and work of a group of contemporary artist/teachers. They will be interviewed and the documentation of their think-
The method I will employ to collect my data will be the per-
sonal interview and these interviews will provide the major
sources of data for my research. This is necessary since
research is only beginning to emerge in this area.

However, there have been numerous philosophers and
developmental psychologists who have long understood the
implications of the trends now emerging in the arts. This
is the reason they are included in the bibliography.

Philosophers such as Harold Taylor and Herbert Read
view the arts as learning processes which are fundamentally
different from the dominant verbal methodology of most schools.
To such thinkers the personal learning procedure involved
in the making of art is, educationally speaking, extremely
important. This process orientation, currently so stressed
by the artist/teacher, has long been a major goal of Taylor
and Read.

Developmental psychologists such as Jean Piaget and
Jerome Bruner have also understood the importance of the arts
as an educating procedure. Piaget states that formal verbal
instruction is generally ineffective for children. They
learn from the manipulation of physical objects in their
environment, and such activity constitutes the manner in
which they accumulate a large percentage of genuine know-
ledge. The art activity is the physical manipulation of
objects in the environment. Jerome Bruner supports Piaget's
thinking. He suggests that the ability to structure a learn-
ing situation in a personal manner, to learn how to learn, and the use of intuition in learning, are educationally important goals. Both of the above ideas are fundamental to the art process.

In a sense Taylor, Read, Piaget and Bruner have been emphasizing process art as one of the most effective means for learning. For some time artists have been emphasizing the art process. The dematerialization of art as it occurred in the 1960s was a movement to de-emphasize the art object and to emphasize the process. At the time many artists did not understand the educational implications of their activity. What is fascinating to this study is that with the dematerialization of art and the accompanying emphasis on the process, the objectives of artists and educators become the same. In such a merging lies the potential of the artist/teacher.
The Decline of Formalism

In 1973 the Museum of Modern Art in New York City held a retrospective exhibition of the work of Marcel Duchamp. At first glance what may have appeared confusing about this exhibition was the fact that Duchamp died in 1968, yet the last dated painting in the exhibition was 1914 and the major work of the retrospective was a construction titled "The Large Glass" done between 1915 and 1923. In terms of traditional artistic merit and depth, this show was not particularly impressive. It traced the development of Duchamp through his early years with various drawings and paintings typical of the period. Perhaps the most famous traditional work in the exhibition was the cubist painting "Nude Descending a Staircase"(1912). One might speculate that Duchamp ceased to work just at the point when his artistic career seemed to be gaining momentum.

What are the reasons for these contradictions? Why does the Museum of Modern Art, one of the most prestigious museums in the country, organize a retrospective of a man who stopped working early in his career and whose works up to that point were not especially impressive? One wonders why Duchamp disengaged himself from traditional art in 1914. And, finally, why is Duchamp today regarded as one of the most important artistic influences of the twentieth century?
The answers to these questions may be found in the analysis of "The Large Glass" and its accompanying verbal instructions in "The Green Box" (1915-1923). This work, which is in the collection of the Philadelphia Museum of Art, is "in fact a coherent allegory of the devolution of modern art."¹ The analysis leads to the assumption that by 1912 Duchamp had arrived at a semiological theory of art. This would explain his semi-retirement from art after that time.

Arturo Schwartz in his book A New Society and a New Language states that "by 1912 or 1913 Duchamp had grasped the essential relationships between language as an evolving set of positional signs, and art as its semiotic, perhaps simpler counterpart.² According to Duchamp, the linguist is closer to the mechanisms of art than is the artist. This explains his interest in word play and its conceptual importance for art. He understood that art as a fragile system of signs and values was a closed system whereby each solution was a step closer to the elimination of subsequent solutions. This explains Duchamp's frequent observation that art's instability is the death wish of art. In his words, "There is no solution because there is no problem." Stated another way, there is "no problem" because art devolves by existing in "problematic form."

As artists continue to seek new solutions, which all serious artists must do since this is the nature of art - hence its instability - their choices become more and more

¹ Jack Burnham, The Structure of Art, p. 164.
² Ibid.
limited. As a result of continued new solutions to artistic problems, artists erode the signifying power of art. As this happens, the underlying structure of art is comprehended, with the consequence that there is no future need for exploration.

The history of art clearly demonstrates how movements in art have become shorter in duration as they approach the present time. Where the Renaissance, for instance, lasted approximately 300 years, today we have a situation where several movements in art may be operating concurrently. What is clearly understood by all artists is that once a movement has surfaced, it is for purposes of artistic exploration exhausted and over. This is the artistic intuition that Duchamp understood around 1912. He believed that any artist who comprehended the underlying structure of art could easily reduce it to a system as he had done. Without this understanding, even the greatest artists would produce only new variations, i.e., signs within the context of the semiotic system. Although major revolutionary innovations, such as Picasso's cubist painting "Les Demoiselles d'Avignon" (1907) and Jackson Pollack's action painting (1947), would continue and lengthen the life of modern art - in this case, retinal painting - they would at the same time be bringing it to a close by limiting future discovery, thereby reducing the signification capacity of art which as a closed system has limited solutions. Duchamp theorized that ultimately all painting would reach a purely conceptual state - in his words "without topographical form" - a situation that was realized
around 1970. For Duchamp, then, modern art was a process of continued erosion where one by one artists would uncover the limited possibilities of sign combinations until the process became exhausted.

It is fascinating that between 1911 and 1926 the genius of Duchamp anticipated almost every major movement to arise in the history of modern art. This is the significance of his optical and kinetic experiments and his so-called ready-mades, examples of which were evident in his retrospective.

Although he acknowledged the greatness of Picasso, Duchamp, in the allegory of The Glass, refers to himself as the "headlight child." Symbolically, The Glass foretells the future of art. For Duchamp it was to be repetition and elaboration until the structure of art became evident. His understanding of this was the basis for his freedom from art - hence his early disengagement. Duchamp did not have high regard for artists generally, although he admired many individual artists. He speculated that fame and recognition were the dominant drives of most artists. And this was another reason for his disengagement from the role of the artist but significantly not the negation of his own artistry.

Duchamp was in no hurry to tell his secret. He was content to allow "art to proceed on its own trajectory through the constant oscillation of different sign combinations."³

This also explains his subtitle to The Glass - i.e., "Delay in Glass." Because there is no visual meaning to this subtitle, it can only be interpreted as Duchamp's understanding of avant-garde art as an essentially closed system which in time would be comprehended.

"The Large Glass" is actually a myth about a myth: "Largely the myth is concerned with the fallibility of cultures which accept their sign systems as empirical truths. But 'The Large Glass' with its puns and allusions is also a most elegant attempt to create a summarizing work of art by explaining the structure of art, setting in motion the kind of dialectical or capping process by which every semiological system transcends its predecessors. Only at this stage does one begin to grasp the magnitude of restraint and psychic complexity involved in the Duchamp Myth. It seems likely that what made it possible for Duchamp to live with this secret for over fifty years was the sublime assurance that his wisdom and oracular powers would one day be appreciated far beyond what was possible in his lifetime." 4

Duchamp's rejection of modern art was in effect a rejection of formalism. Formalism had been the dominant aesthetic philosophy of the visual arts for the past sixty years. An understanding of its origins and workings is necessary for an intelligent interpretation of modern art. Although this dissertation is based on the assumption that

formalism was rejected as an aesthetic criteria around 1960, its origins and understanding are necessary foundations to my major conclusions.

Conrad Fiedler's doctrine of "pure visibility" is the forerunner of formalism. Fiedler reduced art to formal knowledge with the justification that subjective responses to art should be identified with the expressiveness of the artist, not the viewer. Such thinking developed in the 1890s when aesthetics began to substitute subjective for objective evaluation. The art historian Alios Riegl developed such a principle which he termed "Kunstwollen," referring to the power of a culture to develop new artistic sensibilities. Such sensibilities incorporated the intentions of the artist in the analysis of the work, and formalism was a very suitable system for such an analysis.

Heinrich Wolfflin consolidated formalism in 1915 with a system he termed "formal analysis." According to such analysis, art could be organized according to a compositional format using such elements as line, form, color, contrast, texture and arrangement. Originally, such analysis was the basis for representational work only, or what Wolfflin termed "organic art." This is understandable since during this time the human figure was the archetypal subject for art. Gestalt psychology, with its "organistic basis," fitted the requirements of formalism very well and was incorporated to give formalism scientific validity. Accordingly, Gestalt psychology, with its part to whole relationships, suited the requirements
of formalism since works of art could now be interpreted in terms of the perceptual capability of the human eye. Perhaps this connection between formalism and Gestalt psychology reached its height of development with the work of Rudolf Arnheim, a Gestalt psychologist, who developed such a system of analysis of art in his book *Art and Visual Perception*, 1954. In this work perception is analyzed according to such formalist terms as balance, shape, light, color, movement, tension and expression.

Since formalism was the major aesthetic philosophy of modern art until approximately 1960, the decline of formalism is synonymous with the decline of modern art. This is in accordance with Duchamp's theory of modern art as a closed system of signs - i.e., formalist terms slowly being exhausted as their combinations become more and more limited with continued artistic exploration. As late as 1960, various critics still believed that there would be an artistic renaissance based on the synthesis of formalist principles, but by that time the avant-garde in art had become increasingly aware that formalism had reached its end. "The decline of formalism is the decline of a world fashioned to operate on a strictly visual-geometrical level. For the doubtful, compare the inside of a pocket-sized transistor radio with the workings of a spring-wound watch. The geometry inside the radio is an orderly assembly of electronic coding and circuit miniaturization, not casual, coherent relationships as in the watch."^5

---

By 1960 formalism was generally a dead issue. However, at this time many artists still did not understand Duchamp's thinking and its consequent clarification which came about in the late 1960s. Between the early 1960s and the late 1960s, when artists began to understand Duchamp's thinking, they intuitively continued to dematerialize art.

The philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty provided the philosophical basis for phenomenalism, a movement which evolved in art between 1960 and 1965. He derided a world in which an all-powerful science excluded other forms of analytical perception. Since objectivity became the highest epistemological goal of science, Merleau-Ponty saw a need to study consciousness as its mechanisms formed the basis by which objectivity is reached. Merleau-Ponty, using Edmund Husserl's research on consciousness, was very much interested in the modes of perception and the various experiences which stimulated the perception of form. He suggested that the viewer gain a conceptual reality by his various perceptual acts while viewing and interacting with works of art. Artists up to that point had not understood that the viewer must reconstruct a work by himself, that seeing was an existential act on the part of the viewer based on his interaction with the work, himself and other people.

In the past, seeing was done according to the logic of formal analysis. According to Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, artists began to create works which did not form a conceptual unity. They were left open - in a sense, conceptually
unfinished - and clues were given by which the viewer, through various perceptual steps, would form a Gestalt. In painting the reductive works of Barnett Newman and Ad Reinhardt, and in sculpture the works of Robert Morris, Tony Smith and Donald Judd, are examples of this trend. Minimalism and object art were the names given to this movement. Minimalism was a reaction to and a further rejection of formalism. Formal considerations were not important and were de-emphasized. In fact, minimal art was anti-formal or without formal properties. Minimalism stretched object or material art to its limit. Since object art was dependent on formalism for its structure as well as its content, minimalism also pushed formalism to the limit since minimalism rejected a formal structure. The logical next step was the creation of art without objects, or conceptual art - in Duchamp's phraseology, an art without topographical form. Such a movement developed in the 1960s.

The period of the middle sixties to the early seventies produced a chaotic situation within the visual arts. It was not a period that could be described as a movement but rather was a series of various ideas loosely connected by a few broader concepts. The period has many names - i.e., conceptual art, idea art, process art, anti-form, etc. What connected these ideas into a network was, first of all, the notion that the idea or concept was more important in an art work than the formal aspects of the finished product.
This undermined the formalist approach and put the emphasis on the content or idea of the work. Thus the process or system began to determine the form of the work, and artists began to refer to their methods of working as a systems approach. The second premise of the period that connected many of the ideas was the notion that materials could also determine the form of a work. Under this approach, what constituted the basis for art was greatly expanded beyond physical materials into such ephemeral materials as time, space, non-visual systems, unrecorded experiences, unspoken ideas and so on.

Generally, the major ideas of this period de-emphasized materials. Lucy Lippard documents this period in her book entitled *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object, 1966-72*, and lists such characteristics as uniqueness, permanence and decorative attractiveness as those material aspects which have been de-emphasized.

Artists of this period referred to their work as information systems. What they were doing was collecting and disseminating information. Artists have always followed such a process except that the traditional method that the artist followed was to collect information and use it for the making of an object which the public could view. Now the emphasis is on making the process much more direct by providing the information directly.

In *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object,*
Stephen Kaltenbach is quoted as follows:

"Culturally we are permitted to move faster now. I like being in a looser, faster moving, developing kind of thing. The developing has really become primary. I'm having a hard time making objects now, and the objects that I do make seem to sort of drop out, as evidence of my discoveries. Anything I can understand seems to become potentially a way of working, so that as I get and understand information, and if I do anything to that information myself, then I'm really anxious to pass it on. The traditional method of passing it on was doing a work and having people see it and understand what is new in it and do it themselves. Now, instead, you can simply pass on the information."^6

One aim of the avant-garde art movement of the mid 1960s was the hope that art would be removed from the commercialization of the art establishment of dealers, galleries, critics and museums. It seemed logical that this might happen since conceptual art rejected the art object which was the saleable commodity. If artists no longer were under the pressure to produce what galleries dictated to them, then art might again regain its function as an integrator of life.

This has not been the case with conceptual art. Many conceptualists are currently handled by prestigious galleries and the documentation of their works in written or photographic form is selling at high prices to an art-hungry public.

^6 Lucy Lippard, Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object, 1966-72, p. 86.
Formalism was dependent upon object invention, the objects that fed the art market. We now have a situation of non-object invention or idea invention. This is promoted by the art establishment which is constantly looking for the new theme or trend and encouraging investors to buy the potential "new find." The New York art scene is an absurd conglomeration of competing galleries, each promoting their own stable to the investing public.

What is the current situation? As predicted, it is not a clear picture. Formalistic art is still very much in evidence in 1976. We are in what can be called an interface period - a period in which there are formalists and those artists who are using a formal structure in a secondary way. In such cases, the content of the work is not the formalistic structure which serves only as an organization for the work. It is interesting to note that many such works are still labeled and criticized as formalistic by art critics who by so doing are completely misunderstanding the work.

While formalism is far less important at this time, its structure has not disappeared. Many artists will continue to work in a formalist manner, especially older artists who have worked according to such a structure for a long time. Since many teachers are still teaching according to formal principles, formalism as an aesthetic criteria will continue for perhaps twenty to fifty years.
Formalism is certainly not the all-embracing aesthetic of the mid 1970s. Its major thrust is gone and a large proportion of younger artists have either rejected it or use it only to structure their work, not as the content as previously was the case. Formalism is just not the issue among most younger artists. But it is interesting to note that these artists don't reject those whose major concern is still formalism. To do this would put them in a formalistic position of evaluation. The current situation then is very fluid, with formalism being important to the art establishment while to the younger innovative artists it is not an issue. Among this group the artist/teacher is considered to be a leading innovator.
The Interviews

Before presenting the interviews, it is appropriate to establish why the interview was my major research approach and, further, to indicate the procedures by which the actual interviews were conducted. The rationale for selecting the specific artist/teachers interviewed should also be established.

The interview method was selected because it is perhaps the best method of gathering information that is direct, precise and unaltered. This allows the reader to confront information in a direct and unobtrusive way and to draw his conclusions based on the information given. This approach is in keeping with the attitude of many contemporary critics and also reflects my ideas about the dissemination of information.

The interviews were conducted in an open and unstructured manner and each one lasted a little over an hour. Usually we would begin by talking about art and what our current interests in art are. This was not taped. In most cases, the tape recorder was inhibiting in the early stages of our talk - the sense that everything said had to be quotable. As the situation became relaxed, I would direct my questions towards specific issues and begin recording. I did not follow a definite format of questions.
Rather, I preferred the interview to develop in a natural manner. This best fitted my aim of getting at the attitudes of those interviewed and avoiding definitive answers solicited by me.

After approximately one hour of conversation, all areas were covered in a way that reflected similar opinions yet evolved from different points of view. I consider this to be a positive situation, for although it made the transcribing and editing a time-consuming and arduous task, it reflected opinions that were varied, well developed and sincere. One hour of tape transcribed into just over 35 pages. These 35 pages were condensed and edited to approximately 15 pages, which were then sent to the artist/teachers interviewed for their review. After such a review, the final draft was prepared.

Since the ideas in this dissertation are just beginning to emerge, very little written information is available on the subject. The major findings developed are just beginning to gain momentum at this time. Consequently, such interviews are the most practical way to gain insight and gather information about these ideas.

The artist/teachers selected for these interviews exemplify my philosophy of the new emerging concept of artist/teacher. They are individuals with whom I am well acquainted and whom I respect. It should be clear that my sample was not at all random but carefully chosen. The
intention was to document the thinking of this group and thereby substantiate and reinforce my own research. By conducting the interviews in an open manner, my views could also be refuted, and a number of my ideas were in fact altered by the interviews.

Ten artist/teachers were interviewed because this number was sufficient for my study. More than ten would have been repetitious, while less than ten would have been inconclusive in terms of the validity of my study. I use the term artist/teacher to include craftsmen, museum educators and teachers since this study deals with the artist/teacher both in and out of the traditional school context.

Although those interviewed are presently located in the northeast, their past history covers a wide range of geographical distribution within the United States and, in two cases, abroad. Furthermore, I have spoken with numerous artist/teachers both from the United States and abroad and their opinions support my conclusions, although they are not specifically included in this study. What emerges is that my conclusions are not regional but reflect trends which are national and global in their implications. This, I believe, is a logical conclusion since the phenomena which form the basis of my conclusions are national and global in scope.

Since the interviews were conducted in an open and unstructured manner, it may be difficult for the reader to deduce what trends he should be looking for. While it is my intention that the interviews should stand by themselves, a
brief summary of the major ideas may be of aid to the reader. The following twelve topics provide a philosophical position for the ten artist/teachers interviewed. It should be noted that those interviewed do not fit neatly into categories and in certain instances a particular topic may not pertain to them. The term artist/teacher refers to those individuals in this study and others of similar philosophical leaning. It is not meant to include all artists who are teaching.

The following twelve ideas provide a framework for the analysis of the interviews:

1) Attitude towards formalism
2) Product and process in art
3) The role of craftsmanship in art
4) The sharing of information and the idea of ownership and authorship
5) Attitude towards change
6) Art as an integrative agent - an aesthetic
7) Art and its relationship to life
8) Attitude towards teaching
9) The relationship between teaching and art
10) Approach to and objectives of teaching
11) Art as a special learning process
12) Justification for the study of art

Perhaps the major idea that separates the artist/teachers interviewed from other artists who are teaching is their rejection of formalism as the major aesthetic philosophy of their
work and teaching. Formalism implies working within set styles and with limited media and information. Formalism is essentially dependent upon the art object. Although some of the artist/teachers interviewed have not totally rejected formalism, to work and teach within strict formal confines is far too limiting for these artists.

Formalism is dependent upon an art product which is then analyzed according to formal criteria. If one teaches according to strict formal principles, process is not the issue. The issue is the product. Conversely, if the working process is stressed, formal and materialistic properties become less important. The artist/teachers in this study tend to be process oriented in their teaching. They do not reject the product but emphasize the product as the materialization of the idea - the tip of the iceberg which is above the water.

In product-oriented teaching, craftsmanship is important because craftsmanship defines the product. In certain cases craftsmanship is the most important aspect of a work - its content. On the other hand, if one teaches according to a process orientation, craftsmanship is only a means to an end. It is a tool used to define the content of a work. To most artist/teachers craftsmanship is not the issue in art. To them the substance of a work is in the idea.

When art is limited to the object and analyzed according to formalistic criteria, invention becomes important and a competitive atmosphere develops whereby each artist is secretive and protects his own product invention. The sharing of ideas would be very foreign in such an atmosphere. Those
artist/teachers interviewed would remove art from the competitive realm and make it a process whereby the artist shares his information. Ownership and authorship would be negative ideas to this group.

A strict adherence to formalistic criteria dictates stable and unchanging information. Consequently, change can be a threat and poses a challenge to such an artist. Because the artist/teachers in this study do not have a strict adherence to formalistic criteria, they are open to and encourage change. In their lives they are growing and changing and they view education as a means of preparing people to cope with change.

The artist/teacher considers art as an integral part of his life. It is not a separate activity which is isolated and hermetic. This is contrary to many artists who view art as separated from reality. Those interviewed see their art as an integrative agent for their lives. Art gives their lives a structure, a method of organizing time beyond material existence. To structure time beyond materialistic existence is the means by which an aesthetic is achieved.

All of the artist/teachers in this study have a very special attitude towards their teaching. They regard teaching as a very important activity and they are dedicated towards achieving a degree of excellence in their teaching.

Although all of the artist/teachers in this study view their teaching as important, the relationship between their teaching and their art differs. To some of them it is the
same activity - teaching has become their art form. To others it is still a separate but related activity. What is basic to all is the importance of teaching.

The artist/teachers in this study have various approaches to teaching. What they have in common are their teaching objectives and their regard for the student. Teaching goes beyond decorative object making. What is stressed are procedures for learning, methods of working and self-direction. The student is regarded as an intelligent individual who brings with him much useful information.

Art is viewed as a communication and learning process. The learning process in the arts is different because one begins with the assumption that a person comes to art full of information. The information for one's art is the life experiences of that individual.

Colleges and universities are graduating thousands of art majors each year. Yet a very small percentage of these graduates become artists. What is the justification for our art programs? To justify art programs as places where students learn to make decorative objects is to point to the weakness of art education. The artist/teachers in this study suggest other and what I consider more important reasons as a justification for the study of art.
Interview with Jerry Kearns

S. P. Do you consider formalism to be dependent upon the material object?

J. K. I think that there are long interface or transitory periods between the object situation and the non-object or process situation, and while artists are making various moves towards a non-object process situation, it seems of necessity that various organizational structures will be brought along from the object situation to the non-object situation. You can organize form in objects and you can also use a formal structure to organize time and process. You may use the same sort of systemic relationships as a methodology for organizing time and process.

S. P. Most theorists concerned with this question believe that formalism in some manner will be around for another fifty years, but its impact will gradually diminish.

J. K. There are a lot of people now who are twenty, thirty years old who are painting, colorfield painters. It is likely that a lot of object art will be very formal and that people who are interested in less formal concerns will be non-object oriented because I think that the object won't be the vehicle to sustain the emotion of communication in a way that the process will be able to do.
S. P. Do you consider that you're still interested in the formalist principles?

J. K. I see myself using them for organization. A number of years ago I began to use very simplistic methods of organization which was the formalistic level of my work. This was secondary to the content of the work but provided some kind of structure that didn't get in the way. More recently, I find that although structure is becoming more an inherent part of my work, it's growing more directly out of what I need to communicate, and not as formalist theory. A lot depends on the view from which you look at the work. If you take the work and try to criticize it formally, it's inherent in that position that you're going to find a formalistic work.

S. P. But you would be missing the point of the work if your main intention was to look at it as a formalistic work.

J. K. Absolutely. A lot of reviews of my work have done just that, which really cracks me up. The reviewer will review my work from a formalist point of view, and that's the most nothing part of my work, in fact I try to make it blatantly nothing; but that's what the reviewer is looking for.

S. P. That's the structure that is used for criticism.
J. K. One of the interesting things that relates to that is that in the past year or so there have been a couple of reviewers who have started to take on very anti-formal terminology and to talk about the death of the modernist tradition. All that sort of stuff that artists have been doing for four or five years. Marcia Tucker, who's a curator at the Whitney, talked to me recently. She just put on the show by Richard Tuttle at the Whitney which drew tremendous laughs from the formalist establishment.

S. P. I think formalist critics just don't know how to deal with this and as a result the vanguard artists become the critics for their own works; they understand it a lot better than the critics.

J. K. That's what's happening. There's a new book out - it's called The Fox - which grows out of the art and language people from England. It's an American contingent, a younger contingent of artists, and they are writing criticism in their own kind of journal and the criticism is very anti-formalist.

S. P. Let's move on. What are the major tenets of your teaching?

J. K. What I really try to show students is that their education is a process of questions and that every definition of the art activity is a momentary definition. It is only useful insofar as it can answer very present kinds of questions, and you have to let go of the activity
or the process when it begins to hinder the questioning, when it starts giving too many answers. I try to talk about it as a process of self-enlightenment - it's a private, personal kind of process of self-enlightenment, and on a secondary level it's a shared, communal association of that enlightenment with other people.

S. P. Are you trying to have the students establish for themselves things like systems of working which are personal, and methods of collecting and synthesizing information?

J. K. In the beginning classes, I show a series of five or six methodologies about collecting data. We'll do a work which comes out of minimal art or we'll do a work which comes out of tribal art; we'll do a number of different kinds of processes and approaches to making an image. Then we talk about the various similarities between these processes and the differences between these processes, and how the use of one process will lead you to a particular kind of situation. I use this sort of example. I say that the language that you use to speak with determines as much what you're going to say as the ideas that the language generates. This gets across the idea that your methodology controls you as much as your thought processes. That's very important for students to understand.

S. P. Then you see art as having far greater importance than the making of objects in the classroom. The reason I ask you this is that you have hundreds of
students at the University of Massachusetts majoring in what you call art. Now a very small number of them are actually going to become artists; so we have to have a justification for what you people are doing other than the making of objects.

J. K. Right. Absolutely. You teach them that art is one process of investigation, it is one among many - you talk about philosophy or history or any number of approaches to investigation.

S. P. But it's also a very different type of learning process in that from earliest time it is on a personal level. It's not a question of using information which is coming out of books. The information comes from life experience.

J. K. I heard a nice thing about that idea once. The sciences teach students like they were empty bags; when they come into the room they fill them up with all kinds of data.

S. P. They assume that there's nothing in them.

J. K. And eventually they can reiterate and accept that data. But the artist sets out assuming the person's full - they've been doing something for twenty years - so we try to let them begin to operate with that information.

S. P. That's a very basic difference.

J. K. And I think the earlier point you were trying to get at about the definition of the artist as
object maker is such a limited definition and satisfies the needs of very, very few people in the classroom. The definition they are involved with is much larger and much less specific and much less oriented to things like reputation and goals. It does not involve the isolation of the individual, but an awareness of people and sharing with them.

Much of the artistic activity in the future will question the whole idea of authorship. Authorship in the history of art is based on invention - everyone protecting his little secret, his own personal little invention. The problem is that so many inventions are coming out simultaneously that invention as an end in itself will become purely insignificant. Invention and authorship are ways of preserving, of holding back, and we're in an age of sharing. We don't really have a choice. Information is growing geometrically, the mechanisms man has created for communication are going to deny the importance of invention. For example, videotape can be made in thousands of copies. People will be able to copy anything. You cannot own information.

S. P. What is the role of craftsmanship in your definition of teaching?

J. K. It's not an issue. Craftsmanship involves doing something well enough so that it doesn't get in the way of the content of the work. Sometimes it has to be done really, really well in order not to encumber what
you're doing. It's neutral in a sense.

S. P. But craft is sharing. I find a lot of interest in the idea of craft as a vehicle for achieving a certain life style. I think that's the meaning of what's been happening around here - the countryside is flourishing with craftsmen.

J. K. It's a humanist introduction to technology.

S. P. Not only that. Many of the craftsmen I know don't consider their craft to be an art form. They consider their craft as a means of achieving a certain life style, and this life style is what they consider their art form. They have really come very close to achieving a total integration of their lives.

J. K. That's an excellent point.

S. P. What position would excellence have in teaching? Do you think it's important to stress excellence regardless of what they do?

J. K. I think one of the activities that art is about has to do with achieving a kind of excellence in your life. I think the word quality is bad - I don't know a good word to describe that but what it's all about is making you aware enough to be sensitive to excellence and to quality and to an aesthetic, to generate and open up an aesthetic. From that sense, I would say that you demand a kind of excellence, a high level of excellence.
S. P. Do you consider teaching an important part of your art or, put another way, do you consider that in order to function as an artist you have to teach?

J. K. That's a complicated kind of question. It has a lot of meaning to me because I try to marry the two sorts of activities on several different levels. Sometimes they come apart and sometimes they're very closely attuned to each other. One of the things I'm doing now is performance. I appear before thirty or forty people and do a particular kind of personal activity. The nature of that activity is called art because that's the label that I have put on me.

S. P. You're an artist.

J. K. Therefore I do art. So they will consider that with importance. Now what I hope to do with that activity is create a certain kind of spiritual or psychic relationship between me and that group of people. I very specifically control the information and imagery that they see in that particular time. I try to reach in and touch certain parts of them, to awaken certain parts of them for possibilities. There's a second part to this activity. When the so-called formal art is over, in the sense of what they considered was the art - the performance part - I will come and sit with them and start talking to them about the performance. Now they no longer necessarily think of this as the art, but for me that's it.
The performance was a way of generating a certain psychic state in the room, a certain spiritual learning state, where information can be transferred between me and them. So on that level, teaching and art are one thing - they merge.

S. P. You're giving me a definition of art in which you're saying that your art is intricately connected with your life.

J. K. It's all one thing. That's what I've been trying to do for the last five years, to make it all one thing. We've been using the word teaching and I'd rather interject the word learning because the reason I'm interested in doing this is not that I feel I can come and relay some great knowledge, but that the transference of knowledge between myself and them at that moment is a process of learning which is much more powerful than the so-called process of teaching, which is a process of emptying oneself out in the traditional way. I'm very much against that; it's something I started realizing in the past few years.

S. P. People aren't used to that because for sixteen years, for twenty years, they've been talked at.

J. K. You know what they do? They get very upset and they complain that there's no structure. What they mean by structure is a situation where they receive and somebody gives.

S. P. They want you to teach them how to do things.
J. K. They want me to give them very fixed definitions. They want the security of having been told that they now know how to do this and this and this, and if they learn six more things they'll be able to do art. The thing that you can teach them, of course, is that that's not true.

S. P. You're making art into a very humanistic type of activity.

J. K. I'm trying to integrate it into my life and make it all one activity. In general, for me it's all about back and forth between people.

S. P. Many people don't consider what you're doing to be art. They might say: What does this have to do with object making?

J. K. Right. One of the things I learned from the performances is how to try to deal with hostility — when somebody attacks me and I don't defend myself.

S. P. The natural reaction would be for you to protect yourself.

J. K. To put them down in some way. But I find that people don't learn very much that way, and I don't either.

S. P. Do you see the university as a fertile ground for your type of teaching?

J. K. I'm pretty concerned about universities, and I'm starting to do things now at the university to
sort of test things out in terms of the future. I think there are a lot of problems with the way a university is organized, the way it functions bureaucratically in relation to true learning. But I love teaching. Unfortunately, the institution really gets you. The longer you're there, the more bureaucratic you become and the more institutionalized you become. Now I'm really beginning to develop as a teacher. I can really teach. But my job now, I would say, is 30 per cent teaching and at least 70 per cent bureaucracy. I have to go to all of these meetings, which have nothing to do with teaching, which only have to do with bureaucratic functioning. That should be done by bureaucrats. The art department should be concerned with the art of learning — maybe fewer teachers, and bureaucrats who are hired for that purpose.

S. P. And they could run the department and let the artists teach.

J. K. Absolutely. It's insane. And not only is all of your time taken up, the best people are eaten up that way.

S. P. Do you see the consciousness of students increasing?

J. K. I think that here within the art department the consciousness is a couple of hundred percent higher than it was four years ago. Over a period of four years,
the students have begun to believe, to take themselves seriously.

S. P. It seems that perhaps one of the most important things that you're trying to accomplish in teaching is to have students take themselves seriously, to be confident learners.

J. K. That's it.

S. P. Although you have certain doubts about teaching in the university, your overall attitude about the potential of the artist/teacher seems very positive. Do you think the artist/teacher has an important role in the future?

J. K. Definitely. There are going to have to be people who can perceive what to do with time, and I think people who would have been called artists in the past might be those kinds of people who help others understand the nature of time and how to utilize it, which means to develop an aesthetic. The traditional function of time as viewed by the person is that time is organized for them by necessity. I have to eat so I have to have a job; I have to belong to the community so I have to join the Y or the church or whatever these things are. So most people's time is a function of needs that are physical, and I think that those needs that are consumed by the material ordering will be fewer; people will have more time available to them.
S. P. They will have to find ways of organizing their time, and what you're saying is that the artist is a person who could help them.

J. K. Because we understand that.

S. P. Understand that in what sense?

J. K. We understand how to structure time to have meaning beyond material existence. That's the main thing. What you're really doing is structuring your life, and that's what artists do. You can take painting or sculpture or any activity and you can see that essentially it is a methodology devised to structure time so that you put your life together in some meaningful way. You use time in some way that has meaning to you.

S. P. This would be another important tenet of your teaching - that students be able to organize their time meaningfully.

J. K. Absolutely. You give them various means to begin to think about organizing time or structuring their lives. That's what I mean when I say you give them an aesthetic - that's what an aesthetic is.

S. P. That's such an important point. You're saying that art can be used as a tool for helping people to organize their lives in an aesthetic way.

J. K. I believe that. I believe that will become the basic function, and that artists will be people who go around and talk to people and do things for them and show them other ways of using time, other ways of structuring
their existence.

S. P. That's really an excellent thought.

J. K. One of the important things about that is that art then remains in the present tense and it's not something that is deified. It's not something you go see; rather, it's something you do. Certain people object to that. They believe it's the destruction of art. But it's not the destruction of art. It's true integration. In the past, art was a methodology to record a higher level of consciousness so that people coming afterwards could get off on it and start reaching those levels of consciousness. But what I'm saying is that it's a possibility that you no longer need to have so great a time lapse; you begin to close down the time lapse between artist consciousness and public consciousness and you try to have those things come closer together. They can't be the same but they can come closer together. Artists are starting to do all kinds of things, like getting involved with the ecology and politics.

S. P. They're becoming directly involved in life.... Do you see the artist as object maker as being a thing of the past?

J. K. That's a kind of dangerous thing. I'm not saying that there won't be functions for that. In order for me to function as an artist in the sense that I want to function, it may be necessary for me to make something,
to get involved with materials at certain times.

S. P. Also, you would have to be open to the thought of another person making something materialistic.

J. K. Absolutely. In other words, I think what we're moving to is not a period of exclusion but a period of a panorama of activity, much larger, much more inclusive.

S. P. There wouldn't be such a thing as styles. Art could involve doing many, many things.

J. K. Right. My position, or the position of people who are like me, would be that artistic activity does not exclude any activity. Because if you do that, then you're in a formalistic evaluation of activities.

S. P. So you would like to reach a point where as many people as possible in the population could have the attitude of the artist about their lives and how they work.

J. K. Right. If they could see it as a philosophy of life.
S. P. Let me briefly explain what I'm interested in doing. I want to interview a series of artist/teachers who view art as a learning process that is integrated into life. This may or may not involve a strong emphasis on object making. If it does involve making objects, such objects should have meaning to the individual. But generally the artist/teachers I'm talking with reflect a certain attitude about themselves, their teaching and their art, which deals with the idea of integration - a total integration of all their activities. In their teaching, these individuals are de-emphasizing the art object and emphasizing the process of art as a learning procedure that develops a personal approach to problem solving in a larger context.

There are a growing number of artist/teachers who share these views about the potential of the arts as vehicles for human development. However, many of these people lack support for their ideas. I see this project as providing support for such people by documenting a group of artist/teachers who are involved in such a teaching approach.

P. B. Let me tell you what happened to me. It basically spans a five-year period. It started out while I was on sabbatical - four years ago. The thinking went on for about a year in advance of that. There were a number of
things I could have done - I could have gone to Europe, I had money at that time. But what I decided to do was to sell my other house and to move to the woods. At that time there was nothing here - just us. I wanted to involve myself in creating a new environment, in which I could work primarily. At that time the house wasn't ready. We were living in the basement; and it was a very important experience in terms of my family in the sense of community - because I don't think we had to that point or have since then experienced that sense of community that we experienced. We had no electricity, we had no toilet, we had no water.... What became increasingly important to me during those few months into winter was that we were as a family experiencing a sense of community. And I began to realize that in a teaching situation the thing that was lacking was the notion of a sense of community. So I started thinking about that a great deal and discovered that there was something radically wrong happening, that what I was doing as I developed my studio was making my objects to make money. And I came to the conclusion that for me this was all wrong, that I had not come up here to make a living. I had come up here to make a life. I had a lot of time on my hands. I would sit around looking at the stream and so forth and wondering what was going on. This kicked me off into an intensive reading binge, which had nothing to do with art, and I started asking a lot of questions. What I finally concluded was that this
whole product orientation was a relatively useless activity.

S. P. Why?

P. B. Because it was a kind of vicious cycle that everybody plugged into. I plugged my students into it, and I wasn't really having very much fun. I was approaching thirty-five and starting to wonder what the rest of my life was going to be like. I've worked very hard. I've been too responsible. And I decided that it wasn't necessarily a matter of becoming less responsible but of checking my priorities. I asked myself: What's really important to me now, what's important to my students, what's important to my kids, what's important to my wife, and so forth. I started asking a lot of questions and I became very dissatisfied. I decided that I would change my way of looking at my art work and I would think a lot about my teaching. And that's what my sabbatical consisted of. I did a lot of sitting around, thinking. I didn't work much. I thought a lot about my teaching, and my teaching became very important to me.

In the process, what I discovered - and this is the most important thing that happened to me - had to do with the notion of language. I decided that I had never defined my terms, that my vocabulary was somebody else's vocabulary that I had just accepted and used, and took the credit for terms which were not mine. To begin to restructure my priorities - my life style, my teaching, the whole business - was to start from scratch and assume I knew nothing. So the
first thing I asked myself was: What's form? I decided I was interested in dealing with form, since this is my work. And so I went to dictionaries, I went to these art books I have, and so forth; and everything I encountered wasn't acceptable. Finally I decided: Nobody is going to tell you what form is. You have to figure out what form is yourself. And I realized very soon that in attempting to define what form was to myself, I had omitted one thing from the definition of form, and that made all the difference. As soon as I figured that out, all kinds of things started happening in terms of building my own vocabulary of ideas. It had nothing to do with just art; it had to do with everything. Art had to do with everything.

S. P.  What was omitted in your definition of form?

P. B.  There was one thing I had not taken into consideration before in thinking about form. I knew that form had something to do with the second dimension, and I knew that form had something to do with the third dimension, but what I hadn't taken into account was that, just as important, form had to do with the fourth dimension - I had forgotten to include the notion of time. As soon as I worked time into a form notion, the whole world opened up to me. Prior to this, the idea of thinking in terms of form in two and three dimensions limits you immediately to thinking in terms of an object. A static object. As soon as I started
thinking in terms of time, I busted that whole thing in my mind. So I came up with the following definition of form: Form was an event in the time-space continuum. I then had to turn to mathematics and physics to start defining my terms. And I started bumping into things like function, relationships, systems, and all kinds of terms which had been used when mathematicians and philosophers bumped into the same kind of barriers that I was bumping into as an artist. Form is an event in the time-space continuum; it just became obvious that form could be absolutely anything, that I had no limits. And I thought: I've been telling my students a lot of things that have limited their thinking in terms of form. So I started building on that, and I got very excited. I thought of a lot of different kinds of things that I could do with students, that I could do myself, and the interesting thing was - and I guess this is very important - that the things I started thinking of were right here on this piece of land. As soon as I busted that definition of form wide open, I could walk down by the stream and do certain types of things that became very meaningful to me in terms of the form experience. I would go chop down a tree; and what had been labor prior to that began to become an aesthetic act. A lot of things started coming to mind.

S. P. You are defining art as a wide open activity. Don't there have to be certain limitations? Did you consider that idea?
P. B. Yes, that became an important consideration. In order to be able to cope or grapple with anything, you had to set limits. I immediately latched onto a word which I plugged into my vocabulary and which I introduced to my students. That is the word "parameter" - and you had to establish some parameters, otherwise everything was so broad that you couldn't deal with it. In establishing those parameters, you could use anything you wanted to use in the time-space continuum, but you had to limit your parameters somewhat, you had to know what they were, in terms of the time-space continuum...in making the decisions as to what to use or what to eliminate.

Another idea became important. In this type of decision making, it was much more important to consider the elements you decided not to use than the elements you decided to use. What you discarded was more important than what you decided to use. That set up a kind of system for decision making that became very important to me, and it also introduced the notion of an independent variable. Once you had decided what your parameters were, if you selected any one parameter and let it be an independent variable, let it change freely, that allowed you to move in many directions. And that parameter could exist in the second, third or fourth dimension. I toyed with that a long time and I started writing down definitions and talking to students. The result was that I stopped making products completely,
and I had a lot of fun. Then I went back to school and I decided I would not teach the way I used to teach. I would not teach techniques.

S. P. These were techniques that had been taught for years. Was it also the way you had been educated?

P. B. Yes. Students would come to me and say: teach me techniques, give me a glaze recipe, a clay recipe. These things aren't very important. Anybody who wanted a clay recipe, a glaze recipe, or wanted to learn how to do something with clay, could find that out. It was available. Furthermore, in terms of being a teacher, I could tell any student what that technique was about - probably in somewhere between three minutes and half an hour. I could probably talk about all the techniques of pottery in two days' time, and that would be it. Technique wasn't particularly important. What was important was an event in the time-space continuum controllable in terms of parameters. And so I went back to school and I started teaching my courses in a totally different way. My colleagues were very upset with me. First thing I did in my classes was I said: Okay, this is a pottery class and what we are concerned with here is the medium of clay. It's too bad that for centuries people had told us that we have to fire this stuff because by going through the traditional processes of dealing with this clay we have limited ourselves to a simple repetition of experiences which I could probably tell you about in an hour. And so
I'm going to change the rules of this ball game with you, and you have a choice: you can vote and override me as a class, or you can elect to ride with me and take a chance. I have no idea what's going to happen. Interestingly enough, to a person, they decided to try it. And these were the ground rules: No products will be created in my classes. Let me restate that because that's kind of misleading. We would be dealing with the medium of clay and we would be producing products, but the products would end... Well, the classes met for three hours twice a week. The rule with the students was that at the end of three hours, whatever product we came up with would cease to exist, it would be destroyed, it would be removed, unless there was a good reason for keeping it. Instead of a gift that you had made to bring home for your grandmother or your maiden aunt, what you were going to try to get as a product was the excitement of the learning experience. We decided to make a learning experience the product. The ground rules were that this learning experience would occur by any means possible. We would not eliminate anything, and we would take into consideration the kinds of extensions we had into the past in terms of the history of ceramics and so forth, but we would also strongly take into consideration our extension into the future and our existence in the present. So we started out. The class agreed to do this. Our parameters were simply: we were dealing with the material, clay, and we were dealing with the
notion of form as an event in the time-space continuum; and in order to communicate we would have to, together, build a vocabulary which was useful to us in accurately communicating our experiences with each other.

The first thing we did was we decided that if we were going to deal with clay, nothing could be fired. We just didn't have enough time to fire these things. There would be nothing fired. We would simply deal with clay within that three-hour period. How would we do this? We decided that the first thing we could do with clay was to find out what it is. We made up about half a ton of clay - about 1,000 pounds of clay, and we put it in barrels. The idea was that we were providing ourselves with as much clay as we could possibly handle, that we weren't going to be limited to one pound of clay, that if we decided we wanted to use a thousand pounds of clay we would use it. So we set up a six-stack pile of clay, we put it in barrels and kept it wet. We started playing with the clay and tried to figure out: what about clay? What does clay do? And immediately we got away from the notion of technique and so forth and we became fascinated by the idea that we could break it, we could stick our fingers into it, we could bend it and it would crack open, we could stretch it, we could throw it at something and it would stick, we could sit on it, we could walk in it barefoot and let it ooze between our toes, and we could let it dry and we could put it in water and it would dissolve again. Clay did not necessarily involve a potter's wheel, a modeling
stick, a sponge, a turning tool. There were a whole bunch of experiences which we had forgotten about. And as we started sticking our fingers in clay, not jabbing but slowly sticking our fingers in clay, we discovered that this is a beautiful material, very sensual, very rich, that it was different from a lot of other materials, and that we should start by involving ourselves in experiences on a large scale that had to do with the properties of our material. And we were writing it down and we were talking about it. It was very fortunate - I had a photographer in the class, who was a photography graduate of Rhode Island School of Design - Katrina Morosof - and Katrina brought in the camera and started documenting; it's a beautiful documentation. So we did all sorts of things. We'd walk into a room and we'd define our parameters. You just had to come to grips with what you were doing by defining certain things. And once you had decided what your vocabulary of ideas was, you had to make those terms and that vocabulary automatic so you didn't even have to think about it. I call this automatizing. It has to do with learning something so well that it becomes automatic, it frees you to learn something else. We decided one thing we had to automatize was our vocabulary. We decided to work with it, and we had to agree upon that. And one of the parameters you had to deal with was this vocabulary of ideas. Secondly, more important than coming up with an object, was to develop for every
individual a system of problem solving that worked. And we adapted the following point of view, and this was applied over several semesters, and I'm really convinced that this is a good way to approach one's work. It basically evolves around the notion that being able to state a problem is 90 percent of the way towards the solution; that the bulk of your activity and the force of your activity occur within a conceptual realm and not working with material. Working with the material is essentially an afterthought. Once you state the problem, you know what the solution is, and the actual making of the material is just something you can enjoy and do, and you can bring to it certain kinds of skills, but basically there's no issue after stating the problem.

S. P. This is almost just the opposite of what most teaching is.

P. B. Right. So then I decided, well, my teaching is all wet. What I have to teach is how to state the problem, how to problem-solve. The problem with my students, the reason my students were not creative, were not expressing themselves, is that they had no idea how to do this. They would confront materials with totally blank minds, and so I changed my teaching completely into teaching how to problem-solve; so no matter what material you encountered, once you knew how to problem-solve and how to state the problem, you could go to any material. One could work a few days or for
many weeks; what was important was that you had to deal with the material in terms of the stated problem. And I decided that more important than that was for everyone to devise for themselves a system of problem solving, a way to state the problem, and make that automatic - so that everything they encountered in their lives they would approach in this way.

S. P. What you're saying is that this problem-solving method had to be personal for each individual.

P. B. That's the next issue. So how does one begin? One begins as I did on my sabbatical - and this is what I started preaching to the students. One doesn't begin by handing out a textbook or giving a lecture on this is art, that is art. What everybody has to do is sit down and figure out in a very, very earnest and objective way what their present priorities are - not what yesterday's were and not what tomorrow's will be but what's important to me today, now. And you started working on that idea as a means of arriving at your art experience. You stated the problem around what was important to you at that moment, and that was the only thing that made any sense to me. That, basically, is what I've been doing with my students and with myself.

You ought to see the sense of community this group of people have.

S. P. How long did it take for this sense of community to develop?

P. B. Believe it or not, it took about three weeks. I began to realize these people were starved for something other
than the usual format, they were starved...for their needs, their interests, and that was fantastic. I have thirty-two students; I don't have a cutting problem. The kids get upset if they get sick and have to miss class. It's just been a real fantastic experience - and for the first time I come home, I sit down with Gail, I don't bitch about the day, I start sounding off about the day and all the fantastic things that happened.

S. P. Are your colleagues upset by what you are trying to achieve?

P. B. They're frightened by it.

S. P. Why do you think they're frightened?

P. B. Because they find great security in the traditional forms of experiences, and the thing is that I can't communicate to them that I'm finding security in the excitement of the learning experience that's going on - the product can be absolutely anything.

S. P. Your whole philosophy is based on change.

P. B. Right. And I'm not frightened of it. I think change is fantastic. And so I too have changed. This has permeated my family - my relationship with my wife and my children, and we are a hell of a lot more stable - we're not afraid.

S. P. Yes. It's strictly a question of how you define the product.

P. B. Right. So I get back to my form definition
- that form is an event in the time-space continuum; but I guarantee you that my 3D class has covered more territory and that group is extremely articulate. You get into a conversation with one of my students, and they know what they are talking about. They're not using terms loosely. Okay. A typical example: A student said: I'm dealing with volume. Another student said: I thought we were dealing with mass. The student said: That's the same thing. The other student said: Uh hah. And the class said: What do you mean? Next thing I knew, the class decided by themselves that there was a difference between mass and volume, and that was defined - that's what I mean by the defining of terms. And then they started thinking in terms of volume and mass as two separate kinds of considerations and started dealing with these things. And it builds that way - it's fantastic. Some of them keep a word list and a journal....

S. P. And this is at their initiative?

P. B. Yes. What one student has in his journal is totally different from what another student has. No two problems that come in are ever similar - for the most part because everyone is working on something different.

S. P. Is class time used for dialogue?

P. B. People bring in the material and we talk about it, we use a critique format, and things take many different forms. Anything is apt to come in, and they have to deal with absolutely anything. It's very exciting.
S. P.  This kind of personalization in education is very time-consuming. Do you find a conflict between your teaching and your art?

P. B.  It's very time consuming. I work very hard. I don't have much time in the course of the day. I'm just constantly meeting with students. But it's worth it. It forces you to make a decision. Teaching is going to be my art.

S. P.  Over a period of time you've obviously worked it through and thought it out.

P. B.  Yes. Well, I'm not afraid to say that I'm a teacher. I can still recognize the objects, I still practice that, but I like being a teacher. I also see the value of students rubbing up against me.... Who says I'm not a teacher? My students are very important.

S. P.  What it all gets down to is how you're defining art.

P. B.  I decided that, whether my colleagues like it or not, for me my art is teaching, and I love to do it and I think I do it well and I put a lot of time into it. And in terms of my craft, I have accepted the fact that with my hands I can do very nice pottery and besides the pottery I do, I'm just having fun with it. It's a hobby. It's not my major means of expression. I'm doing things with pottery that's perhaps more important than a lot of other people are
doing - my pottery at the moment has something to do with photography. I studied the history of photography. I devoted my entire summer to this. I have hired and paid an enormous amount of money, and I have a qualitative analyst and a chemist working for me. And I've come up with a way to do photographic ceramics by developing the pot and not just the plate, any kind of a form. I've gotten a system so that I can do this with a six-foot form if I want to. My whole point in doing this is that I'm interested in juxtaposition and creating three-dimensional images on three-dimensional forms where they juxtapose all over each other. I've got a multi-color process that I'm using. It's all chemistry. Well, I don't know if you know this or not, but I was a chemist as an undergraduate. My first degree is in chemistry. And it was part of my priorities that I tended to be very technical with the pottery. I was interested in the chemistry that was happening, and I thought: Okay, if that's one of your priorities, don't fake it, work with that and see what you can develop in that sense. And that's what I'm working very hard on. I'm also very interested in music. Music was one thing that incorporated time in a very direct way. That is a kind of form, and I use music in my classes to illustrate time.

S. P. Do you think the students are going to run into a conflict? They've gone through this kind of experience, which is a very different experience from the traditional kind of learning.
S. P. What's going to happen when they leave your classes and take a painting course?

P. B. I'll tell you what's going to happen. When I get through with these people, I think they'll have a certain amount of discernment and enough sense to find out who they should study with. Everyone will seek his own level. The thing is that they're learning, and there are no limits to that learning.

S. P. And they themselves are the source for their learning. That's even more important. They're not learning what you tell them to learn, they're learning what they need to learn at that moment. They're learning how to learn.

P. B. Yes. They're excited. And they excite me. It's been even more fun working with certain special problem students because on a one-to-one basis you can have a little more control over the situation than you can with a large group. You can get very excited on a one-to-one basis. You can go into depth.

S. P. It would seem to me that the subject area in which you teach is of secondary importance to the learning process.

P. B. Yes. What I see is lending support and trying to gather together a group of faculty who are very broad and open-minded and think somewhat similarly about the learning process - not stylistically, because none of us think similarly in that area. Getting together a group of colleagues and really doing a number with these freshmen.
Interview with Donald Brigham

S. P. I'm interviewing a series of artist/teachers who have rejected the idea of art as a strictly object-making process. These people have found ways of infusing art into general life systems. What we have been talking about fits that nicely. Perhaps then you can give me your ideas that made these changes possible for you. Specifically what were the causes that led you away from art as object making and into art as learning systems, since it appears that your art is now dealing with learning?

D. B. On reflection, we have to look into the art field for those people who have been interested in art from a conceptual aspect. Rudolf Arnheim has been a leader in arguing that the formative processes in the arts are cognitive models of visual thinking processes. Gyorgy Kepes at M.I.T. would also be a supporter of such a view.

We have, I believe, a tradition in aesthetics of looking at the art objects not as an end in itself but as evidence of conceptual process - that the object is essentially interesting as residue. The art process was the process of the artist groping with materials, through materials, to create a form which was an authentic image of being human in this world.
S. P. Let me be more specific. I'm working with the idea that whereas the arts were formerly taught as skill acquisition, now the arts are viewed and taught as information gathering systems.

D. B. Not only were they taught as skills, the emphasis was upon a set of conventions. Even though there has been much talk of creativity in our education and much rationalizing that that was the function of art, generally in the schools you found that the art teacher had an expertise in established art techniques and media. Teaching art was communicating these techniques...in other words, to establish a convention, a product convention. When mobiles were in fashion, the objectives inevitably at the junior high level had to do with mobiles.

S. P. They made mobiles that had nothing to do with the thinking and the concept of what a mobile was and the evolutionary process involved.

D. B. Yes, the creative process in creating the form. Instead, we really have conventionalized teaching in spite of the fact that we talk creativity, we are almost cast into a role...the school even supports that...the school officers would ask us to state our learning objectives and we would make an inventory of well-known techniques and forms, and we would be evaluated on our ability to prepare students to be able to make these established forms. That would get them into professional
school perhaps if they were exceptional. The other aspect of art education is that we were trying to communicate the value of art...in the past it was called art appreciation...but generally we as art people are very concerned to proselytize the value and the significance of art; and we were playing upon a genuine concern. The average American does tend to feel a little guilty about avoiding the arts and not being concerned with the arts. But I think we got ourselves into a situation of lip service. We would have a kind of token art, and not too much. It didn't cost the tax payer too much and it didn't really involve the academically gifted students at all. It was more the kids who weren't scholarly who gravitated to the art studies. So we were very peripheral; we were tokens of the community's feeling that it really ought to recognize the arts. Well, if you scratch the surface you find that they are prepared to sacrifice the arts under the pressure of the tax payer's revolt against the costs of education, etc. However, under the situation that exists in Attleboro, we are not vulnerable to this tendency to dispense with the arts as non-essential. We're beginning to be an essential function in the core, the central development of learning abilities in a cross-section of the population.

S. P. But your approach was radical. You did not call your program art. Instead, you researched the
structure of art and you found it was synonymous with the structure of learning.

D. B. Yes. That's right.

S. P. And then you called it visual learning.

D. B. Yes. Because learning has priority, human development has priority in education. Art has, as I've indicated, had more lip service than genuine priority, and we might regret dropping the expression art in favor of visual and manipulative learning or multi-sensory learning. We've only sacrificed the name and hopefully we've not sacrificed the essence of the art experience. So if we cling to the name of art, we risk the reality that the majority of kids, that the majority of school children, that the majority of teachers and administrators have stereotypes in mind that we can't overcome. Those stereotypes have been formed over many years. They were formed by their limited art experience in their education twenty years ago, thirty years ago. So as soon as you use the expression art, they immediately assume that you represent all the things they used to know.

S. P. So you found that as a strategy you were better off not to use the term art.

D. B. I certainly recommend that you withdraw all terms that have stereotype interpretation by members of the general public, and that you immediately go to terms which deal with critical issues in education, critical
issues in learning. Terms which are compatible with the art experience as we know it, and the central meaning of art.

This may be difficult to get to, but one of the essential meanings of art has to do with visual perception, has to do with conceptualizing experience in non-verbal terms, creating forms, creating structures which articulate relationships and also express images which somehow communicate the nature of reality, the nature of human experience. In other words, perhaps art is essentially image formation, out of sensory experience, human sensory experience. Okay, maybe learning - creative learning - is image formation. Essentially interaction with the materials of the school environment. Perhaps learning is concept formation. And when I use the expression concept formation, many people immediately think I'm talking about verbal concepts. But here we should refer to people like Rudolf Arnheim, because Rudolf Arnheim has begun to establish credibility for the idea that there are non-verbal concepts. That's what I think a sculpture is; that's what I think a painting is. It doesn't matter whether it's abstract or figurative; it's a concept formation; it's the establishment of a relationship which is a kind of analogy or metaphor for some perceived relationships in reality.

Therefore, we can't sometimes say in words exactly what the meaning is of a sculpture. So we have a problem in trying to educate the larger number of people, of
developing in the larger number of people the skill of translating or the skill of communicating with non-verbal forms. This is really where this process started, because the process in Attleboro was that we were going to take a look at art, and there was an underlying concern that very few people and very few products of public schooling, in other words very few children educated to art, or experiencing art in public schooling, were actually learning the language, the non-verbal language of art. So what we were trying to do first of all was try to modify the art curriculum in the public schools, so that we might deal with the perceptual aspects, so that more children would be able to respond intelligently to an abstract sculpture, or abstract painting. As soon as we got to that level of dealing with perception and interpretation of art forms, we found that we were talking almost the same language of learning specialists. Now we're entering the realm of the artist/teacher.

S. P. My research is to document the changing attitudes of what I call the artist/teacher. I'm attempting to show that the function has changed from earlier transfer of data about product making to a generalized transferring of information. You are working with learning skills which are the tools by which we handle information. So therefore the whole idea of the artist and teacher merge; you can't really separate them.
D. B. It occurs to me to use an expression the teacher as artist, and that could be any teacher as artist. The teacher may not necessarily have been educated through professional art training, although I might recommend it. I might recommend for more teachers, and I would say that in certain communities there are now more and more teachers who would now see the value of their taking a sculpture course, of their taking a painting course, because they are beginning to appreciate that they are not fully informed, that they have not been very adept at form perception, at visual analogy, at visual abstraction, at visual perceptual and conceptual skills. These are called by some other name in art schools. They're called basic design, they're called drawing, and so forth; but these skills are now becoming more generally appreciated by more and more teachers as fundamental skills that help the child organize information. I'm not sure that visual arts in learning is as much the field of communication as it is the field of organization. It's the ability to take data, sort it out, organize and synthesize it into a pattern which makes sense. As soon as you have a pattern which makes sense, you have a communication.

The child in school has a lot of information to deal with. The school has not focused upon the cognitive skills of organizing information into patterns which can be retained, which can be communicated, and so
forth. What we have in art is concrete models. We can take
an information system and we can conceptualize it in terms
of a visual pattern or even as a three-dimensional,
sculptural pattern which the educators are apt to call a
model, a cognitive model. That's powerful, and many
educators are quite ready to recognize this. If a child
is learning arithmetic, it is strictly in terms of the
manipulation of numbers. The non-verbal child is at a
disadvantage. He has great difficulty dealing with these
abstract symbols. If you could put the relationships which
the symbols signify into a concrete object formation - a
model - which you can call a sculpture or a construction,
then you make visible and concrete a relationship which
the numbers signify. Then it's relatively simple to teach
the number system. You refer the child to the concrete
model that he has constructed.

This all fits into what's going on in learning.
You see, because we have the influence of Piaget and Piaget
has said that there are normal stages and he has indicated
that up to approximately age six it's essentially a sensory
perceptual stage. Then he talks about the ages six to
eleven as the concrete operational stage. What is concrete
operational learning except the formulation of materials
into patterns, into structures. Piaget has talked about
the structure of learning, Bruner talked about the
structure of learning. But a whole lot of people are very confused and mystified by the structure. Well, structure is organization, pattern, syntax. Our people know something about the manipulation of materials into structures, and that structure can be analogies. It has a correspondence with verbalized structure, or a numerical structure. What we're dealing with is the modality evidently, according to Piaget, of the majority of children in elementary schools. The normal child in elementary schools is a concrete operational learner. Therefore, he ought to have the tools that are characteristic of the art studio. And then when the normal child gets older, which Piaget calls the stage of formal operation, then he can begin to deal with abstract thinking in terms of word and number symbols. But how much more competent this child would be, say, after the age of eleven if he can refer back to models, concrete models which he himself had a part in forming.

So we're implying a kind of inductive process in early learning where the teacher helps the child create the forms the way the forms have individuality, where each child's form is not a stereotype, a copy of some pre-established or pre-conceptualized forms of the teacher. And I would stress that this is humane or humanistic because we are proposing that the child participate in and create individually distinct models of the intellectual concepts, so the child sees a reflection of himself in the
form that he has created. We can have a situation arise where children create mathematical models, they create verbal syntax models, they create social concepts, science models, and each one of these models will have an individual, distinct kind of flavor, so that the child doesn't feel alienated, the child doesn't feel that he's just submitting to society's or the teacher's standardized forms but actually has personalized his forms. So these are things we normally associate with art, and now they can become characteristic of humanistic education in elementary and middle school and finally might even serve the high school and even the college level.

S. P. What about your current interest in remedial reading? Tell me a little bit about this whole idea of how you moved from being a painter through all these various stages and now one of your interests is remedial reading.

D. B. For many years now, reading has been a natural priority in education. There has been a lot of discussion about low reading ability in large segments of the school population. Reading has become a critical issue in education. The question has been: Why are so many children illiterate; why are so many children unable to progress? Anyone who is helping with reading is generally welcomed into programs, especially, for instance, Title One Programs - Title One E.S.E.A. Programs where the commitment has been primarily to remediation of low reading abilities.
Attleboro already has been committed to what is called a multi-sensory approach to reading and learning, and therefore we visual arts people could easily enter this activity because we knew something about tactile, visual and kinaesthetic learning. It's very interesting for visual arts people to be in the field of reading because reading is a communication system, but it's very, very different - maybe the other side of the coin from visual communications or what's sometimes called non-verbal communications. There's something very, very different about reading and visual arts communication. I've become increasingly aware that good reading ability depends upon a highly developed oratory language ability. Reading is improperly called visual; reading is not a visual ability. Reading is an oratory ability. Just because print is visible does not make reading any more a visual ability than music is a visual ability. No one would ever think of calling music a visual ability, but yet we can read music, we have a musical notation system. What print is is the notational system for language, for oratory language, just as printed music is the notational system for oratory music.

Evidently, the very best readers pay no attention whatever to the visual aspects of words, for instance. Words are simply visual cues, and the visual cues immediately trigger audition. What the good reader has is a highly developed oratory language system in his head, and the
print triggers that system. So what the good reader does is to immediately translate visual symbols into oratory patterns which have meaning.

Now, the interesting thing is that we visual arts people are very adept at and in fact are trained to pay attention to the visual aspects of things. One may look at learning disability as a reading disability. If you look in the literature of learning disabilities, they talk about the problem of distraction, and paying attention to the visual aspect of print as a disability. Paying attention to what is irrelevant to the meaning, to the content. We who in art school have learned to admire calligraphy and typography and the forms of words and letters and so forth are paying attention to what is strictly speaking irrelevant to the content of literature. For instance, if you translate that to the child in school, translate that to a third-grader who is really turned on to visual information, who is distracted by all the visual phenomena of his classroom, and distracted by all the interesting patterns that letters and words make, that child can't read because he is, from the perspective of learning disabilities, visually hyperactive. Well, that's one way of looking at the relationship of visual arts and reading.

S. P. How are you actually working with poor readers?

D. B. Through association with learning
disabilities one becomes aware that reading problems generally have a basis in visual perceptual disabilities or oratory and language perceptual and expression problems. A visual perceptual problem, for instance the inability to form a gestalt - in art we call that the inability to see the whole figuration. In reading, that means that the child can't see letters of a word as part of a unit, and in fact the child tries to decode the word as separate fragments. So we do have visual problems that interfere with reading. Oratory problems or oratory inadequacies lead to language deficiencies - the child has had imperceptions, has not listened adequately to language, and therefore distorts and scrambles word order, for instance, in expression. And this child with oratory imperception problems, and therefore with language distortion and very likely speech problems, this child will have difficulty in reading because this child will be unable to attach visual symbols of print to correct language. Therefore, this child has the difficulty of not being able to integrate the visual symbols to language. The child with visual problems may very well have acquired language, but he has a problem that he can't grasp the visual symbols and attach them to language.

Now the approach that we have been exploring here, identifying the children who have visual ability - these
are children without visual perceptual problems - they have no difficulty whatever in seeing a pattern as a whole, they have no difficulty whatsoever in forming an image, they have no difficulty whatsoever in imaging in their mind's eye the content of a story. But if you take visually competent children, you still find many in this group who cannot read. Their problem is very likely that they have oratory deficiencies, and that therefore they have not adequate language development to which to attach their visual abilities. So our approach has been to identify these kids, then to put them in a visual arts setting and to use visual arts materials and visual perceptual materials, and assume that these children will have no difficulty whatsoever in manipulating and comprehending visual patterns, visual relationships. Therefore, you're teaching to their strength, which is visual, perceptual, manipulative, and applying that to their difficulty. And what is their difficulty? Their difficulty is very likely to be oratory patterns. Okay, so this means that you give them experiences which they visualize, oratory patterns, including language patterns, and we have been quite successful. You will find, for instance, a music teacher who will say that these children perform very poorly initially on auditory discrimination, on matching melodic patterns. But as soon as these children went through some activities where they could create a visual symbol system, representing the
auditory pattern, then they did very well on auditory discriminations and auditory memory and so forth. What does this mean? It simply means that the child is using his ability, which is visual, and he is applying it to the realm which he is weak in.

He has a reference now. Now the kid doesn't have to deal with auditory information strictly in the oratory area where he is weak. Now the child can rely upon and refer to his visual model, his visual pattern. The child can very well remember a visual pattern - he has good visual pattern recall ability. Therefore, he will be able to recall an oratory pattern because he will attach it to his visual pattern. So this is the gist of our approach to the remediation of reading problems and writing problems, including spelling problems, in elementary children. Give them an environment which is comparable to the art studio. They feel confident where they are happy, where they enjoy the sensuous quality of materials, where they are very competent at representing relationships, patterns, recognizing patterns. They make language, for instance, including language syntax, the structure of sentences, the order of letters in words, the order of words in phrases, the order of words in sentences and paragraphs. This makes that the subject matter of the art studio. Have the child dealing with areas of cognitive difficulty as the subject matter of art processes. And the child will, of course, develop
tremendous self-confidence, tremendous pride, because all of a sudden these children who had to believe that they were dummies - I mean, you put them in the verbal environment of traditional teaching and they are literally dumb. They don't understand why they can't keep up with language, they can't conceptualize from language, so they're relegated to the low reading groups, relegated to the low learning groups, they're humiliated, so they become problem children, they become emotionally disturbed, and they become the most difficult kind of kids in school. Okay, that's because you have focused upon their weaknesses and caused them to feel inferior.

Now these kids basically are not inferior. They simply happen to be inferior in the verbal linguistic domain. Bring them into the visual arts domain, or in fact any sensory art domain where they are competent. In the jargon or terminology of contemporary education that's called adapting, it's called individualizing instruction, adapting instruction to the learning style of the child. It's sometimes called modality adapted teaching, and that means that if the child is deficient in oratory, verbal abilities but very competent in visual perceptual imaging and modeling abilities, you put him in the art studio environment. You have a new kind of artist/teacher who is going to employ these abilities and the child develops tremendous self-confidence, he discovers how smart he is
because they are obviously very smart in this domain, they have it all over the verbal kids. In fact, I've been surprised to find out how many highly verbal teachers, for instance, are terrified by visual perceptual problem solving situations. How inadequate they feel. Our effort here is not to make them feel inadequate, but they should recognize conversely how inadequate a visual manipulative child, or person, feels in the presence of a purely verbal educational environment.

Well, what you do is you restore the self-confidence of these children and they find that they are really capable of conceptualizing the content of math, the content of social studies, the content of literature and so forth, in terms of visual models, in terms of visual imaging. In fact, they can now create these visual images and we're getting to film strip making by children and we've got into visual modeling exhibitions in the corridors of the school, and they can really instruct other children, other teachers, in the visual form of school information, school concepts.
Interview with John Roy

S. P. What do you consider the most important objectives of your teaching? You're teaching art. What do you hope to accomplish over a period of a year with the class?

J. R. The thing that I think is probably the single most important in terms of skills, outside of a growing personal awareness and personal consciousness, is learning how to see. By that I mean knowing what their individual perceptions are during the act of perception. Seeing then, for me, is defined as becoming aware of the information that's present at the time that you're looking at it.

S. P. This is what you're defining as seeing.

J. R. Right. Become aware of the information present while you're looking at something. You see, we often fill in from imagination. A good example would be, "Oh, this is a sidewalk," and it's a flat plane. I can look down two hundred yards and just walk the whole distance and never become aware of all the shadows on the sidewalk.

S. P. So you would consider it critical that someone looking at something be able to get all the necessary data on what they see.
J. R. That's right. The data being the information present.

S. P. Would you say that your teaching has changed over the past ten years? What are you trying to accomplish in your teaching? Are you trying to accomplish different things now?

J. R. Not really. Not essentially. Seeing and learning to see have always been the primary contents of my teaching. I guess that's from Joseph Albers. This was also one of the primary messages of his teaching. The procedures that I've adopted and followed are different from what I was doing in 1965, or in 1970, but the aims are similar.

S. P. Let me ask you this. I remember in 1965 you were painting, you were a teacher of painting. Now you're doing totally different things. Why did your work change from a traditional type of painting to the electronic machines that you're starting to build, which involve programs and the use of light?

J. R. Mainly because it included motion as a dimension.

S. P. And you were interested in motion?

J. R. Mainly in change. You see, painting is an oddball form of communication because it takes a spatialized light out of something that extends in time, and it fixes it forever. The kind of paintings I was
Doing at the time were involved with changes.

S. P. You were dealing with change in a stationary way, and then you moved to work where involved change in an actual physical sense.

J. Right.

S. P. So change and motion became important to you.

J. P. Time really has to be included or incorporated in a fundamental way in our concepts of nature and co. 12 and environment. So frequently our language, for example, is geared to its spatialized light. When we say it's an apple. The concept, or the name apple, really refers to this single spatialized moment in time, and that's not really the case. The apple is not forever sustained; it changes in time.

S. P. These are very important differences that you were interested in - motion, time and change.

Are these reflected in your teaching?

It's hard to say because it was there prior to 1965.

S. P. You structured problems for your classes involving concepts of motion and time and change.

J. Yes. The last things that I've done inter- with the way I also teach. Some ideas that occur in terms of learning spill over and affect where my interest lies in doing loving work. But time was always...I think
it's part of our climate, part of our culture, the concept of change. You hear musicians talking about changes too, and that the most important things are the way things change, in the development of sound pattern. I have some composer friends who also talk frequently about change and the way things change.

S. P. The type of product that you're going to achieve when you're working with ideas like time and motion and change are going to be a very different type of object than if you weren't interested in those ideas. Obviously your work changed quite a bit because the ideas which were important to you developed and changed.

J. R. Well, Sid, I became involved in electronics, and it dawned on me at the time (I can remember remarking to myself at the time) that it was no longer simply change on the surface of things but it was manipulating and controlling change at a very fundamental level, right down at an atomic level. You're controlling the exchange of electrons and manipulating at a very fundamental materialistic level. Some of the interesting consequences, I think, would be, for instance: Given an electronic machine, it can have an audible result as well as a visual result. And from the point of view of putting the machine together and developing the logic that's required to put the machine together and the right programs to operate the machine, there's essentially no difference. So that I would feel no compunction whatsoever having an audible
result as well as a visual one. One or the other are equally interchangeable depending on the ultimate use that the expressions would be put to. In other words, even though I'm in the department of visual arts, I don't feel constrained by that name, by that contact. I would do audible results although I don't really have an urge to.

S. P. You're in the department of art. And yet a lot of your work is really closer to other areas within the university. You have gone there for information, for resources.

J. R. Sure. Especially engineering. And we're installing a computer system which I think has some interesting possibilities in terms of education, especially since a computer has to be programmed; that means the person who wants it to do some work for him would have to write a set of instructions. In the case of a drawing, a person would have to say I want a specific shape and not rely simply on the muscles of their arms to go ahead and make that shape. In other words, it would insist that the user be specific about what they are going to do. So I think we play an interesting role in that respect, an educational role.

S. P. I find a little bit of a contradiction when you say that the goals of your teaching have not changed over the past ten years.

J. R. Whatever a student is after in a drawing
class, it's the information about something. Now if they're trying to draw a box, they may be putting down potato information, so all we're really doing is saying that the information is appropriate for a certain intention or inappropriate for a certain intention. It's simply appropriate or inappropriate for a given intention. That is fundamental to my teaching and is so basic that it doesn't change.

S. P. So one of your methods of criticism would be to see how appropriate information is to the intention.

J. R. Yes, exactly. So, for instance, we had a critique yesterday and one girl was dealing quite extensively with light and illumination and there were breaks in her illusion, occasional breaks where the information she was putting down there didn't add up to information about or stimulus or clues about illumination. They became clues about the local color of the object rather than the way in which the objects were illuminated. So whereas about 90 percent of the painting was about illumination, except for a few breaks in its illusions, it was very clear that the intention was to deal with illumination. So it just becomes an inappropriate set of clues. It's the kind of thing that happens when there's what we call a break in an illusion.

S. P. You seemed to be very much interested in the group of graduate students we had here in the latter part
of the sixties, especially those working with conceptual ideas. You were more interested in their work than the more traditional members of the faculty.

J. R. You see, I think there's a thing that runs through twentieth-century art that starts probably most significantly, most directly, with Kandinsky, and that is the urge on the part of artists to communicate about their art not necessarily in terms of another medium, and Kandinsky very directly proposes the possibility of a visual philosophy, much in the same way as the development and growth of a verbal philosophy. He proposed a more systematic mode of communication. So I have an ongoing interest in this because it's the artist who wishes to communicate about art and express his ideas systematically without resorting to words or mathematics - to do it in purely visual terms. And I think that the conceptual arts in general contributed to this in their own way, even though many of them resorted to words and to mathematical expressions. They did a lot in what I would call establishing a peer group where it became popular to be systematic about what you were doing.

S. P. You keep using the word systematic. Are you using the word systematic referring to a system?

J. R. Right. Where all the parts are clearly defined and play a clearly defined role.

S. P. One of the things I'm dealing with is the idea of art as object versus art as system.
J. R. Or art as process.

S. P. Process gets closer to system. For instance, your paintings in the sixties would come closer in a general way to art as object in terms of your paintings having a static quality. Your later work, involving the programs, the energy that was needed to make the piece work, was much more complicated, and I would say this art was based on a system. It was based on lots of variables - it was based on the program, it was based on a system of energy - well, the program itself was very much a system. It was a much more complicated way of working. You had many more variable qualities. The idea of time - in painting you were referring to time, you were hinting at time, you were using certain visual tools to deal with the idea of time, but it wasn't really time. You were just alluding to time.

J. R. Right. As a matter of fact, I did one piece, a light piece, in which there's a vocabulary out of which you can generate different visual relationships.

S. P. There's a fundamental difference here that's of interest to me. Your earlier work involved a basic illusion. You were just alluding to motion, to time, to change. Your later work actually involves and incorporates those physical qualities. So the later work is a more integral part of nature.

J. R. Yes, it concerns itself with the environment, with society and our culture.
I'd like to go back a bit on that artist's system and so forth. I tell this to the students. They find art everywhere. We find the words, the letters A R T everywhere. There's an Art office, Art Department, Art history, Art museum, Art object, etc.

S. P. Artifact!

J. R. Artifact. It goes on and on. And we tend to make the assumption that it's always the same thing, always means the same. And I don't know how it does. The art of museums, the art of history, is a very different kind of art from that which is being done by contemporary artists. The art of history requires an antique value that contemporary art doesn't have, so there's an art product, and an art process. Process in contemporary art moves in the direction of art as system.

S. P. Do you believe there are weaknesses in the type of teaching which is reasonably widespread in many art schools, which involves the teaching of painting as a series of technical skills?

J. R. It's ridiculous, as a matter of fact.

S. P. Would you agree that there's a lot of this kind of teaching going on?

J. R. Sure. They teach certain skills, certain specific skills, often simply related to the bias of the teacher.
S. P. You see, I think the type of teaching you've been talking about is very different from that.

J. R. Well, I'll give you an example. When I teach painting, I think of the whole thing as a set of issues increasingly more complex that corresponds to the natural hierarchy that we experience when we attempt to communicate. There's a material level in the communication, the way the material is being manipulated. Then there's the informational level where the material can be assigned meaning, certain kinds of meaning. In this case we're given our eyes and we're given a perceptual context, and so our eyes function with our brain in a certain way. They're human eyes, they're not frog's eyes or pigeon's eyes, so they transmit certain kinds of information to our brain. So the meaning that we assign to material differences is determined by the way in which our eyes transmit the information to our brain. Now we can go one step further and say that the information has an associative quality. We can say that the difference between the red and the blue has a spatial quality. In other words, there's something that goes on in our heads that's not actually in the painting. Then we say the difference between that red and the blue also is the difference between the hat and the face. Or the hat or the sun in the sky and so forth. So instead of taking that approach to determine abstraction, which is used
frequently, we make an abstract of that tree. You see, if you tell a student to make an abstract of a tree, it makes the assumption that they have another choice, but they don't. Painting is automatically an abstraction of the tree. It is simply not the tree. So we start the class as material, we deal with material, and what happens when you direct your attention to the material. And we attempt to constrain our attention to purely material-istic relationships - i.e., the paint is thin, it's thick, it's fat, it's lean. This would be the first problem. So this automatically is non-associative. The constraints would be very similar to a grammarian, who confines his attention to word relationships - he doesn't care whether the noun is about a tree or whether the noun is about a person.

S. P. So in such a problem one of the first things that one might do in solving it is to collect much information about the physical qualities of, for instance, paint.

J. R. Right. Absolutely. Well, how can you change and manipulate the paint? Okay, so the next level of attention would be that when we manipulate this paint, it has an appearance. You see, at the first level you don't care whether it's red or blue or brown or whatever. You don't care about color, you don't care about shape, you're simply manipulating on this flat surface these
material qualities. And the students get right with that. They have some ideas, they bring with them some preconceptions about what painting should be, but they very soon can overcome those preconceptions and manipulate material. They push it around with two hands, and it's fat and thick, and then they put all kinds of marks on it. Okay. Then we say, now pay attention to the appearance of those marks or the appearance of that material, and then manipulate material through manipulating appearances. Now we go one step further and we say we have appearance at a local portion of the painting, now we want to manipulate all the local appearances on a global scale, so they all add up to a total effect - mainly the effect when we get involved with depth and how one thing appears in front of another and we deal initially with boundary relationships. Well, rather than go into all the details, there's a natural hierarchy in the way in which we can direct our attention to whatever communication system that we're dealing with.

S. P. You're involved in the foundations program.

J. R. Right.

S. P. Could you give me a couple of problems that you gave in that area.

J. R. One problem I'm giving in the drawing class is connected with the fact that you think of Drawing I as a preparation for Drawing II, and you think of Drawing II
as being a preparation for Drawing III.

S. P. What do you look at foundations as a preparation for?

J. R. Survival in the field of visual communication. I feel that at the very first level they should be confronted not simply with what would get them through Drawing II but with some fundamental skills, with some fundamental issues, that will encourage survival. For instance, there are different kinds of skills - one skill would be to have the muscles in your arm under control, so that when you say I want to make a line or a mark to extend from point A to point B you'll be able to do it. At another level of skill is the ability to define your own goal. Normally, in a beginning class, the tradition is to go through a set of exercises which will mainly cultivate manual skills, maybe to some extent some perceptual skills. But skills like setting your own goals are not clear, and when you say to a student, define your own goals, they are really at a loss. So in order to facilitate that problem we set up paint - put tins together around some subject that the team members would like to work with. I think the subjects that we have now are: color and texture, figure drawing, emotions, animals, fantasy. So we have groups that vary in size from four to six or seven working on the same subject and their input - how they'll approach the problem, how they'll
solve the problem - has some very unique solutions, some interesting solutions to often difficult problems. For instance, how does one deal with emotion? Which I think is kind of a difficult subject to cope with, and distinct, say, from color and texture. Well, this particular group is putting up a mirror and hanging in front of the mirror a forest of things which sort of represent what they define as emotions. And they then see themselves and all these emotions reflected in that mirror. I think it's an interesting solution to the problem of dealing with a complicated idea. They get a kind of support from one another. They're not like sprung free.

S. P. They did this as a group.

J. R. They do it as a group. Right. And they have to cope with themselves as a social entity too. There are some members who don't want to work, who don't want to have any input in the group. They have to give each other a kind of instruction; they have to set up a vocabulary that they can communicate to one another with. This becomes a fundamental skill that's necessary to survival in this whole area - the general area of visual expression.
S. P. Could you talk about art, and specifically drawing since that's your interest, as a learning process. We have been talking about thinking and seeing in relation to drawing. Could you elaborate on these ideas.

S. H. Drawing should be a process of synthesizing not only what one sees, because drawing is more than putting down what you see, but it also involves making choices about the information that you select.

S. P. So you have all this synthesized information before you start drawing.

S. H. Yes. It's the synthesizing of looking at an object and putting it down on paper and also synthesizing the process of thinking and making some sort of decision about what it is that you see, some sort of decision as to how you see it, and some sort of decision as to just what you want to do with it. And this would involve all sorts of decisions related not just to the object drawn but the piece of paper since that's the vehicle of expressing the idea. It would be a synthesis of both the seeing and the thinking. I wouldn't even limit drawing as a learning process to just the confinement of a sheet of paper since the visual information one is dealing with demands a certain structure which is valid for the organization of all visual information.
S. P. Most educators would consider your methods valuable for all learning. Am I correct in assuming that you view the teaching of art as transcending art information and involving learning in general?

S. H. Very much so. The total process could be applied to everything. The process of synthesizing even if it does not involve drawing is an important way for anyone to accumulate information, whether you're going into visual art or any other field. It's one of the senses which provides us with information that we use in our lives.

S. P. The senses are the receptors by which we learn. The better they are developed, the more effective we are as learners.

S. H. That's right. We all have the habit of looking but of not really seeing. That's what drawing is all about - learning how to see. For that reason, I'm not bothered if my students don't continue with art because if they learned how to see through drawing - how to deal with visual information - that is extremely useful in their lives.

It occurs to me that one of the differences between animals and man is that animals function out of memory and man does not function out of memory alone. When you are dealing with drawing in the simplest way, you are
using only memory because you look at something and transfer it to paper. But drawing has to do with more than that. It has to do with seeing and then making choices as to what you see and then transferring this synthesis to paper. This is a very humanistic quality - man's ability to make choices.

S. P. Art is one of the few areas that allows for decision making based on personal information. Most other forms of learning are rote in nature.

S. H. Well, I don't like to think most learning is rote but unfortunately in schools that tends to be the situation. This makes art very special. You don't need a lot of information because you're working with yourself and your eye. The information needed is generated out of your total life experience - that's the substance from which art is made.

S. P. That's an excellent point.

S. H. There's another idea that I'd like to connect with the above thought. It deals with how one grows, how one develops. I think there are things you can do in a course that can help a student know how to grow. That's very important. Because although you may have learned how to see, how to think, how to be well disciplined and hard working, you may not know what to do next. And part of the process of dealing with art is knowing what to do next. That decision is an important decision - when you get out of school and you're dealing
with your own work, when you finish a series of problems and you finish one kind of involvement, the decision or choice that you make in terms of exactly what you should get involved in next is an important kind of decision; and that's a process that the student can learn in school. Let me be specific. In drawing, I try to explain the process of growth by starting with a very simple method of drawing. I start with just a line - it's simple, it alleviates problems of light, it alleviates texture. Just line, very simple, very beginning. From line we move to another single element like tone. Drawing what you see in terms of tone without making decisions about drawing. Just the drawing of a convincing space based on tone. From there you can grow in terms of making not just what you see but making decisions about what you see. You start with something, and you're able to deal with something more complex only because you went through those 'simpler processes. If I set up a still life and had students draw the still life again and again and again, I don't think that the process of growth, of development, would come across. A lot could be learned from drawing the still life, but I like to think of the structure of a course as a process in which what takes place at the end of the course would not be possible if a certain sequence of problems were not followed.

S. P. Sequence is an important objective in your
structuring of a learning situation.

S. H. One problem for me logically follows the next. There is that sense of sequence in them, that they're very much related, and they're so much related that the outside assignment can always deal with the same subject matter. The subject matter is never important to me, it's always the orientation that the student takes to the subject matter - that is, how he can apply what he knows to whatever it is that he is seeing. A beautiful drawing will not be beautiful because of the subject matter; it's a question of how one approaches that subject matter.

S. P. The most mundane subject matter can be the most beautiful drawing.

S. H. Absolutely.

S. P. How important is the finished product to you?

S. H. I never grade an individual drawing because I feel that a student sometimes learns much more from a bad drawing than he might from a good drawing simply because he tries things that are difficult and you can learn from those things. If a drawing is good, many times that indicates that a student is doing something he is capable of doing - and that's not a very positive thing for me. So the finished product is not important at all to me. It's the total accumulation of work - what's happened from the very first drawing to the very last
drawing. No, I see no value at all in one particular drawing.

S. P. Doesn't the product have to reflect all those qualities that you've been talking about?

S. H. I value the piece of paper if that's a part of the process. I value the fact that a student will have a certain attitude about the kinds of things that he can put down on a piece of paper, and that he relates to it in a way that is something more than just an experience.

S. P. Total integration is obviously important in your teaching.

S. H. Yes, very important. Now I understand your question about the importance of the finished product. You were right in what you said - that that piece of paper is important. A student ought to know that it's important, and that what's put down is important. But it isn't important in itself, it's important in terms of the total, the total thing that happens in relation to other things. One thing alone is not going to mean anything, it's only part of a whole; but the whole could not be achieved without all the parts.

S. P. Your idea about the individual confronting a piece of blank paper was interesting to me. Could you elaborate on that.

S. H. I recognize the person to be someone who has a whole history behind him, since people have feelings,
they think, and in order for them to make any sense out of art from the very beginning, it is important for them to develop some attitude about that piece of paper. Each student is going to be able to confront it differently and to recognize how different he is through that kind of confrontation.

S. P. That makes art different from most other subjects. The student from the earliest time sees that what he is doing is different from the person next to him. That gives his work meaning - it is a personal statement.

S. H. I agree with that. And it can become a personal statement on a very simple level, just the fact that the student wants to deal with a piece of paper in a particular way, that he wants to put an image down in a particular spot, just that initial decision as to where he's going to put that form that he sees in front of him calls for decisions which are of a personal nature. Everybody uses line - when they sign their names, they use line. Every signature is different, and there's something very reflective of that human being in their signature - the weight, the speed, the tension; and the drawing, in order to have any value for me, is going to be that same kind of signature. Students can recognize how different they are when they begin to see that their lines in their drawings are no different from their signatures, which
makes it very different from everybody else. I think people recognize that their signatures are different but they don't recognize the specialness about them.

S. P. They don't see the relationship between their signatures and their drawings.

S. H. And there's such a tremendous relationship, there is. It isn't so much the signature but the fact that when they put their hand down and make marks on a piece of paper, they're making marks that are different from anybody else's marks, and those marks are such a reflection of who they are. And there's no way that you would want to alter who that person is. It's so important to let every student know that he is special. Any mark that he puts down is going to be a good mark. I try to encourage students to do as much with their marks as they possibly can. It's so difficult to forge a signature for that very reason. I think the more a student recognizes this, the easier it will be for him to come to terms as to what art means to him, to begin to deal with those kinds of decisions.

S. P. This has such a carry-over value to everything they do - for them to realize that they are special, a different type of person, in everything they do.

S. H. And for them to realize that what may be right for them may not necessarily be right for someone else.

S. P. What is the role of craftsmanship in your teaching?
S. H. It's interesting that you ask that question right after what we have been talking about. I said that I consider every mark that a student makes to be a good mark. Yet craftsmanship implies those academic abilities that involve the making of a convincing space. All marks may not accurately do this. Well, I think that what should ultimately happen is for the student to make his own marks and also be able to incorporate them with the necessary skills to make a convincing space.

S. P. You see a merging of these two qualities. You want the drawing to be personal yet you also want the student to accurately be able to demonstrate the intent of his drawing.

S. P. What is the role of technique in drawing?

S. H. It has no place. If marks are mechanical, if students draw what they have picked up in the past, their drawing has little value. To draw, you must see what you are doing, you should have empathy for the subject matter. It should be organic and develop from the inside out.

S. P. Could you tell me what your education was like? Are you teaching in the same way that you were taught?

S. H. Although I would like to think that my teaching is based on my own philosophies, I know that this is not the case. But what is important is the fact that
I am thinking about my teaching, ways in which to improve it - it's changing all the time.

I can think of one teacher who was important in my education. It was not so much what he said or how he taught drawing but what stands out was the general concern on his part for each student, and that general concern was what made each student feel his own self-importance and feel that what he did was right.

S. P. That's a very important point.

S. H. It's one thing to walk into the classroom and have some very important things to say, but it's another thing to understand that students also have a great deal to say. That was an important influence on my teaching because until that time I was not sure about that method of teaching.

S. P. It seems important to you that your students do not learn to draw as you do but learn about drawing.

S. H. Yes. But I also believe that there is something I might offer. You can't deny that. It would be a lie to say my influence does not exist.

S. P. We have over 350 art majors at Skidmore, and of these a very small percentage go on to graduate school or continue in art on a professional level. So we obviously have to have a justification for their studying art other than to become professional artists. Otherwise, we couldn't justify the program. Could you talk
about why you think it's important, if it is important, for someone to study art, for someone to major in art.

S. H. I think one would have to come to terms with that in order to go into a classroom every day and confront all these students. I justify it in this way, and it's an important way. You're not really teaching the student to become an artist. What you're teaching him to do is maybe how to think, maybe how to recognize himself as a human being who does think, and if nothing more, you can teach him how to see and how to be aware.

S. P. How to think and how to see in the broadest context, not in relation only to visual art.

S. H. And in dealing with seeing, of course, it is a source of information no matter what you go into, no matter how you deal with life. I think that you could be a richer human being if you could use your eyes much more. You could be richer if you used all of your senses more. It just so happens that we are dealing with eyes. Art is a visual thing.

S. P. Do you think art is an especially good area to develop these things that you're talking about?

S. H. Yes, especially because you don't need a lot of information to go ahead and confront yourself in terms of art, all you need are your eyes.

S. P. On the simplest level, you can start to do art.
S. H. Yes, on the simplest level. You do, on the simplest level. You make marks - the earliest things you begin to do. I don’t know that I would consider that art but I would consider it a process of learning how to deal with visual phenomena which is art.

S. P. We study art history. We study the great masters. What, in your opinion, is the importance of studying the great masters in terms of studio art?

S. H. I think these are important people who have a lot to say. We learn that there are people who are also special and have special ways of thinking and dealing with space. And I don’t think it’s a matter of this is how it should be done and this is how you should do it. I think it’s a process, rather, of seeing that this is a special person and you can learn from all people - not by copying but by digesting.

S. P. That this person had a certain attitude, a certain approach to work, and he had confidence in his work.

S. H. Are all the great masters the same? I don’t think there are two great masters who make the same kinds of marks, so it’s also saying that there is not only one way to make art.

S. P. What can we learn about their attitude towards working?

S. H. That they were committed; that they were
involved. I think that's really important too - a sense of involvement by the student, not just in terms of art but in terms of life. I think you're teaching him how to get involved in something that can apply to everything, and by getting involved, he's going to get more out of it.

S. P. I think this is important - showing the student that involvement in something is important. And if he can learn an involvement in art, it's obviously going to carry over.

S. H. What they're doing in art, of course, is learning how to get involved with themselves, because you are dealing so much with yourself. When you carry that into other subjects, you can see yourself in relationship to those other subjects - that's how other subjects should be dealt with. You also see yourself in relation to other people.
Interview with Philip Yenawine

S. P. A major thrust of the conceptual art movement - i.e., its process orientation - has been lost because commercial galleries are now handling the works of conceptual artists and the documentation of these works are selling for large sums of money. So commercialization of the movement in the form of a saleable product, in this case the documentation of the idea, has corrupted the major tenants of the movement, such as the emphasis on process, the dematerialization of the product, and the non-commercial nature of the movement in general.

This is unacceptable to many contemporary artists who felt they were being exploited by commercial interests in art. They viewed their work as a system of information and information transfer, as does the artist/teacher, who sees his teaching - i.e., information dissemination - as connected with and as an integral part of his art. In a sense then, the artist/teachers are the true avant-garde of art. They have adopted the major philosophical ideas of the conceptual movement and have not become corrupted since they could not be so easily exploited by galleries because they have job security.

Your situation in the museum is of interest to me.
The function of the museum is to collect objects, yet your high school program puts the emphasis on process. What ideas are behind your program, and do you feel that conceptual art is related to what you are doing here at the Metropolitan?

P. Y. One idea deals with conceptual art. I think its real importance should be in education, not in the product becoming marketable. It seems that the process aspects of conceptual art, the emphasis on the art of doing, is so much a part of teaching. This is what I had hoped you would say in reference to Lucy Lippard.

S. P. Lucy Lippard feels that she isn't a teacher, but I would consider her an educator in the true sense of the word, although she is not functioning in a formal classroom.

P. Y. It seems an awful lot of people resist labeling - they don't want to be artists; they don't want to be teachers; they don't want to be critics; but I think that anyone who does the type of thing that she does is potentially an educator.

S. P. When did your high school program begin?

P. Y. It started in 1970 but actually picked up on many things that had been going on for a long time that had to do with tours, very product-oriented types of things. Tours about the types of things that people produced at
other times and in other places, tours about them as history, about them as art objects, and as aesthetic objects. They had something to do with beauty, in other words. Talks about them in terms of formal elements, composition, color, etc.

That attitude, I think, was a reflection of the art museum in its community and in education. In other words, it was the place where you would go to see original artifacts, which is quite different from the classroom in which you would learn the same type of information. But the function was to dispense information about those specific objects. That is slightly different from what happened in college classrooms, in high school classrooms, because it did not always have the same perspective. You talk about particular things and how you look at them but not how you feel about them. You look at them the way you're supposed to look at them, according to the classical elements. I think that reflected the time and I don't believe that the museum has changed. I don't think this has changed in terms of how the museum is viewed by society and how it views itself. Although museums are spending more money and devoting more time to education, their basic view is still unchanged.

S. P. How are they growing? Are they growing in terms of devoting more time to studying the object in an
educational sense, or are they growing more toward a process orientation?

P. Y. I think if you took a cross section of museums, you would find the exact same thing that you would find if you took a cross section of schools, and that is that the majority of them are operating on rather old principles, and in terms of the museum again - that means an emphasis on the object and looking at it formally, historically, aesthetically. As a rule, I would say museums have not launched themselves into the twentieth century, as they should, and that we are still very definitely in a backward situation where people don't really understand process so they can't put their teaching situation into a process-oriented framework.

S. P. What would you consider to be one or two of the most important objectives of your high school program at the Metropolitan?

P. Y. One is the orientation toward process. By that I mean when we are teaching we try to get the kids involved in an active creative process, in the creative act themselves. Not necessarily to produce something that they are proud of, that is beautiful, or that imitates something else, but to try to create something and experience what it means to express oneself through creative
means. We often tear things up; we often put no emphasis on what anyone has done, but on them doing it, so that they understand that a thing got created by a human being. That's one important point.

S. P. But this is something that could be done anywhere.

P. Y. I know this, but this is so basic to the teaching of art. Another thing I was going to say is that we are trying to place the visual arts in the context of the other arts, and of the world. Not to deal with things in isolation. What's the point of looking at Greek sculpture? Well, one of the points might be to examine the role of men and women. The purpose of doing that today might be something as unrelated as this: A lot of people are coming from broken homes, and there's a great deal of confusion about mothers and fathers and men and women in your lives. As we try to explore these things, the whole business of looking at society in a different time, and the possibility that the role of a man and a woman may have been different, helps us focus on our own thoughts. That's a kind of indirect relationship. However, that's important, and it's effective when we've done a lot of that, so I know that it can be used for that kind of thing.

We're trying to develop a sense so that these things that people find in museums are not there simply because they are precious and because some people say they cost a
lot of money, or that they are beautiful. None of that. We're just trying to say that they have some relevance and that they are here because of that, and that if they don't have relevance then they aren't worth anything to you. You have to be careful about that. Another thing that's important about an art museum that makes it unique perhaps is that it is one of the few environments that is devoted to creativity.

S. P. In what sense?

P. Y. In the sense that what they hallow are man's creative instincts. Instead of the kind of destructive process that one goes through, particularly in a city like New York. In the school environment nowadays, they have their own police forces. They are not exactly creative environments - they have so much hostility, so much anger. The museum is the type of environment where you can be apart from that. In that case the notion of a museum as temple is not such a bad thought. It's outside the world; it's quiet; it's one of the few places where you can go and expect that, except on a Sunday.

S. P. This is a very traditional thought.

P. Y. Yes, but it's nice. There is much in traditional thought that we need. For instance, parks are traditional places, but we need them. So, that is what we want people to have and to understand. To feel comfortable in the museum as a special place, a quiet place.
S. P. In some of your literature on the programs here, you talk about the importance of seeing. Could you talk about that?

P. Y. Yes. Museums are great places in which to learn to see. This is one of the cornerstones of our program. There are a number of cornerstones, but this is very important because we discovered that a lot of the kids coming in here were not even interested in art history, and they weren't even looking at the stuff that they could see. I think there are a number of reasons for this - television being one. It's not exactly an enlivening experience visually, perceptually. Films are another thing. The environment created by a film is so captivating because of the moving pictures and the sound and the darkened room. The ability of one to get involved in films is such that there is little control over it. One just finds himself involved. Anyway, those two things - television and film and the fact of McLuhan's world, that is, moving through too much visual information, means that when you do come to the museum you are really unprepared for looking at art, even if you are accustomed to it in your life, which very few people are. But even if you are from the type of background where looking at things is important to you, looking at two- or three-dimensional objects which don't move, it's very hard, even if you live in a museum as I do. When I go into a
gallery I have to erase a lot.

S. P. When you say looking at art, you seem to be limiting this to painting and sculpture.

P. Y. Well, of course I'm not, in the long run. I don't mean to, but in terms of trying to teach seeing, I think the museum is a terrific place to work because first of all you have a special quietness, outside the real world. Secondly, I found if you really want people to start noticing more, whether it be noticing more in painting or noticing more in their environment, it's easier if you start by asking them to look at things which have some interest, and that is my definition of what an art object is. It is something that can captivate you for a while... the longer, the better. The better the art, the longer it can hold your visual attention and other things related to that. So that in a place like this, we have so many things that do have interest, and you can talk about them. There is just so much depth to lots of things you can find here.

S. P. Let me try to steer you back to some of the ideas that I'm working with. For instance, the people that you're working with - the teachers. Did you find a difference in their attitude towards the content of their teaching starting around 1970?

P. Y. I definitely noticed a change - I think the latter part of the sixties, the decade of the sixties, produced so much unrest in the schools and so much concern,
people were trying so many different things, that the sense of a need to change attitude was found in teacher after teacher, and it's really very apparent to me now. However, making a clearer definition, knowing what the attitudes should be, is something that I don't find. I think people are just floundering now. But I think that they also know that they can't be the way they were. And I think that they know what they are supposed to do. For instance, if kids are still supposed to learn how to read, but you don't want to relate to them as someone who tells them to get that book and learn that word, or you don't want to demand that they memorize in order that they learn to spell, what do you do then? Many teachers are attempting to relate to students in different ways and learn in a meaningful sense, but they flounder when it comes to actual methods or systems that allow them to establish new relationships with students.

S. P. I'm interested also in the emerging attitudes of artists as they relate to the sources for their work, their actual work and their teaching.

P. Y. I think a lot more artists in the last few years have decided that teaching is not only something that they can do to support themselves, but something they can feed on. There's that. I think that the teaching
of art has probably become a viable endeavor worth doing for reasons of the amount of creative output involved. Well, I look at teaching as process art. It's doing conceptual art, and I think there are a lot of people who find that to be interesting.

S. P. Would various people on your staff agree with your statement that teaching is process art?

P. Y. I think probably they would, but I think in addition that someone like Randy, who is very much a practicing artist, integrates teaching into his whole life. It's part of it, and in addition to doing process pieces with kids, which is in effect his teaching, he uses the human contact that he has with kids and what he learns from them, the insights they give him, the whole kind of way in which he gets excited by them, as fodder for the other kind of work that he does. And I don't think this is unusual at all. There are a lot of artists whom I know who are functioning in this way.

S. P. I think this is an unusual attitude in terms of most art schools where the older faculty's attitude may be as follows: I'm an artist and my role is in the studio and not as a teacher. If anything rubs off and you pick it up, fine.

P. Y. Well, yes, I think nothing much good is happening in our society today but, on the other hand, I think most of the interesting artists I know like to involve teaching as part of their lives. What they do in
the studio may be separate - that is, they don't do their
work in the presence of students.

S. P. I think we're talking about two different
things. One is the studio artist who enjoys teaching,
but the second is the artist who actually incorporates
teaching as part of his art in the form of direct
communication from him as an artist to his audience, which
in this case is made up of his students.

P. Y. Well, I wasn't really trying to separate
the two in that sense. What I object to is the artist
who sets himself up in a studio - whether it is Hunter
College or Skidmore or the School of Visual Arts - and
says: I am painting or doing sculpture and you as students
can get what you can from me. And that's one attitude of
combining teaching with one's professional work. I think
there are people who have a very different attitude towards
their teaching - they put their entire selves into their
teaching. When they are teaching they are working in a
different way from the way that they work in their studio
on their own work. So there is a separation. But they
are interrelated and feed on each other in a very symbiotic
way, and their growth is a result of these two aspects
of their lives working together. One thing that is
interesting to me regarding this different type of
attitude that we are talking about is the number of artists
doing part-time teaching - in other words, they don't want
to be full-time anything. I really like these part-time people – they're hard to manage from an administrative point of view because there is never a time when everyone is all together, but part-time people to me are really perfect, because you've got the sense of people trying to do a lot of different types of things and these things interrelate very nicely. I think this is an indication of people's attitudes towards their work and the way that their work relates to something like teaching.

S. P. Okay. Now assuming you were working on an actual curriculum, what might be a couple of definite projects that you might use?

P. Y. One of the things I'm interested in is the idea of intensive workshops where you take kids out of one setting and put them to work together on certain things, not for short periods of one or two hours, but perhaps for whole days or weekends. So if I were devising the ideal curricula, I would try to organize it on this basis of large units of time, so you could investigate something for a long period of time, probably removing yourself from an environment which is ordinary.

S. P. In the film on your program there's a scene in a gallery where students are reacting through body movement and gesture to various paintings. What actually were you trying to accomplish there?

P. Y. The environment was one of a medieval cathedral. What I want them to do is to take stock and
see how they feel and respond to such an environment. As you consider the fact that spatial concepts have a relationship - that is, they can be communicated on paper, they can be communicated by architecture or by movement - what I wanted them to think about is that a spatial concept could be communicated in many ways and that it has impact on them in many different ways. That was the basis of the whole exercise. They were asked to look at something and react to it in a variety of ways. This type of thinking would be basic to any type of problem that I design - that is, the notion that you examine something from many different points of view. So, for instance, if you're talking about relationships to family, you don't just sit around and talk about them, or you don't just play psychological games that have to do with simulating various relationships. You talk about relationships in terms of non-verbal things where you set up spatial relationships between people, and try maybe through mime or gesture to deal with the relationship that results from that. Or you try to think about a child-parent relationship in terms of color, so that you have conflicting or agreeing points of view expressed through color. As you do more and more of this type of thing, the idea becomes abstracted from its original context which helps one to view it. The interrelationship of these things is really quite critical. The main focus of the problem was how we relate to certain spaces
and see whether we can translate this into architectural terms.

A more important underlying point is that anyone who participates in this gets the sense of how to relate to a space so that whenever one is in a situation - for instance, when on a subway, one is not going to be stimulated, made to feel spiritually good, whereas for instance in some of the small best pocket parks another type of attitude is going to take place. When you walk into Radio City one thing is going to happen; when you walk into Lincoln Center another thing is going to happen. To make people aware that the environment and how it is shaped has an impact on them and to be able to deal with that is very important.

S. P. How does the staff at the Metropolitan in general - not the people in your area - react to the type of process-oriented activity that you do?

P. Y. Well, they hate feeble attempts to deal with art history, so in one sense they were relieved when we stopped doing this. I think many of them would like to feel that the museum is no place for high school kids at all. Many of them, although they themselves would not approach it this way, think that what we are doing is a valid way to deal with teenagers, although it has not much to do with art. If there's one thing about museum people which separates them from, say, art historians,
it's that they really love objects...that's why they're in museums and not doing research with slides and books, etc. They would most probably like us to combine more information with our teaching, which I don't think would be a bad idea, but it is difficult to get the kids turned on to information that they don't have any connection with.

S. P. Well, what you're doing is really going about it in a different way. You're trying to stimulate kids with the hope that this stimulation will get them interested in the works of art.

P. Y. This is theory. Although this is what we're trying to do, we aren't really positive that it works all the time. I think what stimulates kids here is the fact that they can just come in here and they know that they don't have to memorize or write or learn things; they can just be here. They participate in a way that you just can't believe. They are not coming back for information right away, but some of them do.

S. P. Have you ever done any type of research to find out how many of them actually do come back?

P. Y. No; this really isn't the thrust of our program. I'm sure the curatorial staff would like to think that we would emphasize this aspect more, but we haven't really pushed that. We just keep excusing ourselves by saying we're just trying to build motivation.
S. P. What's the future of the program? Is it likely to grow?

P. Y. It may not grow here. As you know, I'm leaving, and I don't know how much of this attitude has been identified with me, but because I've been involved in this program for the last five years, lots of other places have taken hope.
Interview with Jack Masson

S. P. Last year we spoke about an idea you had concerning your work and life. It went as follows: You said at that time that your pottery was not your art form; rather, your pottery was the means by which you achieved a certain life style, and this life style was your art. That idea was fascinating to me because in your studio you produce objects and yet you're saying that the art form isn't the object. You're saying the art form is the quality of life you're living.

J. M. Yes. The product of the object is the life style that comes with it. To begin with, how many people do you know who can command a satisfactory living - a satisfactory living to manage a hundred some odd acres and have all the bills paid and still have a good deal of extra time? I commute thirty feet a day; I never have to drive anywhere. It's a choice, and I must admit that there are times when I wish I were doing other things. But I wanted to provide a good place for my kids to grow up, and I didn't want to have to deal with the world out there. I had lost complete respect for all that goes on out there - from television land to commuting. I wanted space, garden possibilities; we cut our own wood; we heat our house with wood. I can afford to go in and turn the
thermostat up if I want to. I now have eleven cords of wood stocked. The chain saw is not any further than my potters wheel. For me that's great therapy. It gets me out of here, which is not a good place. If you look closely, you'll see silica flying by my hand. It's a fine form of clay. It's unhealthy to be in here for ten or twelve hours a day. I must admit I did spend a lot of ten- and twelve-hour days in here, but all of these things combined lead up to a certain kind of existence. And at this time this is what I would rather be doing than any other thing. If something else came along that appealed to me more, we're still flexible enough to be able to do it. But my motivation for doing what I do is so great that I find it difficult to take more than three days off at a time. I guess it has to do with loving what you do, enjoying what you do. In the wintertime I ski an hour and a half every day - cross-country skiing. In the fall I cut wood. We also have a sauna at Chapel Falls, so I can swim in my favorite river twelve months of the year.

There are so many things that make the total picture of the way we live. I'm with my children twenty-four hours a day. Sometimes that isn't so good, but... I never saw my parents when I was a kid, so I wanted that to be different.

S. P. You're constituting art as a certain life style, a certain quality of life. Your art, which is
your life, allows you to get involved in all those things.

J. M. Yes. I can live from what I do. I could probably do everything I have to do and command the same income in three hours a day, but I have no desire to be that efficient.

S. P. Why would you say that what you're doing, in terms of your pottery, isn't art?

J. M. Because I don't look upon it as art. I look upon it as a life style and as a way of life.

S. P. But why don't you look at it as art? Many other people might.

J. M. That's true.

S. P. You must have reasons why you don't consider it art.

J. M. All right, I do have a reason, or two, or three. To begin with, I don't think I understand what art means. I visited Don Reik, the Director of the Frontier Museum, the other day, and he said I should allow myself two hours a day to do creative things. I thought about that very carefully on the way back, and I said to myself: It's true. I do not, as far as I'm concerned, do creative things. For instance, I make no more than twelve teapots at a time when I make teapots. They are essentially of the same family, but they are not brother and sister. Each one is separate and different
and an incredibly individual piece of work. Now because it's a teapot, you can't call it art, per se, but the art of creativity has gone into each and every one of those things. Now I don't resent what he said — he got me thinking about something, but in order to back myself up and reinforce the way I think and work, I do under certain circumstances consider each and every piece I do a small segment of art. I have artists say to me: Oh, you do pottery. But what they don't understand is that I've been supporting myself and my family of five for eleven years now just from pottery. Now I don't think that in those eleven years I've diluted the kind of work I do to the point where I produce a commercial line. I don't. I make individual pieces — even mugs. There are ten mugs. By the time I get finished, they'll be very, very separate and individual. They're certainly not art, but it represents a segment of the whole picture which I believe is my art.

S. P. I agree. Within the context of your total lifestyle your pottery is a segment — an important segment. Yet it is the whole which is important to you. You're saying art must not be broken down into little segments. You're looking at your art as a whole system.

J. M. I can't break it down, because if I broke it down I'd be breaking myself down. For instance, I
look upon the art of my skiing as a part of my art. However bad it might be, it represents what I am and what my surroundings are and how I built the surroundings - or how we, because Barbara has been pretty instrumental too.

At this museum, Don Reik very proudly took me up to look at his most famous collection of Japanese and Chinese pottery - a very good collection, incidentally. There were things like teapots - on pedestals worth thousands of dollars probably, and little jars, and so on. So here I am looking at this beautiful collection of oxbloods. In days of old, probably the most mundane, functional household pottery.

I'm doing the same thing! What's it all about? I don't understand. So it's a dilemma and I work it out by attempting to change what I do but then discover it really doesn't represent anything for me, so I go back to making things that one, if they choose, can consider functional. Although I make a lot of things that are outrageously non-functional but have a functional nature. Like a wine jug that you can't get wine in or out of. It's a delightful piece to look at. But that still is a dilemma though, because I find myself moving in circles which are covered with artists.

S. P. You see, one of the reasons that I'm doing this study is that I believe art has become almost totally
foreign; it has lost its integration with life. The making of art has become totally disjointed from life. Students take art courses and they make objects, but they have no connection with those objects. They collect paintings or their family collects paintings because the paintings are prestige things to have.

J. M. And will increase in value with the years.

S. P. Originally the function of art was to integrate life. Art was the mediator between man and nature.

J. M. I agree. Absolutely.

S. P. And I think we've lost that and when that happens, when we lose this integration, art has lost its real function. I'm interviewing a series of artists who I believe are attempting to make this integration between their art and their lives, and I think you fit that category.

J. M. Yes. My hunger is as a craftsman, and I suppose there are those who would call it art. But you see, when I use the word art it elevates what I do, and I'm not sure I want it elevated.

S. P. I remember you said about five years ago that you felt comfortable with the notion of going around and promoting the idea that it was possible for a person to make a good living as a functional potter.

J. M. Right.
S. P. And I remember last year you said you don't do that now.

J. M. Well, I still do, but I modify it. I modify it to the point of view that there is still an overwhelming need for good producing craftsmen. I'm eight months to a year behind on all the things I do. New shops and galleries have a minimum waiting time of two years. So somewhere along the line there just aren't enough people doing what I do. And that's not just me alone; that's all of my contemporaries - they're in the same condition. It took me perhaps four or five years to get to that place. Nowadays if a person is good, he's there in two years; and if he's really great, he's there in one year. A couple in Amherst have pulled it off in a year. The point is there's still a need, an overwhelming need, for good craftsmen. I don't talk in terms of art. But I make it clear that you have to be good or excellent as a craftsman.

S. P. You say you formally don't teach, but in actuality you are involved in teaching through your workshops and the apprentices that you have. What is it that you stress in your workshops, to your apprentices?

J. M. Well, I don't have to say anything if an apprentice is working here. The existence in this producing studio is almost enough because there it is - the clay, the wheel, the kiln, the packing, the shipping...

S. P. The environment.
J. M. Right. Just by being here and having somebody to share the studio with me. I never think about what it is I teach. What I do is allow the people to fix on me what they think is necessary for them at that time. I've had people here who've not made any demands in terms of teaching at all, who just wanted to work and occupy space. Now it usually turns out that they end up wanting to know, but there are no contractual arrangements. Most of the time, people who come here have had some experience. They'll set themselves up more or less a schedule, and they will attempt to do certain things. If they don't, I'll set them a more or less loose schedule. It will start out with some basic throwing, move to more complicated throwing, or get them to think about compounding glazes. I don't spend any time teaching. They can check it out in the book. Figure it out for themselves if they want to... clay bodies, loading the kiln, unloading, packing, skiing... all this stuff.

S. P. So you are trying to convey to them an attitude.

J. M. An enthusiasm for what I do, more than how it's done.

S. P. What are most of them doing?

J. M. As a matter of fact, sixty percent of them are producing, one way or another. But you know, this is a very intense thing. Somebody comes here, they work
eight hours a day, five days a week.

S. P. Would you teach in a formal setting if it allowed you to continue what you're doing here?

J. M. I don't think it would be possible to be involved in the type of teaching I'm doing - the workshops and apprentices.

S. P. Why wouldn't you teach by a formal schedule?

J. M. Well, I couldn't do what I'm doing now. I'm not a teacher. I'm a craftsman. A full-time producing craftsman; and if I were to teach, I would then not be that. I would then be a teacher of my craft, which is fine. Universities and colleges have lots of superb, excellent teachers of clay, crafts and art. What they don't have are producing people who are teaching. That is where I'm different and perhaps that's one value of my teaching.

The graduate schools are still grinding out hundreds of people a year to fill jobs that don't exist, and the good jobs are just a shuffling of the big guns. This means that they're going to have to do something to support themselves. Well, they have options. They can teach in P.S. 11, they can teach in high school, or they can make their living from their craft. Now my point is that there are hundreds of potters in the country now. But their background, coming from all of these schools, is towards doing art, towards doing teacher art. They are not prepared as craftsmen. Consequently, they fail in
their first year when they attempt to be craftsmen. Everybody's disillusioned, everybody's disgusted. Why can't there be schools where they can train people to be excellent craftsmen? What is wrong with being an excellent craftsman? It's sad but true. All of these kids, most of whom are relatively well trained, many of them very good artists, will end up doing something that they don't want to do, that they don't enjoy doing. The females will be married and the guys will be driving trucks.

S. P. It seems to be a real contradiction. They're going through school to be trained as potters, and yet they don't really know how to function as a potter. All this training and they can't or don't want to set up a studio. There is something wrong here.

J. M. They're not encouraged to set up a studio. Let's go back to the propagation of what they do. They're encouraged to go out and teach. As I do these workshops, I go around and I look at what's going on and I see such phenomenal potential. I hate to admit it, but I see people who do far better things than I'm doing, much more interesting stuff. But because they haven't had the delicacies of living from a craft, they go out, and they don't know how to deal with galleries, they don't know how to do their income tax, they don't know what it means to be a craftsman.
S. P. Was there any point when you felt very self-conscious about what you were doing in terms of your pottery? Was there any conflict at some point where people were saying it isn't enough to be a functional potter? You have to be an artist in clay; you're a sculptor in clay.

J. M. That's right. It still happens all the time.

S. P. You see, I'm really against that idea. I go to a college department of art, to the ceramics area, and the graduate students there are told that because they are coming there to get an M.F.A. they cannot be functional potters. They have to be something more than that.

J. M. They have to be an artist.

S. P. They have to be a sculptor in clay. To me that's a real pity because a lot of them come there wanting to be a craftsman and they're made to feel inferior because of that. Many of them are good craftsmen, but they may not be good sculptors. They are forced out of the one thing they really want to do.

J. M. An incredible waste of good resources. Strange as it sounds, there are so many potters, but we still need good ones. I must admit, there are times when I feel I ought to be doing more sculpture in clay, but it's somebody else who makes me feel that way. I don't feel that way.
S. P. I'm not sure that I understand what this means. When you talk about going down to Springfield and seeing these functional objects, these pots that are a couple of thousand years old, because of their age and their rarity, they're put on pedestals and have an almost priceless value. Then you come back here and you sell your pots to people who use them in their kitchens.

J. M. Well, that's the advantage of time. Maybe what I'm trying to say needs the advantage of time also, and only time really will tell.

S. P. Do you see yourself changing, moving into something else?

J. M. Yes. Up and down. I see myself moving into and out of all kinds of things, but they are still within my craft.

S. P. Your craft is the stabilizer, the means to give you the freedom to do other things.

J. M. Yes, that's right. It's an evolutionary kind of thing. I am doing more workshops now than I did before. I am doing less pots than I did before, and that's not always my fault. I am coming into the same situation - if you were painting all the time and people kept saying, You've got to have more paintings. Well, the more people want what I do, the less I want to do it. You begin to resent it. I left New York to get off the
treadmill, but two years ago the treadmill was right down in my driveway. So I stopped. We're making less money now than we ever made before. What we're doing is making the same amount of money we made in 1967, which means it's less money. But I must admit I'm enjoying that less money a lot more than I did in '67. In '67 I was proving, I was reputationing. Now I'm going to let somebody else do that.

S. P. Has the price of clay gone up much?
J. M. Yes. I just got clay that two and a half years ago cost me $389. That same amount of clay a month ago cost me $1,100.

S. P. Three times...
J. M. Three times. Not to mention the price of fuel and all the other things.

S. P. How have your prices been going up?
J. M. I've been raising them - some very modestly. What I do is raise about five or ten percent, and then I turn around and make the thing bigger. So I've really negated any of my increase.

S. P. Your actual cost of living, the way you're living here, obviously has not gone up as much as out there.

J. M. It hasn't. So we can survive on much less.

S. P. So do you price your pots in terms of the increase relative to your cost of living here or out there?
J. M. I price them according to how I feel our increases are going to go, and I feel very confident in that. And then I go outside to buy something that I haven't purchased in a long time and I'm just amazed. You see, I only leave here about once every three months. I really don't go anywhere. I'm perfectly happy to stay where I am. Barbara does the shopping, so she deals with everything out there.

S. P. You see what I was asking. There would be a certain falseness to your wanting to live a certain way and yet gearing your product to the price of what's out there. It's a very idealistic notion, but I just wondered if you had thought about that.

J. M. Yes. I had thought about it and I continued to think about it because normally I don't worry about the buck. But that may have to change because, as I said, we're making the same amount now as we did in 1967, which means a lot less.

This is what is happening. Let's say I do a plate about so big, comparable to Syracuse China, where it is commercially produced by the thousands and was selling for $15 to $18 a few years back. Well, now mine are less than theirs. Here's a hand-crafted pot for less money than a commercially produced pot, which is produced by the thousands. Now that's good from the point of view that my hand-crafted pot will become desirable. In
other words, maybe I will get back to making cups and saucers for everybody in Conway, and they'll make food and cheese for me.

S. P. Then you do trade.

J. M. A lot of trading. Trading for clothing, services, food, equipment, various kinds of equipment.

S. P. Are you saying that you trade your wares, or do you trade any other things?

J. M. I trade services too. We're in the process of helping a friend now to get his sugar house set up, which eventually will mean my children working in the sugar house and getting service, say, for services.

S. P. But your main commodity is your clay.

J. M. Fortunately I have enough for trading for dental services, trading for medical services...as much as I possibly can.

S. P. Do you find most people are willing to do this, or do you go out and solicit?

J. M. No, I don't solicit anyone. At one point I refused to trade with anyone, because most of the people who wanted to trade were sweet ladies at these various fairs who had frog candles they wanted to trade for some of my pots.

S. P. But you have been able to find suitable trading partners.

J. M. Oh yes. They come. Usually the first
couple of times it's a dollar-and-cent sale. Then you find out in time what they do, and if they come up frequently, I have guilt feelings selling my own pots to people who sort of get friendly. So I say: Look, you buy a lot of stuff here, what do you do? And we proceed from there. For us we probably still live comfortably on $6,000 a year.

S. P. Is that so?

J. M. And everything's paid for.

S. P. That's really amazing. And you aren't lacking in what you consider to be important things.

J. M. I just went Christmas shopping day before yesterday. Went through department stores, discount stores. I saw nothing in a whole day's travel that I felt I needed or wanted. It just isn't there. There's nothing out there. It's all the same. The name of the place is different on the marquee, but it's all the same garbage inside. And I come back having a great deal of respect and integrity for what I do. I do the best I can to do what I do. The quality control gets better as the years go on.

S. P. Your children - are they picking up some of your values? Is this an important thing?

J. M. It's important. It's important from the point of view that they are in the middle of a very, very difficult dilemma. They go to a local school which has an entirely different set of values and they see what
we do up here. My kids take solace with me and my wife and my assistants and all kinds of people. All summer long we have a nudist colony - modified, you might say. And then they go to school, and the first week they start to tee-hee about underwear, because that's what's going on at the school and they have to identify with those kids down there. Up here, we don't care if they go to school. Quite honestly, my wife and I get into big fights over this. I want them to go to school because they've got to fulfill whatever those requirements are, but down deep inside if they didn't go I wouldn't worry. But the law says. Unfortunately, the school system doesn't reflect our values. So we do the best we can to influence for better or worse what goes on here, hoping that this will pull out ahead of what's going on down there in school.

S. P. Are they having problems?
J. M. Oh, definitely.
S. P. Are they old enough to deal with this?
J. M. Most of the time they aren't even aware of what's happening. They'll come home and say: Daddy, when are you going to shave your beard? Well, you know they got criticized that day because their old man has a beard. We live in a snowmobile culture up here. They'd love to have snowmobiles. Well, I'm not too keen on snowmobiles. So there are all kinds of dilemmas. They get the blunt end of it because I can't be with them down
there protecting them. They're going to have to face it on their own. This town just threw out its enrichment program because they didn't like the lady who was doing it.

S. P. What was the enrichment program?
J. M. The enrichment program was Barbara - my wife - and a number of other people in the community who would spend one hour a day for a week or so with the kids, doing things outside the school. For instance, a group of kids did clay; another group did something else - horseback riding, skiing. An unbelievable number of interesting things. The town felt that this was fun and games.
Interview with Dale Schleappi

S. P. Your main teaching involvement is in the foundations program. What are the most important objectives of the program? What are you preparing your students for?

D. S. Before I get into the specifics of your question, I think it's appropriate to talk about overall objectives that relate not only to the foundations area but to any student I'm teaching. The overall objective is to have the students develop procedures for learning, and the fact that we deal with this subject matter is incidental to the overall view. One must learn how to learn and, concurrently, develop procedures for working and thereby become self-directed. These particular goals seem to have persisted now for the past fifteen years, and resulted as a reaction to the way I was taught.

S. P. What was your education like?

D. S. It was programmed, oriented towards skills, not only skills but very specific skills and very specific kinds of accepted performances - factory-type learning. The faculty was rather poor in terms of teaching, although there were many important artists on the faculty.

S. P. What were they really interested in doing in their teaching?

D. S. They were all involved in a quasi-star system.
They were looking for the people who could perform acceptably according to the New York scene at that time. And once they found that person, they pushed him at the expense of almost all the other students. You either latched on or you latched off.

S. P. They were interested in finding the one or two students they felt had a chance of making it on the scene?

D. S. Yes, there are only two people I came in contact with who didn't teach in this way. They were really interested in the individual and what his development was. This influenced me not only as an artist but also as a teacher. And it wasn't until some years after I got out of school that I really began to formulate my thinking, which is still in the process of change and development.

The overriding objective is self-direction, away from product-oriented performance and procedure. I think of my role as a teacher as primarily concerned with the creation of an environment where students not only begin to learn how to learn but begin to learn how to teach themselves, and ultimately become totally self-directed.

My personality is not oriented towards group activities and that is an important aspect of my teaching - the attainment of self-direction through personal involvement.
S. P. Could you mention a few specific problems.

D. S. There is the year-long color problem that we deal with. It interweaves all the problems we deal with. I try to get them to approach and understand color as a thinking procedure rather than simply manipulating chips. It can also become a sensibility device or a sensibility that can be at the root of one's thinking as he approaches formal material.

S. P. How about another problem.

D. S. Assessment is a problem that I've been giving to my classes for about eight years. I'll dictate from the beginning that they select a complicated object, a form - it's usually an organic form, such as a bone - and they assess the bone in terms of its portrait properties, its geometric properties, its psychological qualities, its functional qualities, on a graphic level, on a written level, on a comparative level.

S. P. By assessment, do you mean the collection of information about the subject - i.e., bone?

D. S. Yes, and to broaden the field of information as much as possible.

S. P. As much information on the subject of bone? 

D. S. Right. And then through a sequential procedure they utilize this information in many ways. One example might be: What does this suggest to you?
How is this information usable in terms of something that interests you? It might be now that the bone is no longer important.

S. P. After this basic process of gathering information, I assume they try to convert the information into a personal statement according to their developing individual working procedures.

D. S. That's right. Now a lot of people have problems with this in that they don't know what to do. I look at that as a positive time. Most people look at that as negative time, inoperative time. Because I think it's probably understood that time is very important. Somebody sitting around not knowing where to go or what to do. Questions come up, like: Well, what do you want me to do or, what should I do next? Then you deal with that in terms of not what you should do next but what have you done. Is there any meaning here which might begin to spark an involvement or further investigation, which in turn opens up other doors which you or I do not know at this time? So this is usually a year-long problem; it continues over a year. After they get into it, then I push it aside as an ongoing problem. Then we get involved with more specific issues which I direct them towards. No problem is ever completed in my class. There is usually a review, but that's only for purposes of seeing work people have done.

S. P. Would you talk about the class you conducted
at Washington University which was completely open-ended.

D. S. I had been there for three years, and all the courses there were one-year courses. It was a sophomore design or composition course. Primarily it had been a highly structured course, structured to the extent that I had very specific problems with very specific information and objects to be completed, and they were due on very specific deadlines, etc. But this time I decided that I would just walk into class and sit down. I did that the first day. They were all there, they didn't say anything, and for about two and a half hours we all sat there in silence. The bell rang and I didn't even introduce myself. I just sat down. Of course, because they knew who I was, they expected certain things from me. I had a history that had already developed about me which gave me the reputation of being a very demanding teacher. I got up after the period was over, said goodbye, and left. We met twice a week. I came in the next session, they were there sitting in their chairs, practically everybody in the same spot they chose the first day. I came in and I sat down and was looking at them. A few little whispering conversations went back and forth, but that was it. And we sat there. The same thing happened. The period ended and I got up and left. And they, I suppose, got up and left too. Third period rolled around, and the same thing happened again. This went on for almost the whole semester. Maybe
someone would say, "What are we supposed to do here?"
"I don't know. What do you think you are supposed to do?"

A whole semester was devoted to simply coming in and sitting down in virtual silence. Nobody really dropped out of class because the program wasn't structured in that way. You had to go to these courses or otherwise you didn't graduate. So that wasn't a problem since they didn't have a choice. They had to be there. So I had that as a little device.

Second semester the same thing started out again, but in the second week of the semester, one student said, "Hey, I'm getting a little tired of this. I want to do something." I said, "Fine, what do you want to do?"
"Well, something, you know, do something, make something. What are we supposed to be doing here in this class?"

"Well, you're twenty now, what do you want to do? You're in school, you have certain ideas as to what you're doing here. You've been through at least a few courses. What do you want to do?"

He said, "I think I'd like to make something."

I said, "Well, what do you want to make?"

He talked about making some kind of a device, and this guy was to start things moving really in terms of his own energy. He would work during the summers as a pipeline welder for the gas lines going out to the middle of the country. So he got interested in the gas pump,
and his idea at that point was to marry a gas pump in the chapel. This is what started the class off.

So he got the chaplain and the group together. They had a bachelors' party the night before and they had the ceremony in the chapel. Brought in an old-fashioned gas pump. He married it and they had a reception afterwards. That was the event. This was back in 1965-66.

Along with this, other things began to happen - little satellites of activity - and they began to amass information; and things began to pick up very rapidly at that point, where a lot of people were beginning to get involved with activities of one form or another. None of it was prescribed, none of it was even suggested. It came from them. One married a gas pump, one started making plastic boxes, one started making clothing designs for movable sculpture, another started getting involved with color. It was being generated by them. To the point where at the end of the semester three of the students had works in the Whitney Annual - these were sophomores, mind you, and the rest of them were doing absolutely fantastic things. And it was all self-directed.

I followed through with this. The next year, I started out with the old system: Here's a problem, we're going to do this or that; and just about the same thing happened in terms of performance. In terms of activity, it was almost equal.
S. P. Just about the same thing happened?
D. S. Well, the same thing happened in terms of performance. In other words, the students, under a more structured situation. That is to say, my structure, in terms of defining problems, defining a time structure where they had critiques, where they had more problems. The same thing began to happen in terms of their performance. It was another fantastic class.
S. P. Was this the same group of students?
D. S. No, this was a new group of students.
S. P. Now the first group you were talking about was totally student-directed.
D. S. I was absolutely a non-participant.
S. P. And it took about a term until things really built up. Now, the second year you formally directed and structured your class, and it also worked out well. So what are you saying? Which is better?
D. S. I think the former situation, where it came from them. I think the involvement in terms of students was a much more sound involvement. Whereas, when it was directed, I think a lot of the directing probably prevented them from getting involved, from understanding a personal involvement.
S. P. I would think from what you said when we started out that the most important thing you're trying to achieve is for the students to establish a process of
working. If you are directing the problems, it may come about, but it seems to me that the way to achieve it is perhaps to do it according to a self-directed method.

D. S. Well, I think something in the middle of the road is probably where I'm at. I don't think one way or the other is absolute. Again, it depends on the composition of the group you're dealing with. Right now I tend to vacillate between very highly structured situations and situations which are not structured. I have to qualify the term structure. I use the term structure as a work which connotes a situation where you have a prescription and the prescription dictates a certain kind of performance. That's a structure to me. Another kind of structure which I'm mostly using now is where I begin to deal with a more open-ended problem which has multiple possibilities in terms of what are the limits of what the student can or cannot do. But I use them as simple devices - I tell the students this to get them involved. It focuses on a particular group function, and I find this works best.

S. P. Would you summarize your major objectives as a teacher.

D. S. To be instrumental in allowing the students to develop procedures where they can begin to know how to learn. To develop procedures of operation where they can function; and to become totally self-directed.

S. P. Procedures for learning, methods for working and self-direction. What is the role of technical
That's it. The role of technical skills in my estimation is that one learns these skills as they need them. On the other hand, I have also found that if one begins with a technical skill, this also propels certain situations that students can utilize. So I see it in both contexts. But I tend to think a technical skill is something one comes to as one needs it.

You wouldn't assign or structure problems from the point of learning technical skills?

Not entirely. I believe that every technical problem, be it given or be it sought by the student to resolve, often becomes an aesthetic problem. The critical issue is how the person comes to that technical need. In some cases it comes out through his self-directing or through a particular situation that he is involved with. Sometimes the technical skill is given to him and he has to deal with it. So I kind of vacillate there.

How important is the concept of change to you?

I am becoming more and more intense about the whole process of change, rapid change, dramatic change. How are we as human beings able to cope with that? I think this is going to be the biggest question in the future, probably the very near future.
S. P. Do you want to prepare students to be able to cope with this?

D. S. Yes. And in addition to the idea of change, I think we must become at this time system-oriented. How do we understand systems or fields of information and knowledge and how do we relate these and how do we interlace these in terms of not only our own personal needs but the needs of others as we relate to others.

S. P. One theme which is coming out with a lot of people I am talking to deals with the idea of art as a stationary object vs. art as a changing system. And most of the people I am talking to in both their work and in their teaching seem to be moving or have moved from the concept of making objects to the idea of art as a complex system, which involves change.

D. S. I think the time has passed where one talks about one specific item or object. I think that's gone.

S. P. Because, in the context of our culture, where things are moving so rapidly, it just doesn't make sense to you to be talking about a static object.

D. S. No, it just doesn't make sense because...

S. P. By the time you've talked about it, it has passed.

D. S. So now you are getting back to the whole idea of how does one deal with change. If one doesn't like change, one is not going to be very responsive to it or
know how to deal with it.

S. P.  You can't be threatened by change.

D. S. I encourage my students to become problem-centered.

S. P. And by virtue of welcoming problems, you are welcoming change.

D. S. Yes. I tend to gravitate towards people who are problem-centered. I find them much more interesting than people who are not. The question is not one of subject matter. Students can be dealing with portraits - that's not the point; it's how they are dealing with it, the questions they ask.

S. P. Do you see a conflict between the very traditional type of teaching which is based on acquiring a specific skill, a technique, and the philosophy of the teaching relative to change that you are talking about? Are you saying that there doesn't have to be a conflict between the two methods?

D. S. No, there doesn't. It has to do with emphasis. For instance, in a traditional skills performance structure, most of the problems are generated by the instructor. However, students also have strong pre-conceptions as to what art is and if understood by the teacher can be used to advantage. Usually most instructors that put the emphasis on skills or certain specific stylistic performance are not strong teachers according to my objectives.
A relatively small percentage of art students are going to be professional artists or are going to go to graduate school, yet they are majoring in art. What are the values they are getting from you?

Whether they go to graduate school or become professional artists is not really important to me at the time that I am dealing with the students. And I don't think I am dealing with the students in terms of semester or year blocks. I like to think that I am dealing with students where certain things are being established. Certain value systems are being covered here. It has to do with how one approaches the problems. Most of my classes are problem-oriented.

Problems in the broadest sense that you are using the visual area as a tool for dealing with problem solving.

Yes, that's right. Because I think if they are going to become artists, they are probably going to become artists in spite of me or in spite of the situation. As a matter of fact, I think the ideal teacher is the teacher that students forget about because then he will have done his job well. He becomes one which people simply transform through as they become their own teachers.

In my art education class, one of the questions that I ask students early in the course is to remember who were their most effective teachers and what were the qualities that these people had. And it turns
out that they usually forget what the subject matter was.

D. S. And remember the personality...

S. P. And many times they talk about the most effective teacher not as a teacher but as a person who influenced them, perhaps a parent! The personality was most important. Do you see any conflict between being an artist and being a teacher?

D. S. Ideally, I see no conflict, but obviously there is. It has to do with the element of time.

S. P. Not enough time to do your work?

D. S. Both well. But that vacillates. More specifically, there are times when I would rather not be in a classroom because I am so heavily involved with a personal involvement that it really, in a sense, gets in the way. But at other times the heavy personal involvement also generates being in a classroom too. At times it's the reverse thing. The teaching is there because it is there. It is something which I like to do. It's my public forum, actually. As a matter of fact, I would say the classroom is more a public forum for me than my art is because my art doesn't become public that often.

S. P. Do you think it's necessary for you as an artist to be a teacher?

D. S. Yes. But teaching is part of my art, and one must put it in context.
S. P. In the sense that as an artist you have certain thoughts and you feel it important that people understand what these thoughts are?

D. S. That's part of it. I think when you peel that away, it's selfishly oriented. A teaching profession allows me to be involved with people where I witness growth, and that's the reward, that's the payment. And witnessing growth, that's where it's at, really; and it's not that I have anything earth-shaking to offer, it's simply that here's a human situation and I think people learn in spite of us, and I simply become a witness to that, and hopefully a participant.

S. P. Is teaching a stimulus for your own work?

D. S. No, not in that sense. Because I think at least up to now, I have been very clear about separating my work and teaching. I think my work relates to my idea of individuality and privacy, basically. I think my work is very private, and my home is very private, and my teaching is public. It is my public self.

S. P. Yet you said that part of your art is teaching and that you feel teaching is necessary in order to fulfill yourself as an artist.

D. S. As a human being, not as an artist; as a human being.

S. P. But in your case being a human being happens to be being an artist too.
D. S. Well, I don't call it artist. I suppose I perform as an artist now and then. I think of myself as an artist but, first and most importantly, I think of myself as a human being. And this is becoming more important. People ask me: What do you do? And I always have a hard time answering. I am a human being, I am an artist, a teacher. So what I am really laboring towards is that I do many things. I think I do many things.

S. P. Why are you different from the farmer down the road who is also doing many things but may not regard them as a system in the way that you do?

D. S. I don't see a major difference. We each have our own elitist system that we ascribe to as we understand our own peers. That's probably the only difference. I probably have more in common with the farmer than I do with a faculty member.

S. P. What are some of your goals in the sculpture area? Some of your problems.

D. S. The sculpture faculty all agree that school is a very unreal situation. So what we are doing now is simply converting the whole situation in this way....

S. P. By the situation, you mean the sculpture area?

D. S. The sculpture area in relation to the university as an arm of that institution. We are thinking of the sculpture area simply as a kind of factory where
people come to work or come to gather information.

S. P. You want the sculpture area to be a place where they feel comfortable, where they can come and talk to other students.

D. S. That's right. Where they come and work either as a group or individually.

D. P. Do you think a certain sense of community is important in that sense?

D. S. Yes. I think the whole idea of community is important to this extent: that at least it gives to the person and to me a forum from which we can begin to communicate other sympathizing attitudes.

S. P. Why do you think it's important that your sculpture area function as a center?

D. S. I think it's important because it's very difficult for people to work independently at that age level. I think basically we are social human beings and I think what this provides is a center for activity, with each person contributing to that center and to that activity.

S. P. It's a pooling of resources.

D. S. That's right. First of all, just in terms of information. We all come there with a lot of differing information. Students and faculty alike. Graduate students and freshman begin to communicate. People can share a lot of information if they have a place to gather, a place to come to and which they can identify with. It simply is a place where one orchestrates a situation which
proliferates information.

S. P.  This is lacking within other areas of the school, within other areas of the art department.

D. S.  It has been lacking up to now. But I think it will pick up again now because of the fine arts center. I think it will happen again there too because people are forced to get together. It also may mean more walls being built, I don't know. But I don't think so.

S. P.  Do you find students need this?

D. S.  Yes, because they're establishing important philosophies, their value systems, their working procedures. They are establishing certain patterns and discarding others. I think it's important for them to have support. I think that's what it is: to have sympathetic support in a community of people who are interested in similar things.

S. P.  And this would be an area where anyone from freshman to graduate students to faculty could congregate?

D. S.  Yes. As a matter of fact, the new building they are designing doesn't differentiate between freshman studios and graduate studios. It's called areas of activity, that's all. Along with this I think the university and the college and the junior college are probably the only environment which is essentially supportive.

S. P.  Supportive of what?

D. S.  Supportive of student activity and activities
of people, because it doesn't seem to be that way out in the world. I think that's important. And further, the university or college is probably the only place which attains more or less an ideal environment. If it doesn't happen there, it certainly isn't going to happen any place else.
Interview with Hanlyn Davies

S. P. Your main teaching involvement is in the foundations program. You have eighty freshman students in this program. What are the main objectives of the program and what are you preparing these students for?

H. D. Essentially the program should provide a foundation for further study within this particular art department. The problems that we present are actually very very specific. They are related to the structure that exists in the upper divisions. But most important, the function should be one that provides each student with a means of understanding his or her own approach to work, an attitude about work and procedures for doing work.

S. P. A system of how to work?

H. D. A system of how to work, and that system is as individual as the number of students you have. The program is not based on a syllabus, but rather on a series of beliefs, concepts, and an overriding philosophy that what the student, even a freshman student, should be confronted with is the isolated system of any individual artist working in a studio. Because that's the most reasonable and realistic situation of all, as opposed to the somewhat more traditional situation where the instructor is actually instructing what to do, and in return gets the results he expected.
S. P. Then a logical question would be: How do you go about doing this? Could you specify some of the means that you use, perhaps a few specific problems.

H. D. Currently I teach the drawing and design course in the following ways: The design course is taught through a series of concepts. It's a year-long course. First of all as a class, and then as smaller groups, we discuss what design might be. Obviously I do put forth, recommend that there is an attitude.

S. P. You say you're dealing with a series of concepts. Such as what?

H. D. Having discussed design generally and taking down information from students as to what they think it's about, we discuss this and then the first period of work is introduced through the concept of transformation, which I believe becomes readily recognizable in the twentieth century.

S. P. By transformation you mean?

H. D. That transformation obviously has always existed in nature. The butterfly that emerges and the tree that grows, the natural life cycle. This is transformation recognizable as metamorphosis. The transformation in the sense that I'm talking about becomes a twentieth-century phenomena in that it is recognized through speed and quickness of change. The rate of change
allows for quicker recognition of that which has been. It's like in Disney's "Living Desert" where they film the flowers growing quickly.

But we deal first of all with a very simple, straightforward graphic problem where the students are asked to take one recognizable object in silhouette and through a series of logical steps transform it into another recognizable object in silhouette. The reason we deal with this is that first of all it introduces the problem on a simple level, but it also gives me the opportunity to demand of the students immediate excellence in their presentation, introduce the idea of reworking, and point out the formal issues involved. It deals with drawing, it deals with how we see. It is a smooth transformation. It has to do with size, it has to do with scale, it has to do with the interpretation of visual information.

S. P. Is the presentation left up to them?
H. D. No, the initial format is given to them. After the first one or two sessions, they tend to branch out and I let go. After that, the students can work on any aspect of transformation. They can pursue what they worked on earlier, or they can branch out into other areas because the problem as stated is simply to deal with transformation. If you have twenty-five people in the class, you should have twenty-five investigations and solutions coming up.
S. P. Is there a definite reason why transformation is the first concept you use?

H. D. It is perhaps the easiest of the concepts we deal with, and therefore it's the easiest for the students to get started with. There is no doubt that there is a period of time with freshman when one might say that they are kept occupied until they can branch out on their own, until they grasp their own procedures. First of all, they don't believe that they are capable of having procedures that haven't been dictated to them.

S. P. So you are introducing them to what you consider to be important concepts, but these are really only a means by which they should be developing their personal work methods. You are also establishing certain work patterns.

H. D. Work method is very important.

S. P. You are structuring for them a means of getting them involved on their own.

H. D. And also having them develop an attitude and a desire for doing things as well as they possibly can.

S. P. How about a second concept?

H. D. I think perhaps another interesting concept at the beginning of second semester is the concept of connections - how things go together. If one looks at the history of the world in terms of connections, we find the history of the world can be traced by materials
coming together from the time that two sticks came together. The history of architecture can be dealt with in terms of connections in that new materials and the way they are put together, actually at the point at which they connect, is the basis of changing styles of architecture.

You also have conceptual connections. The notion or the concept of connection doesn't predetermine any particular kind of product. It is an idea. We can, for example, spend some time looking at each other in the class and looking at the clothes we wear to see how they are put together. And what comes out of connections is a series of different kinds of form. You have forms of collection, forms of distribution, and forms of gathering. You can list a whole series of different kinds of forms and different ways of achieving form. And so this spins off.

S. P. This all comes from connections?

H. D. Yes. So it gives rise to a whole series of formal issues, and the products are always investigated at that level. There is no criticism of the products as art. They are merely discussed for their formal content and what they mean.

S. P. For their content in terms of what the stated problem was?

H. D. Yes, and also in terms of what does the form mean as visual information. We try to find the language to apply to this so that we can communicate. Then we
move on to the concept of personal space. The premise for this is that each one of us has an inherent awareness of space and it differs from one person to the next. We investigate that and then the students, as a major project, are asked to construct a space or series of spaces with which they feel an affinity. It's an exciting project.

The premise in my art class is that students do not have to be instructed from the letter A. They already have a biography: they already have a history, they already have eighteen years of history behind them. They use that history to fend for themselves in other walks of life, in their day-to-day existence. So it can also be a source to be tapped in an art class. So that we do not rely on pre-established art information and give that as the springboard for further work, but rather use the students themselves and trust in their own abilities at that point.

S. P. This would be connected with your first thought: trying to get students to develop a personal way of working.

H. D. It's sort of tied up in a neat little package here.

S. P. What's the role of craftsmanship, skills, technique, in the whole system?

H. D. I suspect that it's quite subservient to
the idea. The craftsmanship should be that which is required to successfully conclude the intent. Except in some cases it would be dependent upon each individual student. It really becomes a one-and-one situation, and if a student really needs to, if a student really wants to make the craft the premise for working, he is not dis-couraged.

S. P. Your philosophy then definitely puts the emphasis on the concept rather than on craftsmanship or techniques?

H. D. It seems a fair question to ask of the student: What is it that you wish to do?

S. P. It is also a difficult question.

H. D. It's a very difficult question and is not asked in an autocratic or demanding way. It's a question that should be asked with sympathy and understanding, and one has to persevere until a student understands that whatever he or she does initially will be accepted and should be used as a springboard. I feel that the question of craft is a very difficult one. Should it come before or after the idea. If you have the craft and no idea, then you have nothing to apply the craft to.

S. P. In the foundations area, you are preparing students for what follows in the more advanced and specialized courses. And you obviously feel that what is most important is that they have a personal way of thinking
By the end of the first year they should have a sound individual attitude towards their own working procedures and an understanding that these are capable of change. If they don't have that, they will suffer a great deal in the upper levels where the techniques are provided.

I think we can learn so much from the great masters of the past, not by imitating their work but by adopting their attitude, by seeing the way they worked. Matisse at ninety was still asking himself what was important. The foundations program is not based on stylistic preference but on each student's individual development.

S. P. Were you taught in undergraduate school according to the way you're teaching now?

H. D. Not at all.

S. P. Can you tell me briefly how it differed?

H. D. I attended a British art college of a very classical nature with a largely absentee faculty. To some extent, I think I see a relationship in that I learned a great deal there about the pitfalls of not working on one's own. The large majority of the people I was in college with have totally drifted away from doing anything in the field whatsoever. They never learned how to learn.

We sat down every day for the first year and drew from a model, from a plaster cast, with only an occasional bit of instruction. It became important somewhere along the
line for me to understand that what my activity was about was not drawing plaster casts but rather about drawing and that I had to establish my own interests and attitudes and problems within drawing in order to improve.

S. P. Is this attitude we've been talking about a comfortable attitude within your department as a whole? Would most of the members of the faculty support such a way of teaching?

H. D. I would suspect not, and I think there are certain reasons for this. I think the first is that to teach in such a way where you cannot guarantee the answers that you get is much more difficult; it demands much more work and it demands much more personal attention. You have to be on your toes and you have to be prepared to say, "I don't know." The other reason I think is that one encounters (and I think it takes place in most schools) a very strong bastion of various stylistic preferences which are perhaps imposed upon the students. I do not consider this to be good teaching. It is another teaching approach. I personally do not feel that it's the best way.

S. P. When did these attitudes that you have about teaching and use in your teaching develop?

H. D. I don't think they came about overnight. I think they started in my first year of teaching, which was nine years ago, and I think they came about because of the groups of students I had in my first year. I was at the
University of Vermont, I was relatively young (I was twenty-four). Some of the students were as old as I was. I think that their reciprocation and at that time their hunger for courses that hadn't previously been offered led to continued and more vigorous interest on my part. During the four years at Vermont, I attempted a lot of different things, I experimented a great deal, and I think by the time I came to U. of Mass. a lot of things had become consolidated in that I knew certain things I didn't want to do.

S. P. Did these ideas begin to formulate because you were unhappy with the way you had been taught?

H. D. That's a very difficult question. I knew I was going to be employed as a teacher so I thought: What teachers did I learn anything from and what teachers didn't I learn anything from, and why? And I came to the conclusion that in about twenty years of schooling, I had only six teachers that I considered really good; and they all had very special qualities, most of which were indefinable, apart from knowledge of the subject matter, that allowed them to deal with the class in such a way that students learned. But I think the greatest thing I learned from the six teachers was that, whether they cajoled, goaded, berated or enticed the students into a learning situation, they would do all of these things as it was necessary with each individual student. The most
interesting fact was their concern for the development of each student. Metaphorically, they always talked around the hole, always on the periphery of the hole. The hole, which they never spoke about, was the student's development. They never really talked on that subject, but the subject was always there very clearly. I always found that very impressive.

S. P. Do you think there's an integral connection between teaching and your art, or do you regard them as separate things? As your work changes and develops, does this directly affect the way you teach?

H. D. On the one hand, it would be very difficult to regard them as two separate things. There's the question of time which brings them together, sometimes in a clash. Time for my own work. And at other times, I think that I'm really uplifted by the vigor of some of the students. I find that very refreshing. But I also see a fundamental separation between teaching and what I do. What I do happens to be the activity of an artist. My teaching has nothing to do with art. Teaching has to do with people, not with art, history or science. There's a separation between my work as artist and as teacher, and I think that's why I can say teaching is only a job - it's formalized people work, the act of education. Education is only a natural act that has been institutionalized.
S. P. It's dealing with people; but you're teaching them art information, aren't you?

H. D. I'm sceptical about that because I have given you no definition. My definition is that art is a word that is sometimes applied to the works of man. That's a very general one, but I feel more comfortable with it because art is also the residue of various people's activities, and I'm interested in those activities. My work is the result of my activity, and a lot of that activity is to some extent unexplainable. It falls into the category of art, I suppose, because that's been my major thrust for many years. But I feel fairly compulsive about these things and I suppose when I'm doing them I'm not really thinking about them as being art. They may be. I'd like to think that they are. I'm not sure that it really matters.

S. P. Would you agree with the following statement. If you're dealing with people and your main objective when working with them is the achievement of their personalized learning and working methods, would it be your objective that these methods be for work in general or just for so-called art work?

H. D. I think the attitude that can exist or eventually exist becomes very crucial to everything.

S. P. Let me clarify why I ask you this. You're dealing with hundreds of students over a year's period.
A very small percentage of them will go on to graduate school and become artists. So obviously there has to be a goal other than developing artists.

H. D. Absolutely. It has to do with doing things as well as one can, and I think that's very professional. I don't mean professional artists. I think we all like to know people who try to do things as well as they can. We are even capable of appreciating the superior hustler because he does it well.

S. P. So one of your objectives is the attainment of excellence.

H. D. Yes. Well, anyone can strive for that and it usually has to be worked for. This attitude I'm talking about is an attitude that the students can take to French 101; it can apply there, it can apply in math, and in all subjects. If they can grasp that attitude and come to know what they want to do, then they become central rather than peripheral to the subjects that are offered.

S. P. Do you think the art situation is an especially good place for learning this type of attitude?

H. D. I think it is, because more than anywhere else a student coming into an art class is immediately on his or her own, and what we deal with is the relativity of our basic experiences as people. The subject matter has to come from the people because we have a history of the subject. Also, the person coming into art probably has a
desire to do something, and to do something on one's own is the perfect springboard.

S. P. Art is really one of the few areas where students are allowed to work that way.

H. D. Yes, and are encouraged to develop individually too. It's not knowledge and information learned by rote. That may be true in other areas. I think the activities that go on in an art department - not necessarily art - offer, perhaps more than in other departments, a chance for very real growth in a personal sense.
S. P.  What are your objectives when teaching art? What are the most important ideas that you wish to convey to your students?

L. L.  I would say that probably the most fundamental thing is the establishment of a relationship - a certain working and productive relationship within yourself, between you and materials, and between you and other human beings. This relationship should be real and true to oneself, and it should be a beginning from which anyone can then move into individual criteria. This criteria could be visual or non-visual, that's immaterial; because to me art and the teaching of art is not just visual, it goes deeper than that.

S. P.  It would involve all the senses.

L. L.  Yes, and all the senses that we usually do not even consider. Particularly in art education, we have limited ourselves just to the visual.

S. P.  Do you see the art object as a tool for achieving these objectives?

L. L.  Shall I tell you what happens to me when I paint? Perhaps this will give some insight. Because, first of all, there's a process of thinking, my own orientation. I stand in front of a canvas and put a mark down. As soon as I've done that, I'm committed to that mark; but as soon as it exists out there facing me, it begins to work...
on me. So when I talk about a relationship, it involves this constant feedback. I'm no longer totally in control of that painting. It becomes more and more an identity in and of itself, and all of a sudden there comes a point when it tells me "I'm completed." It was a tool to begin with because I had to extend myself, but then it took over.

S. P. You started off by making marks; but as the canvas started to become filled with your marks, something happened and it started to react with you.

L. L. Yes, because it took on an existence of its own. In a sense, I would say it is a tool, but more than just a tool, it is a context within which I can establish a meaningful relationship with something beyond myself.

S. P. Is the type of relationship one establishes through art different? Can this relationship towards learning come about through the study of chemistry or history?

L. L. You know, you have just asked me the question that I have been tossing out at my students all semester. They never caught up with me, I always got away without having to answer. I think there are a lot of similarities in any creative process. I think the choice of visual media is quite arbitrary. There is a quality of life or spirit that exists in art that does not necessarily exist, let's say, in solving a mathematical problem.

S. P. Isn't the information that one uses for art coming from a different source? In physics the information
is usually taken from textbooks. The information one needs for making art comes out of that person — out of his total life experience.

L. L. I would go along with that. For myself, I'm trying to get back to the idea of art, the process of arting or the process of creating, as a general learning process that's involved in all areas. I'm wondering, is there a difference between a chemist who is in the process of creating a newer thought, a newer theory, and an artist?

S. P. I think on a certain level chemistry or any subject can be similar to art. But the difference is that from the moment one starts to do art, it's a personal thing, based on personal information; whereas in chemistry you may have to have a Ph. D. before you have collected enough data to begin work in a creative way. Isn't that where your idea of human spirit comes in?

L. L. I agree. In the process of creating a painting, this human quality, this human action, comes into existence. Something that has never existed before is born. It's impossible to divorce that human quality, that human spirit, from the art of putting paint on the canvas. I don't care how academic you want to become — it's still the creation of something new.

S. P. How would you go about teaching a class in painting or drawing?

L. L. Immediately when I start a class, I dismiss
any preconceived idea as to what I expect from a drawing. I present topics that stimulate a commitment in the most basic way - the putting of marks on paper.

S. P. There has to be a certain commitment.

L. L. A tremendous commitment. I think we don't stress that in education. I think it's a tremendously important idea because when you understand the commitment you have made, this involves the establishment of that relationship that I spoke of earlier - the relationship of myself with myself. This is what I do with the students - there's a constant process of analysis as they do these drawings, and not in an academic sense. I point out: You put that down, what does it mean to you? The whole question of meaning comes in. That line says something about you. What does it mean to you? And you begin to establish a relationship with the work.

S. P. This is one of the ways in which art is different. If you set up a still life and you have thirty people drawing it, you are going to get thirty different drawings.

L. L. I approach it from thirty different points of view. There's another idea that I think we've missed - it's not a class. I think it would do us well to get rid of such terms as class and assignment since these are generalizations. You see, I believe that there has to be initial spark right from the beginning in any work situation - that is, it might be easier to go into a classroom in
painting without saying a word; for a teacher to put something down and wait for a reaction, in an organized manner but not influencing right from the beginning. See where the people take it. This is the kind of approach that I think we've missed, at least in public schools.

S. P. Yes, because in public schools, the structure of the school dictates structured problems.

L. L. I don't believe in that kind of structure.

S. P. Ideally, you would let a class evolve naturally, deal with each person separately, and bring out what each one has.

L. L. Quite acceptable. There should be a structure but it is individual. The most important thing is to establish a relationship with each person in the class. Unstructured situations are different. Most beginners are not used to non-structured teaching, which we have to get into more and more.

S. P. Because for all their lives they've had this structure, they've been taught at.

L. L. Absolutely. And rather than being taught at, I would emphasize experience - they would have to experience an arting situation, they should experience it very strongly, and then perhaps begin to manipulate the external situation and eventually end up with a painting or drawing. To make something that has meaning, that shows a commitment. And so when the student ends up with a painting,
there is such a strong relationship with that painting that nothing, no criticism, no praise, should make a difference because it is established. I think a lot of the criteria we use in evaluating students' work is quite arbitrary and out of touch with the active process.

S. P. The only valid type of criteria for evaluating someone's work would be strictly personal - talking to them in terms of their work.

L. L. You must establish a relationship between the teacher and student that is open to communication. Once this is done, the third element - the work - enters the picture, and so it becomes a three-way relationship, with the work in the process of becoming.

S. P. Now we're getting into the role that the teacher plays. Could you talk about that.

L. L. My role as a teacher is to allow a student to come into contact with that which he experiences. I then have an obligation as a teacher to give my interpretation of that situation, my interpretation at the highest possible level. It is also my responsibility to allow for the exchange of ideas, where the student can use me as an example, until he or she no longer needs me or rejects me as an example and takes on a position of an interpreter of a situation which he experienced.

S. P. Using you as a sounding board?

L. L. Yes. Here I become a means to an end; but, in the process, I am also evolving myself. I am interpreting
my life meaning, my art experience meaning, to the student. I have to act as an interpreter. I don't give knowledge, I can't; I interpret. With any input the student gives me, I interpret that experience which we both share at that moment.

S. P. What is the role of craftsmanship and technique?
L. L. I can't divorce my technique from my expression, but I'm not teaching that. I don't want to teach that.

S. P. Your technique only has meaning to you and therefore it would be questionable for students to pick up something from you in terms of a technique. What you're after is for them to develop their own tools, their own methods.

L. L. Yes, and I'm glad you clarified that because I really hadn't thought about the idea of technique very deeply at this point. You see, technique to me is not a static thing; technique is also a process of change. It doesn't matter what kind of a technique a student develops. Once there is that commitment, a desire, a search for meaning, the technique will also come because there will be a need for expression. At that point I can explain a technical idea. Technique is a by-product of all these things and as they change so will technical needs. But there is also a constant search for excellence, but excellence at each individual's level.

S. P. Excellence is another idea. Do you think teaching art is one way to establish the idea of excellence?
L. L. It has to be there if anything meaningful
is to materialize. That itself is a commitment.

S. P. Does every work a student does have to be excellent?

L. L. The work is not the excellence. The excellence is in the approach.

S. P. I recently told my class that art by definition incorporates excellence because when one is doing art the work is not complete until it is the best that one can do at that specific time.

L. L. I think this is something we need to clarify in education. You can yell and scream and you're expressing yourself. But the excellence involves a commitment and is a reflection of you. If it's only half of what you can do, that needs examination because I would ask the student: Is this what you think about yourself? Students know a great deal about their own work without being told - they know when they're doing well because it has a meaning to them. This is another area where art is different. At all levels it demands excellence - the highest level of personal excellence.

S. P. You have hundreds of students majoring in art yet only a small percentage of them are going to become professional artists. What is your justification for them majoring in art?

L. L. First of all, to talk about professional art is exposing our limitations. It's a pinhead of what the
potential of the arts are. We have only touched the surface in talking about professionalism. All these students go through art school and they don't become professionals. Look around our society, look around at the ugliness and the insensitivity to our environment. We don't need to worry so much about professionalism; professional artists are a very elitist group. What we need is the city planner who is an artist; the politician who spends his life talking should have sensitivity towards what he's talking about in terms of the total environment. We haven't touched the potential of the arts in our social existence - this is what appalls me. We haven't gone into society. The common man does not understand that visual sensitivity towards the environment may be a matter of survival.

S. P. Suppose then that many of these students who are graduating as art majors never continue to paint or to sculpt - do you still see a tremendous value?

L. L. I think those are the ones who probably can do more if they understand their own contribution to society. They can do more because they are not limited by their professionalism. They can bring a sensitivity to whatever it is that they may do. This can be a far greater contribution than the contribution of professional artists. It is these people who can truly make us a nation of artists.

S. P. Another artist/teacher whom I spoke with last
week put it this way. He said that one of the major functions of artists in the future will involve serving as models of how best to use time. To show people how to use time.

L. L. That's an interesting concept, very interesting.

S. P. He said that to have an aesthetic means to use time in a certain way. The artist by his nature organizes his time in a very meaningful way.

L. L. I like that very much.

S. P. Aren't you saying the same thing when you're talking about sensitivity? Aren't you talking about the organization of time?

L. L. Yes, because the aesthetic quality is the essence; it deals with our very lives, the quality of our lives. The organization of time in an aesthetic way is what it's about.

S. P. What we're talking about now is not something that is appreciated by the average superintendent of schools. He looks at art as being a certain type of subject in which students learn various technical skills. Very few people consider art as a learning process.

L. L. Unfortunately, that's true; and it is one of the most powerful learning processes and has one of the most far-reaching effects that we have, because it touches the
creation of our own existence. I create my existence by what I do through art. This existence, human existence, has to be at the center of the arts, and I don't think we are stressing that with our students.

S. P.  Is it necessary for you to be a teacher in order for you to function as an artist?

L. L.  Yes, in some form.

S. P.  What form?

L. L.  Because I need that relationship, not only with my own work but with the students with whom I work, because I can evaluate my own movements as I work with them. In other words, in one form or another, I am a teacher. It's actually essential for me. I think one reason is that I need that human contact very much, and that exchange of ideas. I do not feel that my time is robbed from painting when I have to work with a student. On the contrary, it gives another dimension. Yes, I think that by choice I would continue to teach in some form or another.

S. P.  Do you look at your own art and teaching as separate?

L. L.  My painting is a result of my experience. It is just that - a result which I put into existence. Every once in a while a painting comes out. In order to do that, I need the richest possible experiences, life experiences, and teaching does that for me.

S. P.  Many of the people I am speaking with bring
up the idea that they are trying to achieve a total integration of their lives. They don't like labels. They don't like to be called teachers; they don't like to be called artists. They like to be called human beings who sometimes teach, who sometimes do art, who sometimes do this or that. They consider that one of the most important functions of art is to act as an integrator of their whole life, that their whole life can actually become their art form.

L. L. I think I'm talking about similar things. Art is absolutely essential; by its very nature, it is an integrating factor. Without having the art experience, I think people are less able to cope with their environment. When I paint, I am involving the full potential of my own educational faculties.

S. P. Everything that you've previously learned?

L. L. Yes, it's all going into that painting. It's creating, it's alive. Sometimes I think the way we structure education does not allow for this.

S. P. Because it sets limits.

L. L. Compartmentalization, no integration in that sense. There's a little question in my mind. Something has gone wrong in our schools regarding this subject called art. It is placed into a curriculum, fragmented and taught like other subjects. There's something strange about that for me because it should come the other way around. As artists in
schools, we should attempt to make all learning follow the processes of working artists. Art should be a mode of integration in school and, further, it should penetrate into all aspects of human life.

S. P. So you're saying that ideally the whole school situation should be organized and structured as if one were doing art.

L. L. Yes. That's one thing. And I don't know how long it's going to take people to realize that. I don't know how long it's going to take school officials to understand what that means.

S. P. Are you optimistic about the future role of the artist/teacher?

L. L. Yes, if people like me are allowed to speak out. That's an egotistical statement. Let me clarify. I think if we allow people with such ideas as we have been talking about to speak out and touch students and allow them to keep groping and moving, then there will be a vital future. But if we continue to keep this division in the arts - the professionalism, the various studio departments - you're just going to suffocate that potential. Am I optimistic? Yes, I am because I have seen young students go out of my classes, or come into my classes, with excitement. And if they still have that, then I'm optimistic. I'm not worried about the students; I'm worried about the bureaucracy.

S. P. In an ideal sense, you see teaching as a
very positive type of activity but you are worried that the institutional structure in which teaching functions tends to stifle innovative teachers.

L. L. It can suffocate that spirit that I referred to earlier - the art spirit. It has to be kept alive, by whatever means. Yes, teaching is a way of life; it is a life.

S. P. When you say teaching, I assume we're talking about teaching in the broadest sense; it doesn't have to be in the classroom.

L. L. No, no. In the broadest sense. I think more teaching from outside should be brought into a formal situation. The more we can break down the formal situation, the better off we are. We should be teaching people to teach themselves how to create their own social and physical environment. We have divorced people from this responsibility and given that responsibility to the planners, the boards. And the human being is just left there and is not allowed to think for himself.

S. P. That's an excellent point, and that's one of the most important functions of the artist - to help people create their own social and physical environment in an aesthetic manner.
Analysis of the Interviews

The interviews will be analyzed according to twelve major ideas that have philosophical importance to this study.

1. Attitude towards formalism

A strict formalist views art as the making of objects using certain media and according to definite formal principles. Art is a separate activity apart from life. According to a formalist, for art to become reality would be the death of art.

None of the artist/teachers interviewed could be considered strict formalists. All of them view art as a means of helping people perceive reality and their role in it. Art is perception, communication and self-awareness. It is not decorative object making, a means of escape from reality or a financial investment. Because of such a philosophy the majority of those interviewed are not object makers or view their object making as their major art activity. Donald Brigham's major work at this time involves using the arts as tools for learning. He has been very successful in using the arts in remedial reading programs. Paul Berube, Philip Yenawine and Jerry Kearns consider teaching to be their major art form. Jack Masson makes pottery that is formalistic but he sees his pottery only as the means of allowing him to achieve a certain lifestyle. This lifestyle is what he considers his art form and his lifestyle is certainly not formal. John Roy, Dale
Schleappi and Hanlyn Davies go to sources outside of traditional art for the information and equipment they use in their art. Susan Hauptman and Liisa Liedes do traditional art within formalistic guidelines but their teaching objectives are anything but formalistic.

What emerges from those interviewed is a view of art as a learning process connected with reality. Art is no longer a picture of a thing. It has become the thing itself. Harold Rosenberg in *The Anxious Object* states: "In a word, art has become the study and practice of culture in its active day-to-day life."

2. Product and process in art

The idea of product or process orientation is connected with one's attitude towards formalism. Formal evaluation necessitates a material art object. Process puts the emphasis on the working procedure. Such a procedure may involve a finished product or it may de-emphasize the material aspects of art.

Because all ten of the artist/teachers interviewed view art as going beyond decorative object making, they see the value of art in its process. Jerry Kearns sees art as a process of self-enlightenment; Donald Brigham as a remedial reading process; Jack Masson as a living process; Paul Berube and Philip Yenawine see teaching as a process which is their art; Hanlyn Davies, Liisa Liedes, Dale Schleappi and John Roy see art as a specialized learning process. What is common to all their thinking is a rejection of art narrowly defined
and limited to object making.

3. The role of craftsmanship in art

Craftsmanship as an end in itself was not strongly emphasized by those interviewed. They view craftsmanship as a tool used to define the content of a work. To a formalist with a product orientation, craftsmanship is much more important since craftsmanship is used to define formal properties. All those interviewed, perhaps with the exception of Jack Masson, would agree that craftsmanship was not the issue in art. Craftsmanship should not be misconstrued with excellence of presentation. Excellence in presentation would be a goal of all artist/teachers; and where craftsmanship was necessary in the presentation, it would be important. But art viewed as craft is not acceptable to this group as a major goal of art education.

4. The sharing of information in art and the idea of ownership and authorship

All of those interviewed and all artist/teachers view art as a process where information is shared. In the traditional sense, all artists have shared information since their work is seen by others. But also in the traditional manner, an artist might be secretive about the methods and procedures used in his work. In the past ownership and authorship were very important to artists since their invention gave them a place in the history of art. Such a philosophy is against the thinking of this group. To them a major objective of teaching deals with the sharing of information with
their students and also a sharing of information among students. Such a view is logical if art is viewed as a communication system that emphasizes self-awareness and growth. Secretive object invention would be foreign to such a philosophy.

It is interesting to note that Hanlyn Davies, Paul Berube and John Roy use highly technical procedures in their work which perhaps could be patented. But being secretive about their procedures is not their concern. Jack Masson has also developed specialized glaze formulas but the fact that he has apprentices in his studio at all times is indicative that he is not secretive about his technical information.

5. Attitude towards change

Change is fundamental to the artist/teacher. He sees change as a dominant feature of contemporary civilization and considers that a major objective of education is to develop an attitude of being comfortable with change. As individuals, artist/teachers are open to and welcome change. Their lives revolve around change and they move from one activity to the next and connect these activities to a unified pattern of living.

Change has also been a basic feature of the work of the artist/teacher. A formalist may work on the same problem with the same materials for many years. The work of the artist/teacher tends to move and change with changes in our culture. The sources of their work are contemporary in nature.
John Roy, Hanlyn Davies, Paul Berube and Jerry Kearns use highly technical equipment and procedures in their work. As such equipment develops and changes, such changes may be incorporated in their work. Donald Brigham has gone through fundamental changes, from traditional painter to learning specialist. But basic to his work with learning problems is his incorporation of the art activity as a learning procedure. Artist/teachers like Susan Hauptman and Liisa Liedes are traditional in terms of the materials and methods used for their art, but their work is not static and has progressed through a number of important stages. Jack Masson is a traditional potter but he suggests that his pottery allows for a certain life style which he considers his art. His life style is flexible and changing. Philip Yenawine views art as a learning process, a way of helping people cope with a constantly changing environment.

To a formalist artist, change is a threat, an erosion of his position which is based on static information and unchanging procedures. To the artist/teacher who views art as an activity of modern man, change is natural and to be welcomed.

6. Art and its relationship to life

To the formalist, art is not reality and the art object is meant to be separated from life. The painting on the wall and the sculpture on a pedestal are a physical separation of art from life. They are in their own environ-
ment. To the artist/teacher the substance of art can be the activity of life. Art is not meant to be isolated from life but integrated into life. The artist/teacher would view painting not as an object on a wall but as the wall itself, and sculpture not as an object on a pedestal but as environmental space. Fundamental to the thinking of the artist/teacher is the concept of art as reality. Art is not about an activity; it can be the activity. All those interviewed expressed this idea and such a philosophy is intertwined in their work and teaching.

7. Art as an integrative agent - an aesthetic

Closely connected with the idea of art as reality is the idea of art as an integrating force in our lives. Because the artist/teacher does not separate art from reality, art can function as an integrator. Those interviewed do not separate their various activities but attempt to unify their lives around Their art. For them art is a method of structuring their lives beyond a material existence. To structure one's life beyond material existence is to have an aesthetic. Basic to the philosophy of all artist/teachers is the view of art as reality and as an integrative agent. All the artist/teachers strongly reflect such a view.

8. Attitude towards teaching

The artist/teacher is highly dedicated to teaching. This is fundamental to the concept of the artist/teacher since the arts are viewed as a communicative and learning process.
Teaching is one of the activities of the artist/teacher. He communicates information, and teaching provides the means.

All those interviewed and all artist/teachers are serious and committed to teaching. They would reject the idea of teaching as a separate activity. Rather they view it as one of the activities of an artist. It should be mentioned that a number of those interviewed expressed the conflict they have regarding adequate time for their teaching and their own work. But aside from that, teaching is important because it is an integral part of their lives. For the artist/teacher not to teach would be a denial of his total role as an artist.

9. The relationship between teaching and art

The ten artist/teachers interviewed are in various states of integrating their art and their teaching. Jerry Kearns, Paul Berube and Philip Yenawine consider teaching to be their art form and have totally integrated their art and teaching. The others interviewed have not made such a complete integration and there is some separation between the two activities. Dale Schleappi considers teaching his public art and his own work his private art. For Donald Brigham teaching and art are integrated and he uses the art process as a procedure for all learning. The others interviewed see somewhat of a separation between the activities. But what is common among all artist/teachers is their commitment to teaching as part of their function as an artist.

10. Approach to and objectives of teaching

All the artist/teachers interviewed view art as
a learning procedure. To teach art as decorative object making is far too limiting for the artist/teacher. Liisa Liedes and Susan Hauptman use traditional means in their teaching, but they both stress that the finished object is only a means for achieving other objectives. As Liisa Liedes stated, to view the objective of art as the training of a limited number of professional artists only points to the weakness of art education. The true potential of the arts, according to her, would be as a process whereby large numbers of people through art activity lead happier and more fulfilled lives. Susan Hauptman views art as a procedure in which one deals in an intelligent manner with visual information. But she would add that the art process could provide a structure for dealing with all information. Dale Schleappi summarized his objectives as procedures for learning, methods of working and self-direction. All the artist/teachers interviewed would agree with these objectives and their approach to teaching would stress them. The artist/teacher approaches teaching as a process-oriented learning activity where the growth of the individual is fostered.

11. Art as a special learning process

All artist/teachers view art as a learning process which is different from other methods of learning. While most learning in schools is verbal and based on memorized information, learning in art is based on personal experience and activity. All those interviewed expressed the idea that one
comes to art with a biography, with years of experience. This experience should be used as a springboard for one's development. The overall objective of the artist/teacher is a confident and self-directed learner.

12. Justification for the study of art

The formalist would justify the study of art as decorative object making, as an activity separated from life. All artist/teachers would emphasize just the opposite. They view art as an activity which is not detached but connected to life. This is the whole logic of viewing art as a broad communicative system inseparable from social, urban and global conditions. To the artist/teacher the substance for art is the activities of modern man.

In analyzing the interviews, the reader should become aware that the philosophy of the artist/teacher is very different from that of the strict formalist. Such an expanded philosophy has implications for curriculum change in art education. The interviews have stressed what these directions will be. In summary, the future curriculum as developed by the artist/teacher would stress the following ideas.

The curriculum in the future will tend to be process oriented and away from decorative object making involving limited procedures and materials. It will be a multi-arts curriculum which will incorporate many art experiences. Dance, music, theatre will not be viewed as isolated and separate activities but will be combined in multi-arts events.
The arts in the future will be viewed as a communicative system not separated from reality. The importance of art as a system for value clarification will also be emphasized. Finally the connections between the developmental psychologists and the art educators will grow in importance as the realization of the art activity as a potent learning force becomes clarified.
The artist/teacher who is the focus of this study is one segment of the population of artists who are teaching. Before I analyze the interviews, it would be informative to present a view of the entire art-teaching profession.

The faculty of art departments in colleges, universities and professional art schools could be divided into three basic categories: the object makers who regard themselves primarily as studio artists and whose teaching is narrowly defined by their own stylistic preference; the innovative group who are making contributions to contemporary art but who also regard their teaching as unrelated to their art; and the third group of artist/teachers who see definite connections between their functions as artists and as teachers.

The object makers until quite recently were in the majority. They are usually the older faculty members, although occasionally a younger person may fit this classification. A certain percentage of this group are not producing art in any meaningful sense. Occasionally they may do a work but there is no consistency in their creative effort, and what is produced is usually a repetition of
former work or slight variations of it. The teaching of this group involves unchanging information since their knowledge of art has ceased to expand. Within this group, there is a segment that is still actively engaged in the production of art. However, they regard art as a closed system and believe that art would be subject to destruction should it become involved with economic, social and global conditions. They would be exponents of "the art for art's sake philosophy." To them making art is synonymous with making objects. These objects fit what is for them an essentially unchanging aesthetic mode, falling within the framework of formalism which developed into the major aesthetic philosophy of art between 1910 and 1960. Because their aesthetic philosophy is closed, it allows for intensive development within a relatively narrow realm. So it becomes possible to concentrate on the same problem and use the same media for long periods of time. Many such artists settle in and spend ten, twenty and perhaps thirty years working on a single problem. The more gifted may make meaningful statements within their limited area or perhaps bring innovation to that area. The less gifted fall into repetitious object making and after a while cease to produce. Generally, innovation would lessen with age and many of these artists become the stewards of their own works in their later years. It is interesting to note that so great an artist as Constantin Brancusi spent the last ten years of his life doing little more than polishing his bronzes.
For the most part, this group regards teaching as unconnected and foreign to their art. What they do teach is their own area of interest, and this constitutes their own personal niche in the history of art. Since their work is static, their thinking and teaching are, for the most part, also static. Their philosophy of teaching is a negation of teaching: artists don't teach, they produce art; and if put in a teaching situation, they are there to function as artists and occasionally give a little insight into the student's work via their own stylistic preference. Everything in their teaching situation focuses from the position of the artist as object maker. This group is working in the past on ideas which are of little interest to artists of the present. That they continue to work in the way they do is their prerogative and needs no justification. However, that they use such limited information for teaching in contemporary schools is highly questionable and could be considered incompetent. As teachers of art, they are an anachronism.

The second group of artists comprises that segment to which innovation is important. Their work has developed and changed as they have changed, and as cultural influences have altered their thinking. In this group are dedicated artists who are making contributions to current art movements. Much of the material which forms the basis of their art comes from areas outside of art. The university is a
fertile source of information for this group and they feel secure in it. For a select few in this category, the university may be essential since they are working with highly sophisticated materials and equipment which would otherwise be unavailable to them. Various engineering equipment, electronic equipment and computers fall into this category. Examples of such artists are John Roy at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, whose work involves highly technical electronics and computer science; and Robert Mallary at the same institution who is currently involved in the development of a center for the study of art and technology.

Although such artists are highly innovative in their work as artists, they usually view their teaching as unconnected with their work. This is usually because of the following reasons: in the first place, their work may be so esoteric and technical that few students would have the necessary background to comprehend what is involved. At the graduate level, their work may be of interest to some students but again because of its esoteric nature this may not be the case. Another interesting problem here involves the difference between scientific and artistic research. The research of the scientist may be of value and interest to graduate students since its findings may have broad applications. However, this may not be the case in art since the artist is involved in a much more personal way in his work, and his research may have limited application to
others. Graduate students in art are encouraged to develop a "personal statement" and in fact this may be a necessity for their degree. So they are likely to show little interest in becoming involved in another's research.

The second reason that this segment may not be interested in teaching deals with their personality. They may not enjoy working with students. They prefer to work as much as possible on their own projects; and since their research may not be suitable for general teaching, they don't have an interest in such an endeavor.

What is important about this group of artists in my study is the fact that their work involves a kind of information which is radically different from the information used by the first group. The information used by the first group is static and unchanging since their aesthetic philosophy is a closed one. The information of the second group is current, innovative and changing. Instead of making objects, they are involved with systems of information and, because of this, their work is relevant to contemporary life. As a result, I consider them to have a more meaningful relationship within the university since it is paramount that a modern university be engaged in issues that affect conditions of contemporary society.

Formalism is very important to the understanding of these three groups. It is clear that the first group, the object makers, work and teach according to the formalist aesthetic. "Art for art's sake" to them means art as a
closed system of limited formal knowledge that is not related to outside sources of information. This explains the very limited scope of their teaching.

The second group, the innovative artists, have for the most part abandoned formalism as the content of their work, although they may still use it as a structure. This group has gone to outside sources of information for the content of their work - sources such as engineering, electronics, sociology and linguistics.

As in the case of the second group, the third group - the artist/teacher - has also rejected formalism since it serves no purpose other than structure. For the artist/teacher, formalism is not the issue in art.

The dividing of teaching artists into the foregoing three categories is not meant to be a precise classification, since many artists do not fit neatly into any one category. But for the purpose of this work, such a classification serves as a clarification. It is also fair to mention that in the first group - the object makers - may be found highly dedicated teachers who consider their teaching to be important. However, because the information they teach is usually limited to specific techniques, it is not considered relevant both in terms of contemporary society and for the individual development of students.

The focus of this work is with the group of artist/teachers, those individuals who have made integral connections
between their various activities. Teaching and producing art are some of these activities. There is a distinct attitude and definite characteristics that define the artist/teacher. They are different, stand apart and possess motives, goals and values quite different from their peers. What are their special qualities?

They are, first of all, highly motivated and genuinely concerned individuals and believe they can make a meaningful contribution. They are confident that their work can make a change for the better. An important product of their art is the individual development of their students, not so much as professional artists but as exciting human beings. Because of their commitment, they themselves are exciting human beings.

Labels are avoided by this group. They don't view themselves in an isolated or fragmented manner as teachers or artists. They view themselves as human beings who are involved in a number of different but related activities. Teaching is not a conflict. It is regarded as an important and worthwhile activity for their creative energy. It is an important part of the whole. Many artists did express the conflict of time - time required for all their activities. There was also a strong concern that the bureaucratic structure of educational institutions tends to suffocate innovative and creative teaching. But aside from these concerns, their teaching is important and meaningful to them.
and provides a sustenance for their lives.

As a group, they are flexible, open to change and problem oriented in their thinking and teaching. The definition of the artist as object maker is much too narrow a definition for this group since it satisfies the needs of too few people. Their definition interprets art as a learning process involving an awareness of and a sensitivity to people, and a sharing of information with them. In their lives, these artist/teachers strive for excellence and integration - a total integration whereby their lives become one with their art. They are idealists but in a down-to-earth and practical manner.

As artists, they are committed and successful in their careers. They are not object makers but systems oriented. Their work concerns itself directly with the environment, with culture and society. It is dependent on sources of information outside the realm of traditional art. Engineering, computer technology and video are some of their sources. Certain artist/teachers have totally integrated their art and teaching and consider their teaching to be process art. They are directly passing information to their audience. Others in this category make objects and use formalism in some degree as a structure, but as in the case of the second group, the content of their work does not center on the formal properties of the object but the concept that is conveyed through these formal properties. In terms of
artistic thought, many in the artist/teacher category are very similar to the innovators, the second category. What makes them different is their attitude towards teaching. To the artist/teacher, teaching is important and integrated into his concept of art. One artist/teacher suggested that structurally he was doing the same thing when teaching and producing art. The difference was the audience. When producing art, you collect and synthesize information into an idea and present it to an audience in a gallery or museum; when teaching, you also collect and synthesize information and present an idea but in this case the audience is the class. Students then combine the ideas of the teacher with their own through a similar synthesizing process and produce their own artistic idea.

The philosophy of education of this group evolves from their philosophy of life. It is flexible, problem centered and based on the dignity and reverence for individual creative activity. Serious involvement is the goal and it is accomplished through self-directed activity.

Their teaching involves a very specific structure based on sequential learning. The sequence dictates a logical and well-developed framework. Within this framework is flexibility to allow for individual development. What is learned at the end is, for the most part, dependent upon earlier investigation.

Process is the key word - an ongoing process of investigation and growth. Individual projects are sub-
servient to the total process, and the product of the total process is the growth of the student. The emphasis is on systems of learning, not on object information. Systems involve various parts which are clearly defined and have clearly defined roles. Contemporary culture is systems oriented, and process in contemporary art moves in the direction of the system. Art defined only as object making is far too limited. In many cases, the object is regarded as a residue of the conceptual process. Subject matter and materials are also of secondary importance. What is stressed is an attitude, an orientation to the subject and materials; an attitude of excellence, exploration and questioning.

Education in art is perceived as a process of questions based on the rationale that every definition of art is of a transitory nature. One's approach should be based on personal experience. The overriding assumption is that one comes to art with a biography, with years of life experience. This information, the information of life, should provide the material for one's involvement in art. The overall objective is a confident, self-directed learner whose education in art could serve as a model for a philosophy of living based on excellence and dedication.

What are their major objectives when teaching? The overall objective is the individual learning of the...
student. To accomplish this, each student is encouraged to develop procedures for learning, methods of working and self-direction. To learn how to learn.

Each student is encouraged to develop his own personal procedures for working. A class of twenty students may have twenty different solutions to the same problem. Students are taken seriously and encouraged. A serious attitude about work and a commitment to work are basic. Excellence is an integral part of doing art - a personal excellence. A work of art is not complete until it is the best one can do at that specific time.

To accept and become comfortable with change is encouraged. Art is viewed as a process of investigation and a search for new directions. One's art education should be a process of ongoing questions, of knowing how to grow, how to define goals. All the artist/teachers felt that it was imperative that students confront themselves as soon as possible with questions such as the following: What is important to me? What is it that I want to do? These are difficult questions and should be posed with understanding and patience. But such a period of probing should also be viewed as exciting and full of potential. To avoid developing procedures for dealing with such questions is to avoid a confrontation with art and, in a larger sense, with life.

While conducting the interviews, it became clear that certain topics elicited responses that defined attitudes and a
philosophy of teaching and art. The responses concerning change, and the responses concerning craftsmanship, technique and stylistic preference, are illustrative of this point.

Basic to this study is the question of how one views art. The traditional way is to view art as object making and to limit art to that activity by employing certain techniques and craftsmanship. The view of those interviewed is that art encompassed far more than object making. For this reason, the question was posed as to what role craftsmanship, technique and stylistic preference should play.

If art is limited to object making, craftsmanship is of primary importance since qualities of craft may form the content of the work. On the other hand, if the concept or the process is what is important, craft becomes subservient and is the tool used to convey the intent. It is needed but is secondary to the content of the work. There is also the issue of stylistic convention. There is much teaching that is based on this idea and usually involves the stylistic preference of the teacher. Those interviewed consider this type of teaching to be of limited value since the individual development of the student is not stressed. It should also be noted that if craft is the primary goal of an art education, the university is far from the best place to learn craft.

Attitude towards change is another pertinent matter. Those artists who reject change teach limited information related usually to their own work. Therefore, they are not
interested in students' ideas and not involved in the growth of the student. If a student works as they do, they may get a little attention. Rejection of change in art usually implies egocentric teaching of limited scope. Such teaching is of limited value to students.

The artist/teachers in this study are open to and welcome change. Their lives revolve around change and they move from one activity to the next and connect these activities to a unified pattern of living. They therefore encourage the individual development of their students because they view art as a personal process of investigation.

Central to the thinking of these artist/teachers is the process of integration. All of them view their lives as one unified activity. This is a fundamental building block of their existence and it permeates everything they do. In a world that is alienated, where most people have little connection with their work, the integration of our lives seems a worthy goal.

They have been successful. Their work and their lives are not separate but a series of related activities. They don't look forward to weekends and vacations because they don't need to. Their enjoyment is the result of their work, and their work is not alienated from their lives. They are happy people, pleasant to be with. Working and helping others is not an infringement on their lives. It is a part of it.
The activity of art is the nucleus of their existence. Art provides the structure for their lives. It is a learning process, a process for integrating their lives.

How do they live? All of them are different because their lives allow for their individuality. This is very basic - their uniqueness; and their lives are an affirmation of their individuality. They encourage their personalities to grow by developing an environment where it will flourish.

Integration of their lives is their personal goal, and logically their teaching also stresses this. They view the visual arts in the context of all the other arts. Their teaching and art operate in a symbiotic way. They want to convey an attitude through teaching about art, an attitude about life and the quality of life. It has to do with excellence, achieving excellence in one's existence. Art is a fertile place for the development of values, a system of values for the integration of the human being. One of the artist/teachers expressed an idea about art and integration that illustrates the essence of this thought: The artist understands how to structure time beyond material existence. This is the meaning of an aesthetic. The artist of the future will provide a model for structuring time. He will help people to structure time in order to give meaning to their lives; to live aesthetically, to achieve integration.

Art integrates our lives in a humanistic way. It differs from other areas of learning in that from the
earliest contact with art one is relying on personal information. Every signature is different, and the relationship between a signature and a drawing is most basic. When one begins to make marks, there is a reflection of his individuality in those marks; an affirmation of his uniqueness in the world. To create an awareness of one's differences is to stress his humanity. Growing is developing in a personal way, and personal awareness and sensitivity pave the way for an awareness and sensitivity when dealing with others. One comes to art as a full bag, so to speak, and confronts art with information from that bag - the information from the total experience of that individual.

What is our justification for teaching art? It cannot be justified on professional terms alone. At many colleges and universities, the art departments are large and growing, yet a very small percentage of those majoring in art become professional artists. This entire work has provided a justification for studying art. To create decorative objects is far too limited a justification. On the other hand, to recognize art as a learning process that is humanistic and develops an integrated philosophy for living is to point to the real importance of that activity that we call art.
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Name: Paul Berube  
Born: 1938  

Education: Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine; Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, Rhode Island; University of Southern California, Los Angeles.  

Teaching: Allan Hancock College, Santa Maria, California; University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 

*The ceramics of Paul Berube has appeared in over fifty major exhibitions throughout the United States. Because his undergraduate work was in chemistry, his ceramics reflects this training and currently he is involved with photographic images that are developed in clay. He has also done professional field work in archaeology.*

---

Name: Donald Brigham  
Born: 1928  

Education: Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts; University of Colorado, Boulder.  

Teaching: Wayne Art School and Museum, Wayne, Indiana; University of Colorado, Boulder; Rhode Island College, Providence; Sutton High School, Massachusetts; Attleboro High School, Massachusetts.  

*Donald Brigham is an artist, educator and author. He has been a Fulbright Scholar and is currently the director of art for the Attleboro, Massachusetts, school system. His program in visual learning at Attleboro has achieved a national reputation as one of the best visual education programs in the United States.*
Name: Hanlyn Davies
Born: 1942

Education: Swansea College of Art, Swansea, Great Britain; University of Wales; Yale School of Art and Architecture, New Haven, Connecticut.

Teaching: Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut; University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont; University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Hanlyn Davies has an extensive exhibition record in the United States and Europe. He has been the recipient of numerous awards and grants, the most recent being the Fellowship in Printmaking – National Endowment for the Arts. His current work in printmaking is highly innovative and involves colour mixture as related to time and oscillation.

Name: Susan Hauptman
Born: 1947

Education: Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Teaching: University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada; Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan; University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York.

Susan Hauptman has exhibited her drawings extensively in the United States, Canada and Europe. She has exhibited in over fifty major drawing exhibitions and has been the recipient of numerous awards for her work.
Name: Jerry Kearns
Born: 1943

Education: University of New Mexico; University of California at Santa Barbara.

Teaching: University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Jerry Kearns has exhibited widely in the United States and Canada. He has been the recipient of grants such as the Rome Prize - Sculpture and the National Endowment for the Arts grant. His current works are performance oriented and involve videotape. He is very much involved in the New York avant-garde art scene and has a loft in New York City.

Name: Liisa Liedes
Born: 1935

Education: Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts; Columbia Teachers' College, New York; Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts; Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Teaching: Margaretville Central School, New York; Lunenburg Elementary School, Massachusetts; Wellesley Junior High School, Massachusetts; State University College, New Paltz, New York.

Liisa Liedes is very active as an art educator and artist. Her professional activities include lecturing, writing, professional organizations and painting. She has been the recipient of many awards for her painting and for her work in art education.
Name: Jack Masson
Born: 1935

Education: State University College of New York at Oswego.
Teaching: Workshops in ceramics at colleges, universities, schools, etc.

Jack Masson is a production potter. His studio is located in Conway, Massachusetts. He led the resurgence of the craft movement during the late 1950s and early realized the need for dedicated craftsmen to produce products of high quality. He is very successful as a production potter. Because of his interest in education, he gives workshops throughout the country.

Name: John Roy
Born: 1930

Education: Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.
Teaching: Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida; University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois; University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.

The work of John Roy has been exhibited in many of the most prominent museums in the United States, such as the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and the Brooklyn Museum, New York. His current work is highly technical and involves computer technology and engineering. The complexity of his work requires the resources of a modern university.
Name: Dale Schleappi  
Born: 1936  

Education: Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York.  
Teaching: Queens College, New York; Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York; Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri; University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts.  

Dale Schleappi was educated and worked as an industrial designer before entering art. He makes use of this background in his art. His sculpture has been widely exhibited in the United States and Europe. He has a major interest in the education of artists and has become deeply involved in such work.

Name: Philip Yenawine  
Born: 1942  

Education: Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey; Syracuse University; Syracuse, New York; Cooperstown Graduate School, Cooperstown, New York.  
Teaching: South Street Seaport Museum, New York; Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.  

Philip Yenawine is an innovative museum educator. As director of high school programs at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, he developed programs that were relevant to contemporary youth and very different from traditional museum education programs. His program at the Metropolitan was very successful and he has been an important influence in museum education.