

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9007745

**Teaching the late modern artist: From mnemonics to the
technology of Gestalt. (Volumes I and II)**

Deitcher, S. David, Ph.D.
City University of New York, 1989

Copyright ©1989 by Deitcher, S. David. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

TEACHING THE LATE MODERN ARTIST:
FROM MNEMONICS TO
THE TECHNOLOGY OF GESTALT

by

S. DAVID DEITCHER

VOLUME I

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1989

c 1989

S. David Deitcher

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

5/1/89
Date

R. Krauss
Chair of Examining Committee

4/27/89
Date

R. W. Long
Executive Officer

Sudhechlin

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Acknowledgements

Preparing this dissertation was facilitated by many individuals and organizations, a few of which I would like to single out for special thanks at this time. The generosity of the Swann Foundation for Cartoon and Caricature made possible my initial foray into the history of American Pop Art, which led to the present study. Rosalind Krauss, my advisor, encouraged me to persevere in the sometimes daunting task of tracking down an object and forging a methodology that both would be efficacious in an investigation of the contradictory character of late modernist art. I am also grateful to Linda Nochlin, my second reader, not just for the warmth and enthusiasm which have always made working with her a special pleasure, but for her remarkable attention to detail, and vigilance regarding the twin hazards of essentialist logic and rhetorical excess.

The generosity, hospitality and friendship of Roy Lichtenstein and Olivia Motch, his curator and administrative assistant at the time, ensured not only abundant information and insights, but many enjoyable hours spent with stimulating company. I am grateful to Rachel Sherman, widow of Hoyt L. Sherman, who greeted me at the home her late husband designed and built during the 1940s,

who provided me with access to his private papers, and drove me all over Columbus as if I were a welcome friend rather than an intruder. Likewise, Sidney Chafetz ensured that my visit to Columbus would be a happy and beneficial one. Corresponding with Robert Lepper and having the privilege of visiting him in Pittsburgh late last year, helped me to untangle the history of the influential curriculum that developed at "Carnegie Tech" between the 1930s and the early 1950s, while disabusing me of the preconceived ideas that I shared with other colleagues concerning the progression of American art and design instruction during that crucial period.

I have relied upon many people at several institutions for archival material, too many over too long a period of time to keep track of. But without the assistance of archivists at the Leo Castelli Gallery in New York, at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh, and at Ohio State University in Columbus; and without the frequent help of the librarians in the New York Public Library and the Boston Public Library, this investigation would not have been possible.

Finally, I want to express my heartfelt thanks to the friends who have put up with me during these last five years: to Clay Guthrie, who was there from the start, and

always reminded me about my proper goals and capacities; to the late Rene Santos, whose lucidity and enthusiasm for art, philosophy and theory helped me to grasp the significance for this study of Husserlian phenomenology and its Derridean critique; and finally, to the late Bill Olander, my dear friend, to whom I dedicate this work, for the combination of encouragement, well timed outbursts of impatience, and sheer courage in the face of adversity; his example will remain a source of inspiration to me and many others.

S.D.D.

April 7, 1989
New York, N.Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME I

Acknowledgements		iv
Table of Contents		vii
List of Illustrations		viii
Introduction		1
Chapter I	The Handmade Readymade	52
Chapter II	Engineering Artistic Presence	73
Chapter III	For the Relief of Toil	143
Chapter IV	A Memory for Tradition	220
Chapter V	Art for the Millions	284
Conclusion		367
	VOLUME II	
Notes		380
Figures		467
Bibliography		544

List of Illustrations

1. Roy Lichtenstein, Portrait of Madame Cézanne (1962), magna on canvas, 68" X 56".
2. Roy Lichtenstein, Man with Folded Arms (1962), oil on canvas, 70" X 48".
3. Roy Lichtenstein, The Kiss (1962), oil on canvas, 40" X 70".
4. Thomas Hart Benton, diagram from "Mechanics of Form Organization" (1926).
5. Jackson Pollock, Mural (1943), oil on canvas, 7'11 3/4" X 19'9 1/2".
6. Erle Loran, pages 46-47 in Cézanne's Composition (1947).
7. Andy Warhol, Dance Diagram - Fox Trot (1961), acrylic on canvas, 72" X 54".
8. Andy Warhol, Dance Diagram - Tango (1962) acrylic on canvas, 72" X 54".
9. The second flash lab seen from the front, Ohio State University, c. 1949.
10. The first flash lab seen from the rear, Ohio State University, c. 1942-4.
11. The first flash lab seen from the front, c. 1942-4.
12. The "bridge" showing phonograph and other equipment.
13. Slide slide storage unit on bridge of second flash lab.
14. Hoyt Sherman on bridge with projector, phonograph, and records, c. 1949.
15. Diagram of equipment for flash lab from Sherman's Drawing by Seeing.
16. Choice of projection screens in second flash lab.
17. Hoyt Sherman, slides emphasizing position, c. 1947.
18. Hoyt Sherman, slides emphasizing size, c. 1947.
19. Hoyt Sherman, slides emphasizing size and background, c. 1947.
20. Hoyt Sherman, slides emphasizing brightness, c. 1947.
21. Hoyt Sherman, slides showing further problems in brightness, c. 1947.
22. Hoyt Sherman, slides used for floor projection, c. 1947.
23. Hoyt Sherman, slides emphasizing central vision and detail, c. 1947.
24. Hoyt Sherman, slides used for flanking screens, c. 1947.
25. Arrangement of flanking screens in first flash lab, c. 1942-3.
26. Sherman and an arrangement of objects to be drawn.
- 26a. Ohio State Monthly (October 1929) cover design by Hoyt Sherman and Thomas E. French.
27. Entrance to the Visual Demonstration Center, Ohio State University, c. 1949.

28. "Pictorial Art Section" of the Visual Demonstration Center, c. 1949.
29. View down corridor of Visual Demonstration Center, (with forced perspective), c. 1949.
30. Exterior of visual demonstrations showing chin rests for proper positioning of subjects, c. 1949
31. The "leaf room" demonstration, Visual Demonstration Center, Ohio State University, c. 1949.
32. Hoyt Sherman (l) and Glenn Fry (r) inside "distorting room" demonstration, photographed from random point of view, c. 1949.
33. Sherman and Fry inside "distorting room" demonstration, photographed from correct point of view, c. 1949.
34. Visitors to "distorting room" demonstration, c. 1949.
35. William Dyce, plate X from The Drawing Book of the Government School of Design (1842).
36. William Dyce, plate XI from The Drawing Book of the Government School of Design (1842).
37. William Dyce, plate XLVII from The Drawing Book of the Government School of Design (1842).
38. William Dyce, plate XLVIII from The Drawing Book of the Government School of Design (1842).
39. Walter Smith, plate 1 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions and Original Designs for Public Schools, Drawing Classes, and Schools of Art in America (1872).
40. Walter Smith, plate 2 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
41. Walter Smith, plate 3 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
42. Walter Smith, plate 4 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
43. Walter Smith, plate 8 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
44. Walter Smith, plate 16 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
45. Walter Smith, plate 175 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
46. Walter Smith, plate 50 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
47. Walter Smith, plate 21 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
48. Walter Smith, plate 37 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
49. Walter Smith, plate 41 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
50. Walter Smith, plate 166 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
51. Walter Smith, plate 184 from The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions (1872).
52. Ford Madox Brown, Work (1852-65), oil on canvas, 26 1/2" X 38 5/8".

- showing furniture and fabrics made by WPA artisans.
54. Gyorgy Kepes, Responsibility (1938) gouache, airbrush on paperboard, 20" X 15".
 55. Adolphe Mouron Cassandre, Integration (1937), gouache and scratchwork on prepared paper, 15 9/16 X 12 13/16".
 56. Herbert Bayer, Ugly Duckling of the Office (1939), paper collage, ink, pencil, gouache, and photomechanical reproductions on paperboard, 20 1/16" X 15 1/16".
 57. Man Ray, Can Paperboard Stop a Shell? (1942) gelatin silver print with collage on paper, 16 15/16" X 14 1/16".
 58. Fernand Leger, France Reborn (1945) watercolor, gouache and pencil on paper, 26 1/16" X 21 7/8".
 59. Herbert Bayer, "The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, and love of soft living and the get-rich-quick theory of life." -- Theodore Roosevelt, letter to S. Stanwood Menken, January 10, 1917. (1959) photomontage, paper collage, watercolor and gouache on paperboard, 16 1/16" X 13 3/8".
 60. "Department Stores Popularize Art," Life, January 3, 1944, p. 46.
 61. "Department Stores Popularize Art," Life, January 3, 1944, p. 45.
 62. George Hoyningen-Huene, photograph for Harper's Bazaar, April 1944.
 63. George Hoyningen-Huene, photograph for Harper's Bazaar, April 1944.
 64. Art News, August 1945, p. 22.
 65. Roy Lichtenstein exhibition, Castelli Gallery, February 10-March 3, 1962.
 66. Roy Lichtenstein, Varoom (1963) magna on canvas, 56" X 56".
 67. Roy Lichtenstein exhibition, Castelli Gallery, February 10-March 3, 1962.
 68. Roy Lichtenstein, The Engagement Ring (1962), oil on canvas, 67 3/4" X 79 1/2".
 69. Panel from Martin Branner's comic strip, Winnie Winkle.
 70. James Rosenquist, Early in the Morning (1963), oil on canvas with plastic, 95" X 56".
 71. James Rosenquist, The Lines Were Deeply Etched in Her Face (1961), oil on canvas, 66" X 78".
 72. Andy Warhol exhibition, Ferus Gallery, Los Angeles, August 1962.
 73. Andy Warhol exhibition, Stable Gallery, New York, 1964.
 74. Andy Warhol exhibition, Stable Gallery, New York, 1964.
 75. Louis Dorfsman, art director, Sol Mednick, photographer, "Busy Market..." ad for CBS Records, reproduced in Art News, Summer 1954, p. 45.
 76. Andy Warhol, cover for Interiors, reproduced in Art News, Summer 1954, p. 49.

Introduction

There may be no better way to introduce this dissertation than briefly to recall its prehistory. It is not just that what began as one thing became quite another -- which it did -- but that the topic, method, and examples I use emerged at the point when the initial idea led to methodological problems that were serious enough to require rethinking the entire project. The fact that this took place in an atmosphere of often contentious debate among art historians concerning their most fundamental goals and methods may help to explain how a dissertation which began with a conventional-enough art-historical plan could be completed only by straying very far afield.

My work began as a Roy Lichtenstein monograph. From the start I intended to represent the erosion of the largely formalist terms in which modernist art was understood in the United States in the postwar era. Lichtenstein's art was to be the medium through which I would describe that dissolution. This depended upon a contradiction: Pop Art seemed to challenge the privileged terms of pictorial modernism -- purity, originality, invention, uniqueness and creative autonomy -- not unlike Dadaism, whose appropriational method Lichtenstein and his colleagues adapted. But Pop distinguished itself from Dada in part

because its variation upon the Dadaist gesture functioned, not to eliminate, but to rescue a vestige of the modernist project: its way of staging ontological difference in the face of a broader experiential equivalence. So small yet significant was the measure of the aesthetic difference between popular images and Lichtenstein's representations of them that his "handmade readymades" could turn a late-twentieth-century estrangement from Western humanist culture into the artist's central motif. Surely an art which could in this way reconcile modernist aestheticism with an historical avant-gardist procedure embodied the definitive strategy for salvaging such conciliatory art.¹

Reconciliation can come at considerable cost. From the vantage point of the early 1980s it seemed that by rescuing "high" cultural experience in such an accommodation with the "low" Pop joined with other, older and more diverse institutional forces in the United States which had introduced masses of Americans to pictorial culture since well before World War II. By the time Pop emerged, however, art had undergone a profound alteration such as few avant-gardists and even fewer advocates of postwar cultural humanism could have predicted, and none desired. Pictorial art of all kinds had become part of the flourishing industry of arts and leisure.²

That I should deal in such sweeping historical claims as the demise of modernism was less a sign of an innate iconoclasm than it was indicative of the fact that my work on this dissertation began at a time when modernism in virtually all its manifestations was being declared a thing of the past. Even the quarrelsome debate among art historians reflected the unravelling of their fundamentally modernist historical method and its underlying system of belief. Moreover, a new generation of American artists -- Cindy Sherman, Richard Prince, and Sherrie Levine, among others -- were then becoming known for works that seemed predicated upon the obsolescence of the modernist system of aesthetic value. For example, Sherman and Prince confronted the spectator with works whose difference from mass-media imagery and material procedures seemed negligible, and Levine's appropriations from the masters of modern photography were devoid of the urgency and engagement that informed the latter's projects. Instead, an air of ambivalent retrospectivity characterized works of art that were emptied of every conventional measure of modernist value. It seemed then that this art neutralized just about everything that was indispensable to the postwar modern tradition. And, to me, it seemed that these artists were licensed to do so in part because Pop artists like Lichtenstein and Warhol had prepared the way for them.

But just how was it possible to address the demise of modernism in a critical analysis of a living, thriving modernist's work? If modernism was so afflicted, it would be hard to show precisely how in the quasi-formalist terms that a monograph dictates. Moreover, that form tends to reinforce conventional modernist assumptions regarding the centrality, coherence and relative autonomy of the artist, thereby contradicting any claims about the negation of such crucial terms in an immanent postmodernism. There was also the problem of how to define modernism historically. If the dissertation presupposed the end of modernism, it would be necessary to define the latter in a larger sense than was evident, for example, in the dominant formalist view which applied to the Anglo-American critical discourse on art since before World War II.

The matter of Lichtenstein's aesthetic education initially suggested a way out of this bind. His art training called attention to itself, having been noted frequently in books, articles, and interviews. From earliest success, Lichtenstein was always eager to acknowledge his indebtedness to Hoyt Sherman, his art teacher before and after the war at Ohio State University.³ Late in 1942 Sherman realized a method of teaching the fundamentals of drawing in a course that emphasized "unified perception": a combined perceptual acuity, manual dexterity and sheer

organizational power, all driven by a singularly aggressive will-to-form. He taught "beginning drawing" using a "flash" technique in a darkened studio. The students drew from afterimages of largely abstract designs that Sherman projected in pulses of light onto screens in the front of the specially designed classroom, which he referred to as the "flash lab." The students drew in the dark between these pulses, encouraged to be aware of the wholeness of the image, to grasp the field of vision as a Gestalt, and to let their bodies feel a sense of fluid, coherent organization, as if in the total absence of articulated thought. Sherman conceived his course for students in all fields of study, believing that the perceptual and organizational skills that were good for art were good for every other kind of productive living as well. During the first year of the American involvement in World War II, he taught his course for several weeks to gunnery recruits at Fort Meyers, Florida, believing it would help them more effectively to blast the enemy from sea and sky.

Even a vague familiarity with the history of modern art instruction is sufficient to recognize in Sherman's course certain themes, ideals, and strategies which had informed fine and applied art instruction at various points and in different combinations during the preceding century. As was fitting for an ambitious American pedagogy whose author

intended to extend, and thereby to improve upon a venerable European modernist tradition, Sherman's course assumed novel positions in relation to many of the latter's pedagogical formulations. Nor was this limited to the taste which some Bauhaus instructors had for Gestalt theory. Because the "flash" technique entailed drawing from an afterimage, it also recalled the mid-nineteenth-century French vogue for teaching drawing from memory. The notion that one should and could teach all students the fundamentals of "form organization" went beyond the regional source in the ideas of John Dewey to recall the utilitarian and reformist traditions in the history of nineteenth-century general education. In this context it is not surprising that Sherman's instruction of gunnery recruits and his design for the flash lab bring to mind a notion which Michel Foucault advanced in Discipline and Punish concerning the commonality of the disciplinary logic which informed both general education and military training techniques during the early years of the Industrial Revolution. As in the case of Joseph Lancaster's "monitorial" system, techniques were evolved so that self-discipline could be instilled in ever larger numbers of students; in the case of Lancaster's pedagogical program, by monitors appointed from among the students' own ranks. Foucault argued that such techniques helped to displace an earlier absolutist concept of power imposed from above with a superego of sorts: an internalized

power relation that was far better suited to the goals of industrial production in an era of increased democratization. In Foucault's words, such training produces "docile bodies."⁴

As an institutionalized practice, art instruction is a specialized embodiment of the processes that contribute to the construction of social subjects. A pedagogy of art may be just a codified formula for realizing whatever the cultural consensus may be at a given time regarding the character of aesthetic value in fine art, and therefore it exists in a relation to older aesthetic traditions. But fine art can also be understood as an attempt to come to terms on an imaginary level with the limited satisfactions, abundant frustrations, structural transformations, and the attendant stresses and contradictions of everyday modern life, all the while sustaining cultural myths and ideals. Inevitably, modern art instruction is affected by and, in a limited sense, affects, the broader spheres of commercial and industrial production, whether it defines itself in opposition to them, or attempts in some way to fuse with and reform them. The character and the limits of art instruction are also affected by the perceived goals of general education, since it too is shaped by government policies regarding the degree to which basic literacy, manual skills, or a broader "cultivation" is to be the common prerogative

of some or of all social classes. Pedagogies of art can therefore share with general education fundamental concepts of what is required for the humane and complete development of the individual. Art instruction, and the kind of social subject the artist is supposed to be, determine each other, whether as Wordsworth's poetic exception to the rule of commonplace behavior -- as bohemian outcast -- or as Hoyt Sherman's model of unified productivity. Like general education, art instruction is a point of intersection where the social, political, and cultural issues which inform individual and collective life at a particular historical juncture become detectable in definable discursive terms.

By disclosing the ideas, values, and philosophical presuppositions that informed a pedagogy like Sherman's, and by examining their historical meaning in the context of a theory of modern art instruction, it might be possible to describe historically just what was at stake in the imaginary spaces of 1960s art like Roy Lichtenstein's. That is, through such an historical account of the education of the late modern artist it will become possible to move beyond the conventional account of how this art negated Abstract Expressionist and "humanist" aesthetic experience, leaving as its principal legacy what critics both on the Left and the Right have been entirely satisfied to identify as cynicism. In this dissertation, Lichtenstein's art

therefore continues to play a significant part as a self-acknowledged realization of a significant pedagogical development within American history before and after World War II. However, one additional change had to take place in my thinking about the goals of this dissertation. It seemed to me that the conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures which informed Hoyt Sherman's course of instruction underlay more than just his pedagogy and Roy Lichtenstein's later artistic practice. To begin with, virtually all American Pop art betrays the same structural dynamic: Pop artists aestheticized commodities while they commodified aesthetics. Furthermore, looking back over the artistic education of Andy Warhol and James Rosenquest, for example, reveals that they too were trained as artists in the broadest sense of that term: as individuals whose varied apprenticeships prepared them to function optimally whether as fine or applied artists. Something rather striking had occurred between the formation of the WPA and the end of World War II in the art departments of large American university campuses -- in the case of these artists, at Carnegie Tech and the University of Minnesota, respectively. During this period the education of the artist and the designer came into unusually close proximity with one another. As a response to a variety of economic, social and political pressures which first were exerted by the Depression and then by the war, traditional hierarchies

between these categories of experience were eroded in significant ways. Into circumstances that were distinct from the ones which obtained in Europe after World War I, and which gave rise to the utopian high modernist transformation of art and design, a late modern American manifestation of such transformation appeared. The fusion of industrial and aesthetic considerations in which it consisted at the pedagogical level before and after World War II would prepare a generation of American artists to negotiate a singular path between such structures to fashion Pop Art roughly a decade later.

It is, then, in the theater of pedagogical history that the drama of late modernism is first enacted according to the social scenario that its theory comprises. In attempting to describe this late modern formation, the problem then becomes: how does one arrive at the such a theory of modern art instruction?

To date, no general theory of modern art instruction exists. That is not to say that attempts at theorization have not been attempted; only that the results have been partial. Especially since the late 1960s increasing numbers of art historians have investigated the field of modern art

instruction. As befits a neglected field, most of these studies are straightforward chronicles. For decades there existed variously sketchy or scholarly studies of art instruction, often written for art educators by historians of education. There were a few art historical surveys, like Niklaus Pevsner's Academies of Art Past and Present (1940), in which the pedagogical field is represented as a sweeping, if not entirely homogeneous academic tradition. But since the 1960s, pedagogical investigations have generally paralleled in their increased specialization a division of art historical labor which coincides with the growth of the art market, as well as the humanities. An exception to this rule, Stuart Macdonald's The History and Philosophy of Art Education (1970) is a misleadingly titled attempt to trace the intricate development of art and design instruction, primarily in Great Britain. The value of Macdonald's book primarily resides in the way it brings together more than one pedagogical category, including fine art instruction, art instruction for industrial design purposes, for the instruction of artisans, school teachers, and children, thus suggesting the heterogeneity and the complexity of the factors which inform art instruction from the beginning of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, theorization is subordinated in Macdonald's book, which functions more as a straightforward chronicle.

There are always more monographic treatments of figures who, like Matisse, Kandinsky, Rodchenko, Klee, Moholy-Nagy, André Lhote, van Doesberg, Hans Hofmann, and Albers, among others, contributed so prominently to the pedagogy of modern art; but pedagogical material remains peripheral to the goals of most monographs. On the other hand, primary material, like manifestos and other theoretical statements have been translated and reprinted more often. Studies of individual art schools have also appeared, like Hans Wingler's Das Bauhaus (1962, the monumental English language edition of which was published in 1969), Martin Duberman's Black Mountain College: an Exploration in Community (1972), or the more recent study by Mary Emma Harris, The Arts at Black Mountain College (1987). Although each of these books contains a more or less thorough examination of the curriculum, of "foundation" courses, and variously authoritative or speculative patterns of influence, attempts at theorization remain localized.

Because art historians' increased involvement with art instruction dates from the late 1960s, and because that time coincided with the art historical challenge to the (formalist) modern teleology which dominated the field after World War II, it is not surprising that a revisionist agenda informs some recent work on art instruction. Nowhere is this more prevalent than in Albert Boime's many investigations of

nineteenth-century art teaching. By taking a brief look at two of Boime's studies -- The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century (1971), and "The Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France" (1977) -- the character of this revision becomes evident and, more important for our purposes here, so too the limitations of the traditional methods of art historical inquiry to move towards a theorization of the modern pedagogical field.

Boime's book was a pioneering attempt to illuminate the administrative and pedagogical structure of the Académie des Beaux-Arts in the nineteenth century and to relate it to developments within French painting during the same period. As such, it was an attempt to right a historiographical wrong: the neglect of the Académie by many art historians, and its reduction to a modernist cliché by others. Focusing on the history of this dominant teaching institution, Boime described in considerable detail the limits and the character of academic instruction and policy, and the relation of the latter to official and independent contemporary pictorial tastes. Basing his work on an impressive familiarity with the contents of academic and administrative archives, and with contemporary art criticism, he disclosed the shifting character of the relationship between administrative demands and pedagogical structures, between political power and administrative

structures, contemporary taste and institutional response, thereby correcting the misimpression that the academy remained static, moribund, and monolithic in the face of sweeping historical and cultural change. The focus of his research upon a relatively homogeneous class of archival material, all of which centered on the figure of the principal institutionalized path to artistic success in mid-nineteenth century France, made it possible for Boime to argue that the administrative and pedagogical structures of the academy were largely continuous with previous and subsequent traditions. From the outset of his study, Boime sounded the theme of continuity --a leitmotif, if not a historical principle -- to argue that "progressive art in the nineteenth century" was significantly anchored within the Ecole's pedagogical traditions.⁵ Boime's preference for the term "progressive" should not obscure the brand of historicism at work here, evident in his use of the former term to denote works by Manet, Morrisot, Monet, Renoir, Seurat, and others whom one might also call modernists.

Boime insisted that the rise of a romantic taste for "originality" -- for spontaneity, the principal sign of which was the artist's impetuous gesture -- paralleled and indeed was made possible by an academic precedent: the existence within Ecole procedures of the "generative" and the "executive" stages of aesthetic production. Whereas in

the Davidian era academicians privileged the "executive" phase over the "generative," by the 1820s -- and especially after 1830 -- a greater appreciation for the generative phase evolved inside academic circles. Coincident with the rise of this "sketch aesthetic" was a taste for the "minor" genres, principally landscape. Boime chronicled the continuing importance of the Ecole within French artistic life and, as proof, compared "generative" works (oil sketches) by those who taught in the ateliers (ie. Gleyre, Couture, Bougereau) with completed paintings by artists who had once studied with them. Finding nothing but affinities between them, he likened Charles Gleyre's Queen of Sheba, for example, to Claude Monet's Quatorze juillet, rue Montorgueil. Significantly, he accomplished this by isolating the issue of paint application while overlooking every other representational concern.⁶ That this occurs in a study whose author claims to liberate his readers from the "hegemonic embrace of the Museum of Modern Art" -- with having "struck at the ideological roots of the myth" of a triumphant formalist vanguard -- is only one of the more striking paradoxes to compromise the value of this book.⁷ My goal here, however, is not to uncover the signs of ideological negligence in the revisionist wave that has swept art history since the late-1960s so much as it is to reveal the inadequacy of the conventional art historical methodology to lead to a theory of modern art instruction.⁸

Boime's theory seems predicated upon a partial, not so say impoverished, conception of modernism. Little more than style, it consists of a taste for the minor genres and for the "original" gesture of the artist. Consider any one of Manet's epochal works: the Olympia, for example. Can its canonical modernist status be accounted for in terms of its spontaneity, or its classifiability among the minor genres? While there is no denying that traditional academic values and hierarchies figure in the conception of this work, precisely in what way cannot be reduced to a matter of influence. On the contrary, it is because Manet's representation of a contemporary prostitute had the scale, format and theme of an academic painting that the Olympia could acquire so much of its subversive potential.

Six years later, in "The Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France," Boime presented a more complex view of modernism. This article described the impact on the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, not just of discontent among independents, emergent modernist painters and their supporters, but of French concern with potential competition (principally British) in the lucrative and prestigious industrial arts trade. With a wide variety of archival evidence Boime showed how, from the second third of the nineteenth century, the more competitive international

marketplace for industrial arts products, the growing metropolitan consumer culture, and new patterns of bourgeois consumption, were making it imperative for the Ecole to become more responsive to advancing French cultural and productive life. Boime documented the concerns of legislators, architects, entrepreneurs, and others who faulted the self-protective administrative policies and inefficient pedagogies of the Ecole, and ultimately forced upon the latter an unprecedented attentiveness to technical skill, and a greater openness to abbreviated drawing techniques. Furthermore, some advocates of academic reform recommended that the technical skill, discipline, and patience associated with rudimentary draughtsmanship would be valuable to the working classes; similarly, they regarded the cultivation associated with instruction in history and aesthetic traditions beneficial to the bourgeois public. In this way the roots of the later nineteenth-century implementation of rudimentary drawing instruction within French general education can be traced to the requirements of earlier industrial development and heightened international competition as early as during the July Monarchy.⁹

The "modernism" which materializes from this discussion is still concerned with terms like "originality," but the latter is now situated in a broader historical context,

embedded as it is within the matrix of cultural responses to industrialization. Insofar as Boime's topic extends beyond the discourse on fine art instruction to embrace design, architecture, industrial production, general education, social reform and philosophy, it shows the diversity of factors that contributed to the discourse on general education in the mid-nineteenth century, and to the formation of an explicitly modern pedagogy of art. In this study one theme predominates: the union of the arts, of art with industry, and, as Boime also put it in a suggestive leap, the reunification "of art with everyday life."¹⁰ By correctly identifying this theme with modernism, he is able, once again, to connect the latter to the history of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. As a central theme and ideal throughout modernist cultural history the union of the arts, and of art with life, was extensively diversified at different moments for over a century. While a combination of idealism and pragmatism informed the attempts of Bauhaus instructors to unite the fine and applied arts, this situation differed significantly from the transformation of art into a component part of everyday life that was the aim of the Dadaists' transgressive strategies. And neither the former variation on the theme of synthesis nor the latter can be likened with the effective colonization of art by an expanding consumer culture that would surface prior to the middle of the twentieth century in the United States.

What is impressive about Boime's essay is the appreciation it gives the reader for the sheer diversity of the discursive factors which contributed to the formation of modern art instruction, and the dynamic relations obtaining between them. This is apparent in the mass of historical documentation he brings to light. However, still driven by a revisionist impulse, his essay seems so focused on the rehabilitation of the Ecole's prestige, that his ability to theorize modern art instruction, beyond the relations he documents, is severely limited. It is only a slight exaggeration to say that if one were to connect Boime's two studies of the Académie end to end, modernism would appear as the product of a decidedly turbulent yet, in every other sense, continuous tradition of aesthetic instruction that extends from the sixteenth century "corporations" to the rehabilitation of academic teaching methods among present day practitioners of what Boime has called the "sorely needed figurative revival" -- continuous, that is, but for a brief period of "hegemonic" eclipse during the period between the end of World War II and the art historical revision of the later 1960s.

Michel Foucault has systematically described and

challenged the character and the effects of such histories. To be sure, he did not address revisionist art history which, postdating his critique by several years, would surely have struck him as only a slightly more refined version of what he intended to challenge. Instead, when he initiated his project at the beginning of the 1960s, he targeted "history" as it was practiced in the university. Foucault has referred to the latter as "total history," by which he alluded to the way its practitioners aimed to retrieve their historical objects from oblivion, as if they were slices from a past which could be restored in all the detail, and with all the archival fullness-of-being to which modern research and analysis aspires. For the "total" historian, discontinuities and contradictions are blank spots "between two positive figures that (have) to be subjected to analysis."¹¹ As Boime's project demonstrated, traditional (art) historians tend to smooth over signs of rupture from the field of history. Such signs of discontinuity are seen as signaling the specialist's failure at the level of research or analysis, and the historian resorts to smoothing over the gaps, or to establishing correspondences between heterogeneous yet contemporary practices because "they all occurred within a given spatio-temporal moment that dominated the 'face' of the times."¹² There is reason to think of such "total" or "continuous" history as "modern." It presumes the value and practicability of seemingly limitless progress

through empirical research, and the ability to deploy scientific techniques to retrieve with certainty what is certainly lost. The author of such histories also shares an essential philosophical project with the modernist artist: to provide evidence of, and shelter for, the sovereign subject of humanist culture.

Continuous history is the indispensable correlative of the founding function of the subject: the guarantee that everything that has eluded him may be restored to him; the certainty that time will disperse nothing without restoring it in a reconstituted unity; the promise that one day the subject -- in the form of historical consciousness -- will once again be able to appropriate, to being back under his sway, all those things that are kept at a distance by difference, and find in them what might be called his abode.¹³

As if in response to this transcendental component within modern history, Foucault developed his alternative practice "to free history from the grip of phenomenology."¹⁴ As opposed to the comforting prospects of origins and eternal returns, and the soothing telegologies that join them together to the subject, Foucault demonstrated the potential of a "general" history, or "archaeology," which is predicated upon the value of casting historical difference into sharp relief. For the Foucaultian archaeologist, discontinuity -- "stigma of temporal dislocation that it was the historian's task to remove from history" -- takes on a special constitutive role as a positive element in an analysis which pursues the limits of historical possibility,

specifically, through the examination of discourses.¹⁵

Foucault's archaeologist resists the total historian's inclination to organize historical material in accord with a singular guiding principle: a progressive world view, a singular meaning, or a consciousness. Instead he or she suspends the statement in what Foucault called the archival "space of a dispersion."¹⁶ The archaeologist attempts to deploy the unsteady "space of a dispersion" in contrast to what one might call the historian's two-point perspective -- the way in which, through the agency of a reciprocal relation between historians and their material, the illusion of historical continuity is maintained. So too is the potential for a proprietorial attitude toward historical and cultural legacies, most notably, humanism. The archaeologist seeks out only those regularities which govern the inherent mutability of discursive formation and transformation. In contrast to the methodology of modern art history, which was modeled to remain attentive to the "evolution" of traditions, the development of "oeuvres," or the genealogy of "influence," the archaeologist avoids these categories altogether, recognizing that they all "diversify the theme of continuity."¹⁷ Instead, archaeological description tries to detect the "formation of concepts, the modes of succession, connexion, and coexistence of statements."¹⁸ Its goal is to describe the materialization

of themes, ideals, and strategies, and to disclose the regularities which govern them in a given discourse. Such a method is especially well-suited to theorize a discursive entity like modern art instruction, for only when one can describe the relations of coexistence within the constituent elements of a discourse can one move towards a theory of that discourse.

One might say, then, that a discursive formation is defined (as far as its objects are concerned, at least) if one can establish such a group; if one can show how any particular object of discourse finds in it its place and law of emergence; if one can show that it may give birth simultaneously or successively to mutually exclusive objects, without modifying itself.

-- Michel Foucault 19

A discourse -- "a fragment of history, a unity and discontinuity in history itself" -- is comprised of a sequence of signs, or a group of verbal performances, or "statements," which are bound together into "discursive formations" by constitutive and normative relations which must be defined.²⁰ Akin to a primary unit of discourse, the statement, in Foucault's sense of this term, is a "repeatable materiality" whose meaning is discernable in its interrelations with other statements. Of primary importance are those questions concerning the conditions that make this

statement (and not another one) possible: what are its conditions of emergence? How can one describe its relation to prior and subsequent statements? How is it bound together with a group of other statements to comprise a discursive formation?

One of the most decisive characteristics which sets a modern discourse on art instruction apart from a traditional one is the dynamic tension that surfaced in the second third of the nineteenth century between utilitarian and aesthetic conceptions and goals. The friction created by this polarity remained central to the formation of new modes of art instruction from the second half of the nineteenth century through the first half of the twentieth. Every new pedagogy negotiated between these terms and others which, in their constructed antagonism, are logically connected to them. It is not difficult to see how this pair of terms -- utilitarian/aesthetic -- opens onto the more familiar pairs: copy/original; reproducible/unique; doing/being. The reader may well object that traditional or "classical" pedagogies of art have also, at least since the Renaissance, differentiated rigorously between fine art instruction and applied art instruction. And while this observation has the ring of truth, it totally misses the point being made here. The classical separation between these categories was marked by discretion, not tension; and as a motivating factor in

the production of new pedagogies, it can be said to have remained inert. The classical separation between a fine art that appealed and answered to a philosophical standard, and applied or "mechanical" arts that responded principally to utilitarian considerations, was not marked by the contentious dynamic which culminated in the teachings of Russian Constructivists and the Bauhaus. Within the context of an expanding industrialization and democratization, the power of the disparity between utility and aesthetics drives the discourse forward, as if in search of an elusive resolution.²¹

While it has been a commonplace of art history to assume unreflexively that "practical" (or "mechanical") drawing and its instruction should in every significant way be kept separate from a consideration of fine art drawing and its instruction, this apparently innocent assumption has an ancillary effect: it advances the illusion of a continuous aesthetic tradition. In light of the dynamic character of discursive formation and transformation, it should be obvious that the separation of these categories can only be maintained at considerable risk to any attempt to theorize the historical field of modern art instruction. The archaeological method suggests a way to mediate between these classes without jeopardizing their differences or losing the potential for extracting historical meaning from

them. By introducing a concept -- for example, the historical conception of memory in nineteenth-century Western Europe -- and by showing how it materialized as a significant theme, a strategy, and an object of contention within a variety of pedagogical and critical practices, the complex, productive interrelation between "practical" and "aesthetic" modes of drawing instruction can emerge.

Memory is one of the more important concepts to assume functional prominence within the early discourse on modern drawing and its instruction. By the middle of the nineteenth century, memory became more than a theme, it spawned variations and gave rise to a strategy for aesthetic production which opened onto another pair of antagonistic terms: voluntary and involuntary memory. These clearly parallel the split between utility and aesthetics, copies and originals, materiality and metaphysics. Memory work -- learning by rote -- was an essential tool of general education, such as it was, in Great Britain from the late eighteenth century. When considered in this context memory takes on its broader social significance as an object of debate in nineteenth and twentieth-century cultural life. Memory will be seen as an object which was diversified early in the nineteenth century within overlapping pedagogical, artistic and literary discourses. In this study it serves as a thematic thread that weaves through such discourses,

connecting, for example, art instruction and general education, and permitting one to identify what kind of social subject each category of teaching presupposes. It is well known that throughout the nineteenth century, there were attempts to restructure and reform British schooling so that it would provide middle-class children with an education appropriate to a "career open to talent." Attempts to educate the poor were also evident in various forms from the late eighteenth century on. But the "charity-school" movement, the "Sunday school" movement, or the system of "endowed" schools effectively limited instruction to teaching obedience and rudimentary literacy skills to a small proportion of the nation's poor children. The development of popular education for the poor was hindered from the start on a number of fronts: because of upper and middle-class anxiety -- heightened in England during the 1790s by the Terror in France -- at the thought of the rabble being educated only to demonstrate more discontent; because of upper middle-class factory owners' resistance to public instruction, as dictated by Reform Acts like that of 1832; or because of jurisdictional disputes between non-sectarians like the members of the Lancaster Society and the Church of England. The fragmented primary and secondary educational system, then largely limited to instruction in the "three R's," relied throughout upon memorization. As a consequence, learning by rote became a favorite target of

criticism among reformers from the early nineteenth-century Owenites to later Pestalozzians like David Stowe and James Wood, or Romantics like Mathew Arnold and John Ruskin.²²

In the curricula of the British design and "normal" schools that assumed their mature forms towards the middle of the century, memorization functioned as it did in general education: as a blunt pedagogical instrument. The British National Course of Drawing Instruction (1852) was predicated upon a belief in the value of teaching designers, artisans, school teachers and, through the latter, children, a narrow repertory of highly codified, first geometric, and then largely classical or vaguely classicizing forms. Drawing these forms, as precisely as possible, from memory was considered a way to improve the retentive powers, discipline, and patience of design students and artisans, helping such workers to draw, or simply read and follow plans for the production of architectural and design elements or consumer goods. Similarly it was hoped that such methods would prepare designers to invent new combinations of the standardized ornamental forms then considered appropriate for new designs. While a memory for "useful" information and draughtsmanly conventions informed the utilitarian agenda of the British National Course of Instruction, it also provided John Ruskin (and other social reformers) with a perfect foil for evolving a more

enlightened, reformist understanding of the goals and methods of art and design instruction. Ruskin deplored the narrowly utilitarian logic of the National Design School curriculum, and singled out for ridicule its determined separation of "practical" instructions, learnt by heart, from a properly aesthetic education. In his view, true education should consist of studying the natural model, stressing a more humane approach to "useful" goals: sharpening perception, increasing patience, and improving technical skills -- all of which would contribute, along with a larger program of social reform, to provide a degree of contentment among the nation's poor. By practicing manual precision, studying the organic model, and being taught moral lessons, Ruskin ultimately intended that individuals grasp, within limits imposed upon them by their class background, the aesthetic and moral truths of a higher reality. In this way, he redefined "usefulness" in terms of an intrinsic value; and "value" as that which "avails for life."²³ Thus in Britain the related themes of instrumental memory and conventional imitation were opposed by the romantic theme of a perceptual acuity whose object was the eternal spirit as evidenced in essential, harmonic relationships that could be extracted by studying and internalizing the organic model.

In France, where the difference between drawing

instruction for practical purposes and its instruction for fine art purposes was not as clear cut as in Great Britain, the virtues of memory work were also being extolled, but to subtly and significantly different effect. During the July Monarchy, many new drawing pedagogies emerged which were intended for varied uses by future artists, designers, architects, teachers, artisans, children, and amateurs. These might include a published course of instruction which, like Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran's, was offered at the Ecole Gratuite de dessin in Paris, or courses that emphasized quick results like Mme. Elizabeth Cavé's or Nicolas Amaranthe Rouillet's. The array of new offerings in this field included innumerable "copy books," descendents from a venerable tradition of engraved geometric, figural and ornamental motifs, which students were to copy precisely and in order of increasing complexity.

Even when memorization played no ostensible part in a course of instruction it would be naive to presume that silence on the mnemonic issue is proof of its pedagogical irrelevance. The idea of copying engravings or casts was to a great extent based on the notion that such objects contained properly classicized variations upon an essentially natural theme. These "improvements" upon nature (as they were believed to be), whether conventionalized animal and vegetable forms, or stock poses, body types and

facial features derived from Greek and Roman sources, were the elements of a representational sign system, an ornamental and artistic code, which it would be merely accurate to say the student was to learn "by rote." Thus, whether drawing "from memory" is stipulated as an exercise within a drawing course or not, one is functioning within the realm of empirical, or "instrumental" memory if that course presumes the necessity of learning a codified representational system, be it classical or mechanical. On the other hand, Lecoq de Boisbaudran's course of instruction (first published in 1847) emphasized the value of drawing from memory in part because of the deviations from a purely mimetic standard which this practice was intended to produce in the student's drawings -- deviations which were regarded as the increasingly obliging signs of artistic originality. Such a discovery of the resources of involuntary memory for the more purely aesthetic purposes of the fine artist attests to the presence of the dialectic within the pedagogy of art between aesthetic and instrumental (industrial) structures.

But the mnemonic theme extends still further than this formulation to include an even more telling mnemonic strategy. Memory and, eventually, drawing from memory became major themes in art criticism. From the Salon of 1846 through to the publication in 1863 of The Painter of Modern

Life, Baudelaire fixed upon memory in a variety of ways: first, as a guide for detecting a truly Romantic fine art; and, in the later essay, as a means of achieving an art of modern life. Baudelaire recommended drawing and painting from memory for the same reason that William Wordsworth had recommended the novelist's and poet's use of a similar technique, thereby seeming decisively to strip from memory all traces of the utilitarian appeal it retained in even the most fine-art-oriented French drawing courses. This strategy was calculated in large part to combat the trivialization of contemporary French painting in the commercial marketplace for art, and partly as a protective response to the growing realization that metropolitan experience had become so manifestly distracting that it threatened the artist's ability to "distill the eternal from the transitory." As a result of the threat posed by the faddish pressures of the marketplace, and by such a demand on the urban artist's senses, and powers of organization, Baudelaire suggested that the artist retreat from the marketplace to the greater stillness of the studio where he or she might deploy the reciprocal resources of imagination and memory. This critical strategy therefore presumes the separation of art from daily life, despite the fact that the latter served as the subject matter for the "painter of modern life". Insofar as drawing from memory became a way to ensure that art could provide evidence of, and shelter for,

the "centered" subject of Western humanism, it also heralded the elaboration of a phenomenological thematic within modernist art.

Consider the following historical leap: from the concept of drawing from memory, understood as a nineteenth-century strategy for the production of aesthetic form and experience, to the strikingly different method that Hoyt Sherman employed almost a century later for some very similar reasons. The critical negation of utilitarianism on Baudelaire's part leads not so much to a figure like Sherman, but to one like Hans Hofmann who taught drawing and painting in a search for a metaphysical "real." The French pedagogies that featured the practice of memory work for more than fine art purposes can be seen as the progenitors of Sherman's later attempt to realize a union between art and everyday life. The appearance, transformation, obsolescence, and displacement of a given theme, and the aesthetic strategy devised to preserve the latter's viability, signal the rise and fall of three notable historical periods to which I provisionally give the names: early modernist, high modernist or utopian, and late modernist.

The early modernist period is detectable from the second third of the nineteenth century, and extends through

to the turn of the century. It corresponds with the emergence of a fundamental antagonism. The notion of drawing from memory, and the differentiation between commonplace and "true" memory are early signs of the aestheticist predisposition among modern artists. The nineteenth-century artist's self-protective retreat foreshadows certain aspects of the more extreme measure of radical abstraction in the art and pedagogies that mark the beginning of the second, high modernist or utopian phase.

Ernest Mandel has noted that the period between 1830 and 1847 is part of the "long wave of the industrial revolution." According to the terms of Mandel's economic history, this wave, which extends from the end of the eighteenth century until the crisis of 1847, is notable not as a period of rapid growth and large profits, but for the arduous processes by which handicraft-produced and machine-produced steam power were introduced as a motive force into the most important sectors of commodity production.²⁴ It was during this period that the working classes in Britain, Germany, and France were continuing to be recast, through subtle (ethical, moral, educational -- in short, ideological) as well as brutal means, into the "docile bodies" whose capacity to yield surplus value would increase so dramatically after 1847. At that time, during what Mandel has called the "long wave of the first technological

revolution," machine-made steam power was generalized as the dominant motive force in production and communication. The early modernist period within the history of modern art instruction corresponds with the demand for practical and popular drawing instruction and improved design instruction in Great Britain, France, and the United States. It also marks the rise of memory as a prominent theme within this broadly defined pedagogical discourse, a theme which manifests the processes whereby individuals can simultaneously be subjugated or shored up to suit the increasingly industrial conditions of production. The evolution of a mnemonic strategy as an explicitly aesthetic, cultural response to, and elaboration on, that theme, and the introduction of varied forms of nature study (from empirical to subjectivist) are inseparable from the broader context of social, political, and economic transformation during this era. Not surprisingly, from the 1830s the characteristic problems associated with industrialized modernity became commonplace thematic concerns in cultural discourse.²⁵

Like all the themes and strategies which punctuate the history of modernist art and its instruction, memory would be displaced by others which could address more effectively the more extreme challenges to the survival of aesthetic experience during the later nineteenth and early twentieth

centuries. The grant of special privilege to "unconscious" or "involuntary" memory would still apply for modernist art production long after it was displaced as a prominent theme within pedagogical and critical discourse. Memory retains its axiomatic relevance as an unspoken but implicit presence underlying many newer concepts and aesthetic strategies. For example, although there may be no significant mention of memory in the discourse on Impressionism, the Impressionists' representation of the fleeting aspect of a "plein air" experience, their desire to represent the sensation of an instant of perceptual plenitude -- the semblance of a self-proximity as if in the absence of time and articulated thought (recall Pissarro's appraisal of Monet as "only an eye...") -- similarly presupposes the critical negation of instrumental memory.

The prominence of empirical or instrumental memory within conservative and utilitarian nineteenth-century education paralleled the mimetic standard in art, the taste for "objective" records of the surface appearance of things. The rise of mnemonic strategies within art instruction and art criticism coincided with the taste for an original art from which mimesis did not disappear, so much as its object shifted away from the classical canon, from factitious or naturalistic conventions, through shifting conceptions of realism to arrive at the anti-positivist representation of a

"universal" reality.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, during a period which Raymond Williams has called the "interregnum," the movement away from instrumental memory and from naturalistic representation was codified in pedagogies that emphasized the essentially romantic, expressive concept of spontaneity and the compositional notion of the "ensemble."²⁶ Arthur Wesley Dow was an American art educator, artist and author of an influential book entitled, Composition (1899). Dow resisted teaching that focused on the imitation of academic norms or natural models. These he replaced with lessons in the concept of "fundamental structure."²⁷ Dow wanted to teach sensitivity to such structure because he understood it as a method of improving all the arts. Knowledge of fundamental structure would also solve the problem of uniting the arts since they would all provide evidence of the same underlying structural qualities. Influenced by Ernest Fenollosa, curator of Japanese art at the Boston Museum of Fine Art, he employed Japanese concepts like "Notan," a practice which produces harmonious, spare tonal effects. Fenollosa helped Dow to see the potential for a Hegelian synthesis between West and East in a new American art. Dow instructed students in the character of a pictorial structure that could be as abstract in its constituent terms as it was materialist in its

exploration of the artist's working materials. Dow's classes included exercises in the use of line (direction, shape, proportion), "dark-and-light" (tone, quantity of light), and color (quality of light). Essentially a product of turn-of-the-century Symbolist, and Arts and Crafts thinking, his teaching marks the end of the early modernist period while looking forward to the beginning of the second, high modernist or utopian phase in the theoretical history of modern art instruction.

Such an art training, experienced by all, will result in a better quality of industrial products, better city planning, better taste in dress and decoration, and the conservation of scenic beauty....This is the larger service that the art teacher can render to the nation.²⁸

After World War I, Dow believed even more intensely in the importance of a unifying, as well as unified, aesthetic. On the faculty of Teachers College at Columbia University, he became acquainted with his colleague, John Dewey, with whom he would share many ideas about aesthetic experience. At that time, Dow insisted on the social function of art, an idea he stressed in order to promote the dissemination of art instruction within American general education.

Before World War I there were already quite a number of artists who would have shared with Dow his enthusiasm for these goals, but to whom his supporting strategies would have seemed rather quaint. The rejection of a moribund

academicism or a conventionalized realism and naturalism that contributed to the earlier period of pedagogical development was displaced by the concept of a fully developed pictorial abstraction well before the outbreak of World War I. Under the rubric of "nonobjectivity" the anti-positivist, spiritual dimension of the earlier model was extended into the first decades of the twentieth century to support wholly unprecedented forms. Older strategies for preserving humanistic aesthetic experience, like the retreat from contingency to the resources of imagination and "true" memory, assumed new and more radical dimensions. After the war, the experiments which had taken place in this separate zone of pictorial and sculptural experimentation would be displaced in the educational programs of the Bauhaus, or the revolutionary Russian avant-garde, where Constructivists and Productivists pursued a radical sublation of art and life.

The emergence of the second, high modernist phase thus coincides with the pioneering early abstract and avant-gardist experiments. It encompasses the first written formulations of artists like Kandinsky (Concerning the Spiritual in Art 1911) and the varied postwar attempts at idealist or materialist synthesis, ranging from the utopian abstractions of De Stijl, to the mix of utopian aesthetics and pragmatism at the Bauhaus, and the laboratory and ultimately materialist investigations of the Russian avant-

garde. While the ideals and strategies of Dadaists may seem antithetical to pedagogical codification, they should be noted in passing, because their practices can be understood to respond in certain ways to existing approaches to art instruction, whether academic values, naturalistic conventions, or mnemonic methods of fine and applied art teaching; and, in Duchamp's case, to the protocols of drawing instruction in French general education. 29

Before World War I, artists like Kandinsky, Delaunay, Gris, and Mondrian initiated the high modernist period when they turned to abstraction. These experiments could often be accompanied by considerable study of, and borrowings from, the resources of a rational science of perception, the mechanically derived harmonics of an explicitly mathematical system, or even the conventions of mechanical drawing. Such study helped them to substantiate their variously late romantic, theosophical, or platonic goals, enabling them to arrive at the paradoxical idea of a positivistically propped "inner vision."³⁰ This novel graft -- an aesthetic internalization -- made it possible for these artists imaginatively to engage with, and "manage," the radically new material conditions brought about by the second technological revolution.

Ernest Mandel has identified the "long wave of the

second technological revolution" in terms of the generalization of machine-made electric and combustion engines at the start of this century. These industrial advances set the stage for so steep a rise in the productivity of labor as to require the expansion of consumer markets to include for the first time significant numbers of producers. In the United States especially, this goal would be accomplished through the combined efforts of "machine age" design, advertising, and the institution of buying on credit.³¹

The early emergence of the rationalist, scientific theme within the discourse and paintings of prewar abstract artists helped to sustain the notion of modern art as a credible "court of appeals" -- an imaginary realm of coherence, harmony, calm, and resolution -- which, it was widely hoped, would serve as a model for other forms of social life. Through this model individuals might learn measured and effective ways to respond to the increasingly productive and potentially dangerous world in which they lived.³² Prewar abstraction advanced the progressive thematic of modern art, its imaginary encounter with the scientific and industrial models endowing the space of artistic exception with the deeper resonance of profound historical insight. While mnemonic reflection and the intuited resources of the imagination once sufficed to

protect the artist and the spectator's potential for transcendent experience, this generation internalized the industrial grid to map out a wholly imaginary pictorial space in which the individual subject could deploy a sovereign gaze and explore the limits, coordinates, and dynamic vectors of vision in an abstract, stable domain of pure, unobstructed visibility.

This limited, imaginary encounter with scientific logic and industrial form contributed to the construction of prewar abstraction, thereby deeply affecting the course of modern art instruction. The material and procedural requirements of the second technological revolution were confronted directly by artists, architects and designers in the "Higher State Artistic and Technical Workshops" in post-revolutionary Russia and at the Bauhaus in Germany. Ideas first explored in pictorial and sculptural form would confront the material realities and economically dictated forms of mass production. Johannes Itten's introductory course in "form instruction" taught the student to "perceive the harmonious relationship of different rhythms and to express such harmony through the use of one or more materials." This denotes both the mastery of "fundamental structure" and the inclination, under Gropius' guidance, to put it to use in design and the applied arts so as, eventually, to elevate the standard of productive living for

the masses through the production of beneficial environments for living.³³ At the Bauhaus, the medieval thematic was evoked in the use of the corporate triad (Master, Apprentice, Journeyman), and in the attempt to sever the reified bonds between the production of aesthetic experience and the notion of individualism. In this postwar era, the lessons of "form instruction" were applied enthusiastically to as many different objects and activities as could be summoned up, as if to prove how readily the old antagonisms would dissolve in the face of a radical understanding of universal structure, and the productive potential of an applied modern art in a more truly democratic social environment.³⁴

The Bauhaus approach to education -- a high modernist approach -- had a great deal in common with the "progressive" education that John Dewey was fashioning at the same time in the United States. For Bauhaus instructors, as for Dewey, education aims to develop the "total human being" by employing processes which would neither isolate nor neglect any faculty. Through the direct engagement in projects that avoid pointless repetition and emphasize process and, as Dewey put it, "consummation," they intended to stimulate the body, engage the intellect, and "fund" the latter through emotion and association. Josef Albers' "creative education" and Dewey's progressive education are

the twentieth-century culmination of nineteenth-century reformist pedagogical traditions, differing from the latter to the degree in that they sought to extend to all classes educational principles which had generally been reserved for economically privileged children. As part of the broader attempts in Europe and America after World War I to achieve significant social and cultural reform through education, it was hoped that the unified -- and unifying -- social subjects, which the latter would produce, would go forward to transform society and culture in their own forward looking, yet deeply humanized image. While in Russia the relationship of the individual and society was being reworked within a revolutionary process, in Europe and the United States the goals were more limited. Albers joined Dewey when he said that he considered "creative education" a process by which one could "integrate the individual into the society and the economy and have him partake in the activities of his time."³⁵

During the latter half of the 1930s, John Dewey's philosophy would combine with local traditions in Machine Age art and design, and with the new European modernist presence, to form an important component of the third late modernist period in this pedagogical history. Hoyt Sherman, and other art educators of considerable importance to the emergence of Pop Art, belong to this period. Dewey's

understanding of the necessity to redefine the goals of education and art in democratic terms played a major role in the establishment of the Federal Art Projects during the New Deal. Dewey's ideas, more than any others, provided the philosophical rationale behind the latter's challenge to artistic elitism. It is well known that the rise of Fascism in Europe generated the prewar wave of European emmigration to the United States, and that the arrival of European modernists profoundly affected the course of American art and its instruction. At the pedagogical level, this is usually demonstrated by discussions of Black Mountain College and the Chicago Bauhaus. Europeans, disillusioned in the face of Fascism and then Stalinism, confronted Americans who still believed in the potential of science, industrial methods of production, and modern art to produce a valid synthesis for a better and more democratic life. What is less often considered is how American commercial and cultural life combined with the effects of a transplanted European modernism to transform the latter and inform an emergent American modernism. By this term I am not referring to the activities of the Museum of Modern Art, its administrators and board members, and the small artistic vanguard in New York City, but to American attitudes regarding the relationship between art, industry, science, education and democracy as they assimilated the ideas of the new European immigrants, be they artists, educators or

scientists. One can detect that convergence in the American midwest, in cities like Chicago, and on the campuses of American universities like Ohio State.

The third and final period in this history must therefore be examined in the American context where it first surfaced. In the United States, university art departments and accredited, degree-granting art schools acquired a new professionalism during the years preceding the American entry into World War II. This fact, combined with the shift in the cultural center of gravity to the United States, would underlie many of the differences between the high modernist or utopian and the late modernist period of modern art instruction. The third phase is notable for three historical developments. First, a shift in emphasis among the terms in which European modernism had been understood: while the notion of a synthesis of utility and aesthetics had been advanced in European schools that aimed at the more or less radical sublation of art and life, in the American context this was effectively redefined in a manner that was more consistent with the local tendency to assimilate aesthetic considerations to commercial requirements. Second, this period is notable for a renewed split between fine and applied arts. This reaffirmation of the nineteenth-century concept that aesthetic experience takes place in a separate zone was reaffirmed by Abstract Expressionist art,

its critical support system, and the pedagogies that reproduced this system of value, like Hans Hofmann's -- significantly, a method of art teaching which belonged to the second period in the history of modern art instruction. This reiteration of the aesthetic and metaphysical theme, and the accompanying renewal of the hierarchy of the arts, is evident in The Search for the Real, in which Hofmann criticizes the Bauhaus for "confusing the concepts of fine and applied arts."³⁶ The rejection of the avant-gardist formula for radical cultural transformation and its displacement, initially, by a more pragmatic conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures, and then by the postwar return to aestheticism, combined with a broad-based pre- and postwar agenda to introduce Americans to the pleasures of high culture, and prepare the way for the third feature of this third period: what has been called the "false sublation" of art and life.³⁷ The spectacular postwar consumer culture would ultimately absorb most forms of vanguard aesthetic experience so that the latter became highly sanctioned forms of leisure time activity, inflation hedges and prestigious adornments for domestic interiors.

As in the preceding periods, in the American post-war era some of the founding themes of modernist art instruction were retained, while earlier strategies were altered, in some instances greatly enhancing their impact. In Sherman's

case, the engineer-turned-art instructor devised a course for students from all walks of life by adopting theories derived from Gestalt psychology to support his concept of transhistorical and universal aesthetic value. His course brought together several themes and strategies from earlier historical periods into a mutually supporting relation. The flash lab went further than the Bauhaus involvement with psychology (during Hannes Meyer's administration) by making it the functional heart of the course. In his laboratory situation, Sherman enhanced the old mnemonic strategy by literally stopping time, thereby greatly reducing the corrosive effects of contingency upon the individual. Aesthetic structure is here understood to share certain qualities with the worlds of science and industry, as rationalization and the romantic belief in art's inherent beneficiality profited from an unprecedented consolidation.

The late modernist period, like the preceding two, also corresponds with Mandel's account of the three "long waves" within the history of industrialized capitalism. The "long wave of the third technological revolution" begins in the United States around 1940, and extends to Europe by 1945-48. It is identified with the generalized control of machines by electric apparatuses, and by the rise of a largely supervisory or preparative role for labor in the production of goods. A worker trained in Sherman's flash lab would be

well equipped for such tasks. More often Sherman used this technique to train individuals in how to aestheticize everyday experience, as John Dewey imagined it. With the collapse of the Abstract Expressionist paradigm in the 1950s, Pop Art would displace the old order of production: the self-determined creators of metaphoric originals. In its place Pop artists sought to preserve a diminished scale of cultural value by producing dissimulated originals with allegorical double meanings. With Pop the production of aesthetic experience was recast as the preservation of ontological difference.

This schematic theory of modern art instruction emerged from investigating a single rather extreme manifestation of late modern art teaching in an archaeological manner; in terms of its conditions of discursive emergence and coexistence. In the dissertation which follows, I have retained something of the order in which the ideas arose while doing research. In the first chapter I explain how Pop Art embodies a protective strategy for preserving modernist aesthetic experience. This strategy may be understood partly as a function of the pedagogical climate in which Pop artists learned about art; partly as a response to the deterioration of the modernist paradigm which became evident

fairly early in the 1950s. The second chapter details Hoyt Sherman's pedagogy, its philosophical presuppositions, its relation to John Dewey's educational and aesthetic philosophy, and the historical and institutional context which could make such a course of instruction possible. The third chapter locates the incursion of utilitarian goals and instrumentalist strategies into art instruction to the second third of the nineteenth century in Great Britain. The role of instrumental memory within "practical" instruction is discussed, as is the response of John Ruskin to the latter. Memory is a dominant theme in Chapter Four, where the French pedagogies of the 1840s and '50s are introduced. And as Ruskin functioned in the previous chapter, Baudelaire's early critical theory of modern art -- his privileging "true" or "involuntary" memory for the purpose of aesthetic experience -- will reveal how the incursion into art of modern life, understood not just as subject matter but as a structural predisposition evident at the level of pedagogical practice, would obstruct the artist's view onto the Western European aesthetic tradition and set in motion a series of strategies which seem, in retrospect, to have been devised to protect the essentially imaginary function for modern art. This returns us to the notion of the phenomenological "reduction" and to Sherman's era. Finally, in the fifth chapter I address some of the other institutional forces which contributed to the conflation of

institutional forces which contributed to the conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures which, characteristic of that strange, fleeting moment during the American prewar period in art, design, and their instruction, would reemerge in a different form as the dominant characteristic of Pop Art. At that time, on the cusp of postmodernism it becomes possible -- indeed necessary -- to speak of the eclipse of modern art instruction, though surely not about the disappearance of its characteristic practices.

Chapter 1

The Handmade Readymade

Shortly after Franz Kline's death in 1962, Elaine de Kooning wrote a catalogue essay for a memorial exhibition of his works. In it she told of a day, late in 1948, when Kline visited her and her husband, Willem. At that time Kline was anxious to find a way out of an impasse in his work. Two years after Jackson Pollock made his first "poured" paintings, at a time of increasing critical success for de Kooning and other colleagues, Kline's work still consisted of easel paintings in a quasi-abstract style that at times seemed too reminiscent of de Kooning's own. De Kooning suggested to his friend that he take one of the ink sketches he had brought along and insert it into a Bell Opticon opaque projector that he had used to enlarge his own sketches onto canvas supports. Kline's epiphany occurred when he saw the image projected onto the studio wall.

A four by five inch brush drawing of a rocking chair...loomed in gigantic black strokes which eradicated any image, the strokes expanding as entities in themselves, unrelated to any reality but that of their own existence.¹

From this procedure, which Kline would continue to use, on and off, for the rest of his life, there evolved the monumental paintings which, exhibited in 1950 at the Charles Egan Gallery, established his international reputation as a

significant Abstract Expressionist.

Two years after that show, Harold Rosenberg published his famous essay, "The American Action Painters." In it he described such art as a "revolution against the given in the self and the world."² Earlier in his essay, Rosenberg admitted that some of the action painters made what amounted to preliminary sketches; "skirmishes," he called them, for the main event that took place within the confines of the larger canvas arena. The critic had adopted the artists' order of priorities -- their intentions -- when he underscored the importance of their negation, their "constant No," as determining the meaning of the action painter's improvisational method. But in light of the reproductive procedure that Kline and de Kooning are known to have used from time to time, to what extent should such work be described in those terms? Since it is itself motivated by a "given" in the world, such a method of painting can be described as a "revolution against the given" in only a qualified sense.

That no one has allowed the fact of the action painter's reproductive procedure to interfere in any significant way with the conventional interpretation of Abstract Expressionist art attests to the enduring appeal of such spectacularly staged manifestations of postwar cultural

humanism. For a similar reason, the success of Pop Art had to occur before the special affection of Abstract Expressionists for American mass culture -- cartoons, comics, and movies -- could be considered as a valid element in understanding works like de Kooning's "Women."³

Nevertheless, a greater willingness to consider the significance of such a re-presentational method might lead to a healthy skepticism regarding some of the commonplaces of expressionist ideology. For example, art critics and historians usually describe the relationship between Abstract Expressionist practice and the structural character of everyday life as one of fairly straightforward, even rigorous opposition. Yet, keeping Kline's procedure in mind, it seems more accurate to say that some of these artists internalized the repetitive structures that dominated mid-twentieth-century American life in order more dramatically to stage their struggle against it. The idea that the action painter might have used reproductive means to assist in a transcription which is then disguised beneath the ciphers of intuitive invention and emphatic originality makes it possible to describe such art not only as "original" but as a dissimulated copy. Consideration of this less familiar, one might even say, repressed, aspect of the action painter's method suggests that the relationship between Abstract Expressionism and the Pop Art that followed it was

a more dialectical one than is commonly thought. That dialectic is evident in the way that Warhol, Lichtenstein and their colleagues turned the Abstract Expressionists' order of priority on its head, and became the authors of dissimulated originals.

Dissimulation -- in Pop's case, the production of originals that masquerade as copies -- was not overlooked by critics of the new art, even some of the earliest ones. The paradoxical character of the Pop object was central to an unusually lively and revealing debate which took place in the art press late in 1963. Lichtenstein's earliest Pop paintings provoked this controversy, leading one critic to identify a completely new class of objects: the "handmade readymade." Brian O'Doherty (a.k.a. Patrick Ireland) coined the phrase in The New York Times when he reviewed Lichtenstein's second Pop show in New York. Labeling him "one of the worst artists in America," he nonetheless credited him with paintings that "raised some of the most difficult problems in art."⁴

O'Doherty cited the controversy concerning Lichtenstein's work, since the former had only just erupted in the press. The September issues of both Art News and Artforum were running feature articles -- one each -- about Pop Art in general, and Lichtenstein's in particular. Both

were written by an esteemed art instructor from California, Erle Loran, who had targeted two paintings by Roy Lichtenstein, Portrait of Mme. Cézanne and Man with Folded Arms (both 1962, figs. 1, 2), in order to excoriate some of the more salient characteristics of the new art.⁵ Each painting was a characteristically brazen representation of a diagram from Loran's then twenty-year-old book, Cézanne's Composition. Loran, like O'Doherty, thought it absurd that so many supporters of Pop were defending Lichtenstein by insisting that he "transformed" rather than "copied" his sources. Claiming that only an expert could detect such transformation, O'Doherty found such hairsplitting quite beside the point. After all, ever since 1913 it had been possible to classify direct appropriation as art. Marcel Duchamp, that "old master of innovation started it all by setting up his readymades...and calling them art, leaving on us the burden of proof that they were not." O'Doherty and Loran found the transformation alibi doubly annoying since it clinched the matter of Pop's high-cultural status by facilitating a rather academic dual defense. On the one hand, it was art because it "put a frame of consciousness around a major part of American life...we take for granted, fulfilling a criterion students have been writing about in their notebooks for years." On the other, the fact that Lichtenstein transformed his sources, "like a good artist should," fulfilled another commonplace of fine art.

O'Doherty dismissed both lines of defence and, despairing of this "triumph of the banal," observed: "Mr. Lichtenstein's art is in the category, I suppose, of the handmade readymade."⁶

Loran wrote his two articles as a consequence of Lichtenstein's first Pop exhibition in Los Angeles, where the man-sized diagrammatic portrait of Cézanne's wife was on display. His articles may have marked a historical first: there is reason to believe that they displaced Loran's desire to sue the artist and/or his dealer for copyright infringement -- the first, though not the last, such litigious impulse to pepper the history of American art from the inception of Pop. The angrier of the two tracts appeared in Art News, where, in keeping with that magazine's editorial taste for "human interest," Loran openly expressed his contempt for what he beheld and alluded to his desire to sue.

In a recent sell-out exhibition at the Ferus Gallery, Los Angeles, he [Lichtenstein] gave the title of Portrait of Mme. Cézanne to the black and white line drawing on bare canvas reproduced here. Sale price: \$2,000, or more. I suppose I should be flattered that a diagrammatic sketch of mine should be worth so much. But then, no one has paid me anything -- so far.⁷

One does not have to read past the rhetorical question which served as Loran's title -- "Pop Artists or Copycats?" -- in order to detect what was most provocative about

Lichtenstein's (and Warhol's) variety of Pop Art. Loran, like many other people, regarded Abstract Expressionism as a quintessentially American humanist art: a "monument to the human spirit," an emblem of the "depth and richness of human experience and intuition," and a demonstration of the "true meaning of free democracy...in America." He noted that Abstract Expressionists had opened up new and unprecedented avenues for aesthetic exploration which Loran considered on a par with the "most advanced products of the human mind, comparable in some ways to achievements in physics and chemistry."⁸ He was incensed that any self-respecting artist could possibly want to undermine so precious a cultural resource; that such a man would then be handsomely rewarded for advancing a culture of copies over one of originals was just too much for him to endure in silence.

Loran saw nothing significant in Pop "transformation." He insisted that Abstract Expressionists had ventured "far beyond the process of transforming nature" to produce paintings which presupposed "no conscious source but have an identity and imagery that is autonomous." Arguing from a position that epitomized the American postwar view of modernist art, he asserted that transformative activities could only amount to aesthetic regression.⁹ So insistently and so often was it being said during the first year of Pop's critical reception that Lichtenstein "transformed" his

sources -- that his was not a repetition of Duchamp's dreaded gesture -- that the artist himself felt obliged to offer his own cogent, laconic corrective. Shortly after the publication of Loran's two articles (the second of which was entitled, not incidentally, "Cézanne and Lichtenstein: Problems of Transformation"), Lichtenstein responded to one of Gene Swenson's questions by stating: "Transformation is a strange word to use. It implies that art transforms. It doesn't, it just plain forms."¹⁰

Among the critics who joined Loran in his assault, Max Kozloff was sufficiently disturbed by "this little event" in the art press to devote an entire article to it. In the pages of The Nation he concluded that art like Lichtenstein's signaled something not so little after all: "a rejection of the deepest values of modern art."¹² When Kozloff noted that for six or seven years in New York, "we have been witnessing an attack upon the notion of originality in painting," he pinpointed both the central feature of the Loran controversy, and the crucial normative term within the modernist system of aesthetic evaluation which Pop placed in jeopardy. He too feared the implications that this attack on artistic invention would have upon "the ethic of most twentieth-century art." Kozloff condemned work like Lichtenstein's and Warhol's for depending on the high art "context" for its effect; without the art context, he

postulated, such objects would revert back to their status as non-art. Pop Art was, in his words, "as contextual as it is conceptual," an observation which would seem to situate Pop within the tradition of the historical avant-garde to the extent that such art prompts a critical reflexivity regarding the institutional framework of art. But this observation does not take into account the singularly contradictory character of the handmade readymade, without which the entire debate about transformation would not have occurred, and which secured Pop's place within the realm of "neo-avant-garde" practice.¹³

This paradoxical form did impose limits upon American Pop's critique of earlier aesthetic practices, but the emergence of monumental handpainted or silkscreened ads and comic book images forced many observers to admit, and reflect upon, the gradual erosion of the Abstract Expressionist paradigm. The authority of Abstract Expressionist aesthetics had depended upon the viability of the interrelated concepts of stylistic authenticity and metaphoric structure, as well as the mythic notion of the autonomous creator. That these concepts had become, at best, contestible and, at worst, discredited, was apparent when Kozloff observed that since the mid-1950s "there grew a cleavage between the motivating idea and its embodiment, the fusion of which had been the guiding premise of Abstract

Expressionism."¹⁴ This "cleavage" corresponds with the dissolution of the symbolic mode of address and the loss of the attendant metaphoric conception of a transparency between style and the artist, and it was evident in the anomalous practices of Robert Rauschenberg (ie. Erased de Kooning, 1953), and Jasper Johns (Target with Four Faces, 1955). This is another way of saying that a split had opened between form and content, upon whose fusion Abstract Expressionists depended, not just for their metaphoric conception of style, but for their claim to descentance from an aesthetic tradition which arguably could be traced to the birth of humanism. That the Pop object could be described as a handmade readymade offered little solace to the American defenders of aesthetic autonomy.

Looking at Pop also prompted the realization that the once crucial distinction between abstraction and representation was "no longer relevant." Even for artists who, unlike Kline and de Kooning, might never have taken recourse to mechanical devices whose logical effect was to transform abstractions into representations, abstract imagery had become encoded, recognizable.

...it is quite as possible to put comic strips through their mechanistic paces as it is concentric circles. In fact, as conventionalized icons they ultimately have about equivalent non-meanings....this phase in art opposes the straightforwardness of its predecessor with subterfuge.¹⁵

straightforwardness of its predecessor with subterfuge.¹⁵

One cannot very well sustain a view of a modernist vanguard as the last resolutely unique object in the midst of a commodity culture dominated by equivalence once the artistic image joins all others in its failure to establish the illusory union between form and content that testifies to its transcendent status. Once the pictorial signifier cannot be counted on to fuse with its intended signified, it achieves parity only with other signifiers as one side of a now irretrievably fractured relationship to the signified. It is in this sense that all images had acquired an equivalence with one another in their capacity to yield "non-meaning."

When artists like Warhol and Lichtenstein challenged the goals of Abstract Expressionists, they benefited enormously from the gulf that had opened up between pictorial signifier and signified. Concerning style, Warhol could note, "I think that would be so great, to be able to change styles. And I think that's what's going to happen, that's going to be the whole new scene."¹⁶ One effect of such a dislocation of style from its former congruence with the concept of authenticity is that it problematized the matter of locating the voice of the "author" as was never possible under the old and once durable order of metaphor.

of any symbolic function it has no depth. As Roland Barthes observed, no artist can be found "behind" this obdurate object. Confronted by it, he was moved to recall a "true revolution of language."¹⁷

To the extent that the aesthetic practices associated with Pop, and with earlier works by Johns and Rauschenberg, can be described in terms of the dissolution of metaphor, it is not surprising that they heralded the corresponding return to prominence of allegorical procedures. According to Walter Benjamin's pioneering work on allegory, the allegorist appropriates preexisting images (or objects) in a seemingly arbitrary fashion, thus severing them from their original function and meaning. Such appropriation recontextualizes the image, situating it within another network of signifying relations; as Benjamin said: "This meaning with that image, that image with this meaning." The signifier, its original signified now isolated, is able simultaneously to produce a new meaning that is potentially antithetical to the old.¹⁸ This structural fact of allegory had great significance for Pop artists, enabling them to deploy images that could function, on the one hand, at the level of the most debased mass cultural sign (the comic strip referent) while, on the other, insisting upon its exalted status as high art (the comic strip panel of a jet plane exploding functions -- for some-- as a critical cipher

of Abstract Expressionism). It is this structure which made it possible for Roland Barthes to describe Pop as follows: "There are two voices, as in a fugue -- one says, 'This is not Art'; the other says, at the same time: 'I am Art.'"¹⁹ The handmade readymade is the perfect vehicle for the contradictory messages embedded within works of Pop Art. Consequently, Pop was able to assume a uniquely conciliatory social function which was the key to its unprecedented popular, commercial, and institutional success.

Pop Art helped to secure a vast, socially diversified audience for art, while allowing the more privileged among its ranks the "distinguished" aesthetic response which had been their birthright since the origins of modernism.²⁰ Warhol understood that Pop would attract greater numbers of spectators from more diverse social backgrounds into the hitherto more exclusive spaces of high art, and he also knew that they would not all understand it in the same way.

The young people who know about it will be the people who are more intelligent and know about art. But the people who don't know about art would like it better because it is what they know....the people who really like art don't like the art now, while the people who don't know about art like what we are doing.²¹

The conciliatory function of Pop was also evident in the fact that these artists could resolve, or suspend, the

normative pairs of discursive terms -- unique/reproduced, original/copy, high culture/mass culture -- whose hitherto rigorously maintained antagonism was understood to preserve the integrity of modernist high culture, and the latter's legitimizing social effect since before the war.

As early as 1962 Donald Judd recognized this potential when he reviewed Lichtenstein's first Pop show and, after noting the contradictory character of his paintings, ruminated upon their broader cultural consequence. He quickly tempered what might have seemed disagreeable about Lichtenstein's works -- their proximity to the stylistic codes and content of mass culture -- by noting the "traditional" and "quite expert" composition of works like The Kiss (fig. 3). Then he added:

Respectability comes quickly, is strong and can be shrewd. Lichtenstein's comics and advertisements destroy the necessity to which the usual definitions pretend.²²

This last, rather enigmatic comment refers to Lichtenstein's ability to navigate his way successfully through the minefield of high and low normative cultural terms. By representing the mass cultural artifact, while (trans)forming it in such a way that the new object skillfully dissimulates its traditional aesthetic rewards, Lichtenstein could indeed "destroy the necessity to which the usual definitions [ie. between "high" and "low"

between original and copy, etc.] pretend." In this way Pop artists meddled with the normative terms by which high art and mass culture had been kept apart.

Such meddling was one of the self-professed goals of Pop artists. This was evident in a 1964 conversation between Andy Warhol, Claes Oldenburg, and Roy Lichtenstein in which they discussed this and other related matters. Oldenburg noted that he had "always been bothered by distinctions -- that this is good and this is bad and this is better."

I am especially bothered by the distinction between commercial and fine art, or between fine painting and accidental effects. I think we have made a deliberate attempt to explore this area...

Oldenburg was interested in parody, dissimulation, and how they enabled him to explore the differences between, for example, a sculpture by Arp and the random biomorphic grace of spilled ketchup. He noted that by making things that looked like the most prosaic objects, he was able, paradoxically, "to emphasize my art and the arbitrary act of the artist who can bring it into relief somehow."²³

Lichtenstein underscored another crucial aspect of the Pop artist's agenda when, responding to a comment about the "impersonality" of his and Warhol's art, he took issue with that widespread tendency -- born of the numbing effects of living in an advanced consumer culture -- to assume that "similar things are identical."

Since the structure of the handmade readymade insured an experience of ontological difference in perception between the Pop object and the mass cultural one -- between a Warhol can of Campbell's Soup and Campbell's own -- it was able to preserve a vestige of the action painter's "revolution against the given in the self and in the world."²⁴ Coming after the war, during the boom years of the early-1960's consumer culture, Pop artists ceded "invention" in order to preserve an essential effect of the modernist project. In fact, the raison d'etre of all art which has followed Jasper Johns's crucial precedent by attracting the spectator's attention to a target, a map, a beer can, or any "thing the mind already knows," has been steadfastly to oppose this most commonplace form of memory in a concrete perception of a subtle, yet symbolically significant difference. Pop artists could in this way salvage an important component part of the idealist modern tradition of opposing or "managing" the effects of industrialized life within the elaborately sanctioned, imaginary spaces of discrete works of art. Pop artists like Lichtenstein were able to reassert the power of the artist as form-giver by pretending to abandon it with the added drama that only staging the "death of the author" could afford. While the depletion of the artistic persona to something less than a "creator," in the traditional, generative sense of that

term, might have proven a liability to artists from an earlier period, the institutional processes through which the American citizen had been introduced to the rewards of modern art from a period beginning before the war ensured that the artist would suffer no loss of prestige; on the contrary, the avant-gardist strategies of Pop artists, reported sensationally in mass media hungry for novelty, secured greater fame for these artists than for any others in the history of American art.²⁵ And among those processes, art instruction in all its guises was an important one.

What, precisely, was Erle Loran's contribution to this American cultural history? Between 1936 and 1981 he was a professor of art at the University of California, Berkeley. That is to say, he belonged to the same generation, possessed the same type of institutional affiliation, and shared in many of the same pedagogical goals as those American art instructors who, during the 1940s, introduced many of the artists we associate with Pop to the technical skills and belief systems which they considered indispensable to successful modern art and design. This generation of art educators shared the common goal of spreading the gospel of modernism to unprecedented numbers of people in the United States. In keeping with such an agenda, Loran's goal in publishing Cézanne's Composition in

1943 was to disclose the fundamental principles of pictorial organization as the latter are evident in Cézanne's art.

In his book, Loran noted several earlier contributions to such an attempt to divulge the secrets of "space composition," earliest among them, Adolf Hildebrand's The Problem of Form in Painting and Sculpture (1893) and, closer to home, Thomas Hart Benton's essay, "Mechanics of Form Organization in Painting" (1926-7). The illustrations which Benton used in his essay -- abstract diagrams (figs. 4) which anticipated to a remarkable extent the all-over compositional schema in paintings by Jackson Pollock like his Mural (1943, fig. 5) -- suggested to Loran the pedagogical value of using diagrams in his book.²⁶ He placed his compositional maps, based on specific works by Cézanne, next to reproductions of the latter (fig. 6). Wherever possible, he juxtaposed these in the pages of his book with photographs of the artist's original motifs. The resulting comparative method made it possible for Loran to lead the reader, as systematically and with as little doubt as possible, through the intricacies of Cézanne's compositional logic. Cézanne's art was to be laid bare, its significance assessed entirely in terms of its formal logic. Moreover, Loran's diagrams were the kind that connote scientific method, and which were often used during the 1940s and 1950s for the less than scientific purpose of instructing people

they are similar to those even more prosaic images which Andy Warhol pictured in his paintings, Dance Diagram -- Fox Trot and Dance Diagram -- Tango (figs. 7, 8; 1961, 1962). Along with Warhol's series entitled, Do it Yourself (1962), and Lichtenstein's monumentalized how-to Cézanne's, these works comprise a distinct and historically allusive genre within early Pop: a parody of images that one can associate with various levels of the broad-based popularization of culture in the United States.

Cézanne's Composition is in many ways itself a vintage '40s object, a manifestation of that highly significant, far-reaching, and too rarely noted attempt in the United States to extend the benefits of cultural activities in general, and of modernist art in particular, to ever larger, more socially diverse numbers of Americans before, as well as after, World War II. It was largely to the successful results of that attempt (whose roots can be traced to the activities of the W.P.A.) that Clement Greenberg addressed himself when, in 1946, he reiterated the terms of his nearly decade-old argument (first outlined in his 1939 essay, "Avant-Garde and Kitsch") that, if high culture was to survive in the postwar era, American artists would have to produce the kind of radically abstract, anti-domestic, and decidedly elitist art which Jackson Pollock and his Abstract Expressionist colleagues had begun to exhibit in New York. As Greenberg had put it, a new class of patrons was

"surging toward culture under the pressure of anxiety, high taxes, and a shrinking industrial frontier." These individuals:

would demand cultural goods that are up to date and yet not too hard to consume...This state of affairs constitutes a much greater threat to high art than Kitsch itself...The future of art and literature will brighten in this country only when a new cultural elite appears with enough consciousness to counterbalance the pressure of the new mass market.²⁷

(italics added)

Loran's book, Cézanne's Composition, had managed oddly to unite Alfred Barr, Thomas Craven, and Clement Greenberg, among others, in their high regard for what the latter described in the pages of The Nation as a "more essential" understanding of Cézanne's art than any other he had encountered in print.²⁸ Although this book was a technically sophisticated, and rather high-minded, it was nevertheless a product of the drive to evolve more systematic and scientific methods of teaching the fundamentals of modernist pictorial construction to increasing numbers of art students. Many of these students would go on to join that "surge" toward culture which Greenberg had found so threatening. Others became Pop artists.

Of Pop artists it can truly be said that they were among the first generation of American artists to be professionally educated in university art departments, or in fully accredited, degree-granting art schools. They

experienced a unique moment in the history of American modern art instruction, when a singularly rational -- one can even say "rationalized" -- approach to teaching unprecedented numbers of students the skills underlying pictorial art and commercial design united with a somewhat romantic belief in the inherent beneficiality of art and science. The efficient pedagogical methods by which Lichtenstein and Warhol were taught endowed both artists with that mastery of form and paradox which has been detected frequently in their work. This conjunction of a demystifying, often positivistic approach to art training with an ongoing, romantic belief in art's conciliatory, restorative powers constitutes an important historical precedent -- a structural analogue -- for the Pop artist's contradictory aesthetic procedure, and for its ultimate product, the "handmade readymade."

Chapter Two
Engineering Artistic Presence

In this chapter I will discuss one method which was used to prepare students for careers in art between 1942 and 1955 at Ohio State University. This introductory drawing course discloses a great deal about how artists and designers were trained in the late modern period. As a foundation-level class, it promoted a particular understanding of the fundamentals for aesthetic production. As a pedagogical practice, its form was determined by that understanding.

By no means was Hoyt Sherman's course in Beginning Drawing "typical" in the sense of being middle-of-the-road or moderate. On the contrary, it was immoderate, if not extreme in almost every respect. The close attention I devote to it should not be construed as an argument for its prestige or wide ranging influence; nor should it be taken as a measure of the esteem in which it should be held. On the other hand, neither the extremity of its formulation nor its provincial site disqualifies it from being representative of late modern art instruction. In no other period in the history of art teaching could such a course have come into being. And at no other time were the most original pedagogical contributions of a period evolved in

the art departments of large American universities like Ohio State.

Pedagogies of art do not have to be typical to be representative of their historical situation; they need not be celebrated or influential to warrant scrutiny, especially in an investigation of late modern art teaching that models itself after Michel Foucault's archaeologies. The fact that Sherman's activities were quite well known among American art instructors of his day is ultimately less germane than the fact that the consolidation of his ideas into so immoderate a drawing course helps to illuminate the central goals, themes, methodological strategies and ideological priorities of late modernism in art and design instruction.

After outlining the details of this course, I will examine its methodological and philosophical presuppositions, and describe its historical position and significance with reference to the character of large American universities like Ohio State. I will not, however, describe its immediate professional context -- that is, its overall situation and importance relative to American art instruction between the mid-1930s and 1950 -- at least, not until after I look back to examine the prehistory of the goals, themes and strategies which surfaced with such clarity and in so curious a configuration within this

course. From the second-third of the 19th century through the middle of the 20th, the theoretical history of art instruction has consisted of an institutional negotiation between aesthetic and utilitarian structures: between handicraft and assembly line; between originals and copies; between imagination and convention; between the cultivation of unified perception or the resources of involuntary memory and the miseries of rote learning. Chapters Three and Four will therefore outline the historical conditions which caused industry, as it were, to encroach upon aesthetics, to lay claim to certain human faculties and productive practices and effectively colonize them in the name of an instrumental logic for the purposes of expanding national productivity. In these same two chapters I will detail how individuals, who wanted to preserve traditional aesthetic experience in fine art, resorted to other human faculties and productive practices which they privileged in the name of an aestheticist logic for the purposes of modern art; and how still other individuals, advocates of social reform, envisioned a utopian transformation of the opposing sets of terms in which this bifurcation consisted.

Only in Chapter Five will I return to late modernism in art instruction and represent it more fully against the backdrop of the transformations American art and its public underwent during the 1930s and '40s. I will then conclude

this dissertation by discussing the late modern conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures in terms of its ultimate cultural product, Pop Art; and in terms of its ultimate pedagogical product: the termination of innovation in modern art instruction.

The whirl of a fan coming from somewhere deep inside the dark is broken by the sharp click of a steel shutter falling into place. Once every minute that metallic click repeats, punctuating the white noise of the fan, and triggering the rustling of pages being turned in unison. With each click, a flash of light, lasting no longer than the shutter's fall, illuminates the room and its contents. It penetrates the recesses of a space some seventy feet long, half as wide, and half again as tall. One sees in a flash that the sound of the fan and shutter come from a lantern slide projector on an elevated bridge which traverses one end of the long room. The pulse of light reflects white against the faces of young men and women who look towards a square of light that is centered on the projection screen before them. Leaning against draughting tables, the tops of which are pitched toward the fleeting object of everyone's attention, the expression on these faces is one of uniform vigilance. In that instantaneous flash, they see shapes on the screen:

dark ellipses in an asymmetrical cluster; and just as quickly, they are cast again in total darkness. Only then do they draw what remains visible to them only as an afterimage. After the rest of a minute has passed, a different configuration appears in another instant of light before them, and again they draw in the dark.

This was the "flash lab" (figs. 9) which Hoyt Sherman designed and constructed in 1945, and in which he taught "beginning drawing." Three years earlier he had built a provisional one in the same old artillery shed adjacent to Hayes Hall, the art building at Ohio State University (figs. 10-11). That first lab was a little smaller, its equipment and design less highly developed than in the one that replaced it. It lacked the "bridge" with its electronic gadgetry and its singular slide library (figs. 12-15). Sherman documented both labs in his second book, Drawing by Seeing (1947). The construction of the bridge required the addition of ten feet to the length of the old shed; while rebuilding it, Sherman made certain that the new lab would be even darker than its predecessor.¹ Since 1942 his pedagogical program was sponsored by the University Bureau for Educational Research, an agency of the School of Education at O.S.U.. The flash lab was the culmination of more than five years planning by the engineer-turned-art instructor about how best to teach a beginning course in

drawing.² This unprecedented drawing studio was divided into two main sections: an area with stepped drawing platforms on wheels and a stagelike area in front where projection screens were suspended (fig. 16). Above and slightly behind the area where the students drew was Sherman's bridge from which he conducted and could observe the proceedings. Sherman rigged the projector's lens with a tachistoscope, a shutterlike device invented by psychologists in the late-nineteenth century which made it possible to control the duration of, in Sherman's case, a slide exposure to within a fraction of a millisecond. Nearby was the phonograph, the record collection, and various floodlights, these similarly rigged to behave like strobes, and the storage unit containing Sherman's slide library.

The flash drawing course was a six week program, held five days per week for one period per day, not exceeding thirty-five minutes. During the lantern-slide portion of the course (the first four weeks) the students drew while the room was completely dark, from twenty slides per class.³ The classes all started with a period of roughly ten minutes during which the students became "dark adapted." Music -- frequently jazz -- played while everyone was encouraged to feel the edges of the paper, tap pencils, whistle, and generally loosen up in order to get ready for the first slide. At the beginning of the course they were equipped

with a thick crayon or charcoal and sheets of newsprint each measuring 16 x 24 inches; later, when introduced to the problem of color, they used a quick-drying protein-based paint in four colors and a number six brush. During the last two weeks of the course, the students no longer worked from slides but from distinctive arrangements of two and three-dimensional objects.

Since the instant of illumination lasted only one-tenth of a second at the beginning of the course, the students had no choice but to draw from afterimages between exposures. Sherman had learned that an exposure which lasts for one-tenth of a second or less does not allow for eye movement and, consequently, fosters the "monocular" visual experience which Sherman regarded as indispensable in training people for aesthetic activity. This was because monocular visual perception allows one to grasp objects only in terms of their relative position, size, and brightness -- Sherman's so-called "optical cues" -- rather than apprehending them in depth. Perception of objects in depth requires the eyes to perform saccadic movements, as they do when the duration of perception exceeds one-tenth of a second. The monocular mode of seeing is better suited to what Sherman called "esthetic vision," since it facilitates both the process of transcribing the three-dimensional world onto the two-dimensional working surface, and the apprehension of images

as wholes, both of which were among the most important goals of Sherman's course. Sherman thought about every eventuality. Even the size of the students' drawing paper -- the 16 x 24 inch sheets of newsprint -- and its distance from the projection screen were arranged deliberately in order to make transposition of the afterimage to the support easier. Sherman had learned from the data of experimental psychologists that at such a distance the afterimage would "shrink" to the size of the page.⁴ Abbreviating and systematizing the process of learning to see and draw was, after all, the goal of this mode of instruction.

While the students engaged in "seeing-and-drawing" -- as Sherman designated the unitary behavior he wanted them to acquire in the flash lab -- he inveighed upon them to "draw with big movements, feel the movements throughout your whole body."⁵ While there may be a relationship between this kind of expansiveness and the existential choreography of the "action painter," it is not to be located or understood in the narrow sense of spheres of influence. The physicality which Sherman encouraged was to help the students to be at ease while drawing in the dark. He would therefore praise them if they surrendered themselves to an organizational capacity which he believed they could feel in their bodies; he understood that their awareness of this sensation and its aesthetic product were both facilitated in this laboratory

situation. If a relationship to Abstract Expressionist physicality exists, then, it consists in an underlying belief in the value of the individual's potential to produce distinctive, well organized drawings, even in the face of such unusual circumstances. But Sherman also intended that the experience itself be organized, "seeing-and-drawing" being only one experience of that kind.

Sherman designed some 400 lantern slides for the course (figs. 17-24). These he classified according to various stages, from the first two weeks' concentration on two-dimensional configurations, to the introduction to the problem of transcribing three-dimensional objects onto two-dimensional supports in the third week. Within each category the slides are further divisible into subsets which Sherman designed in order to enhance sensitivity to each of what he had learned, most likely from Max Wertheimer's "Laws of Organization in Perceptual Forms," to call the "optical cues:" position, size, shape, and brightness (or contrast).⁶ Within the first group, Sherman would begin with a subset whose purpose was to sensitize the viewer to relative position. Following this, he would expose the students to slides whose configurations stressed size, and then brightness. In each subset, the slides were conceived to "provide(d) an increasing complexity".⁷

Throughout the first four weeks of the course the students moved their work tables closer to the projection screens. As a result, their angle of vision was altered from ten degrees at the beginning of the course to thirty-five degrees at the end of two weeks. Sherman's decision to move the students closer to the screen was wholly consistent with a logic that holds drawing to be an "aggressive seeing-and-drawing act;" and with the desire "to increase the students' angle of vision to be kept under control" -- and to do so twelvefold.⁸ In keeping with this desire to increase the field of perceptual sensitivity, later on in the course the students drew from images projected onto the floor or ceiling, using specially designed slides for this purpose (fig. 23). This exercise was not just intended to enlarge the field of their perceptual sensitivity but, as the slides reveal, further to enhance the student's ability to reconfigure objects seen with distortion in depth onto a two-dimensional surface. The logic informing so many of these decisions was intended to inspire a certain vigilance or, as Sherman said, an "aggressive" approach, in the beginning art student as if to prepare this future artist or designer for coordinated, coherent experience in environments which were inherently hostile to it. In this sense, it was entirely logical that Sherman's course was intended to serve equally well, with slight modification, for preparing young naval cadets for war.

Sherman also devised a way to increase visual sensitivity to light and dark. Instead of using a white projection screen he might use grey or black ones in order to promote perception of subtle differences in tone, and to emphasize further the importance of "ground" in forming the image in a drawing (fig. 16). He designed slides which to instill greater sensitivity, both to the size of forms and their interrelatedness with background (especially fig. 19, and the more complex images in fig. 20). One of the fundamental reasons for the brief exposure time was to instill a habit of grasping configurations as wholes; that is, of making it hard for the student not to sense the importance of the "ground" in forming the "figure." By so severely limiting exposure time that it secured the desired "monocular" visual experience, the student would be less likely to privilege figure over ground, especially when confronted by slides which were designed to sustain a fundamental ambiguity between these components of vision.

As in all methods for teaching drawing since the Renaissance, Sherman devised a way of introducing the students to the problem of transcribing three-dimensional objects onto a two-dimensional working surface. As a result, after two weeks he altered the arrangement of the projection screen. Where once there was a single screen three now

appeared. (fig. 25). Two occupied a single foreground plane, while a third was centered between them at a greater distance from the students. This served as a "transition to the problem of the third dimension," as did a specially designed series of slides (fig. 24).⁹ These frequently represented a symmetrical arrangement of largely abstract forms. For example, the first of the series shows a pair of bold dark ovoid shapes, one on either side of a smaller central shape comprised of parallel hatchings (which, in the slide rather than in the book illustration from which our illustration derives, may not have been hatching at all, but a lighter tone than that of the flanking ovals). The emphasis on symmetry and the essentially rectangular form of the central shape promotes the desired Gestalt while suggesting, because of the lighter tonality of that central shape, a view to an object seen in depth -- not unlike a highly schematic rendering of the operative principle of aerial perspective. The most complex, and therefore "advanced" slide of the series shows the same symmetrical arrangement but, where there was only the configuration of abstract shapes or occasionally forms recognizable as letters or numbers, one can discern the unmistakable, if schematic presence of a pair of curtains flanking a rudimentary flower still life.

It should come as no surprise that mimesis was not high on Sherman's list of priorities for his students. Only after the third week were the last five minutes of each class spent comparing the drawings with the motif "to assure the students that they were really learning to draw."¹⁰ A similar logic informed his decision that, at the end of the second week, an "old master" color reproduction would serve as the students' last motif of the day. That Sherman desired not imitation but a unique organizational response from his students is attested to by the fact that when, in Drawing by Seeing, he wished to show examples of his students' drawings after the "masters," he reproduced their renditions of a typically hypersensitive portrayal of a young girl by the latter-day School of Paris intimiste, Jules Pascin. By proffering this sort of image as a model of artistic mastery, Sherman encouraged a relaxed, equally impressionistic response on the part of his students.

At the beginning of the fourth week of Sherman's course, the transition to the three-dimensional model was complete. Now, where images once were projected, objects were arranged into unusual compositional set-ups (fig. 10). Here too the students could see their motif only in the instant during which a flood lamp flashed on and, just as quickly, off. Simultaneously, a red spotlight served to pinpoint a zone on the surface of an object in order to

establish a "focal point," a planar reference to facilitate the transcription onto the two-dimensional drawing surface. In the three-dimensional portion of Sherman's course, students were periodically asked to move their desks around the room in order to create new compositional problems. Sherman assembled these "still lifes" out of trash containers, old studio props -- including, to judge from a newspaper clipping from 1944 (fig. 26), the plaster casts he clearly regarded as vestiges from antiquated pedagogical traditions -- and other bits of prosaic furnishings, including enlarged cutout letters or numbers. Yet much of this material was hung upside down on ropes from the ceiling -- inverted in order to avoid "clear association with any customary setting."¹¹

The logic which informs this last decision is especially compelling, since it is based upon the belief that recognition of an object or image undermines the effectiveness of the laboratory situation. That is, it jeopardizes Sherman's ability to isolate that instant of pure perception during which the student sees things as wholes and responds in the desired fashion: with neither conscious thought nor deliberation. Sherman emphasized that his students were to allow the drawing to take form as part of a virtually involuntary coordination of the individual's perceptions and their accompanying response. Sherman

referred to the latter as "kinesthetic," thus emphasizing the continuity which it shared with perceptual experience as physical sensation, especially within the controlled circumstances of the laboratory situation.

The important value is the intrinsic quality of the whole active experience for the individual student at the time the drawing is being made....These aspects of the experience are, of course, not the conscious aims of the drawing act at the time the drawing is made, but are the means by which the value of the experience is built up in the student and judged by the instructor. The student's conscious aim...is to see the image and to let the image take form on the paper.¹²

Sherman argued that his introduction to drawing was superior to those in which students were taught theories about the practice of drawing and considered those theories while working. He frowned upon those who interfered with the creative act as he conceived of it: as a smooth-flowing perceptual/kinesthetic instant in which the instructor contrived to stop the flow of both time and language.

The 'aesthetic' in pictorial organization is achieved in the organic ordering of the configuration, not in its dissected and narrowly intellectualized technical construction. Any self-conscious effort that separates the aesthetic into its verbal components, such as composition, perspective, and tonality is a sure way of destroying the desired end.¹³

The flash lab, with its emphasis upon severely limiting the duration of perception, and its concept of a progression of objects or "motifs," starting with the totally abstract

configurations of his lantern slides, and proceeding to arrangements of prosaic objects in the studio which are carefully disposed in order to block "association," was devised to avoid cognition and re-cognition. Sherman was engaged in a project which, presupposing an instant of undivided, lived experience, brings to mind the philosophical project of the phenomenologist, Edmund Husserl. At the heart of Husserl's project is his concept of a phenomenological "reduction." Jacques Derrida has described the latter in the following terms:

Husserl believes in the existence of a pre-expressive and pre-linguistic stratum of sense, which the reduction must sometimes disclose by excluding the stratum of language.¹⁴

The reduction, an ideal state of "primordial" presence to intuition, must be opposed to worldly communication. In accord with the requirements of this logic, Husserl divided the field of language into two parts. First, there is an expressive sense (Sinn), a meaning which is immediately present in and characteristic of the reduction: meaning is experienced; expression is full. In the reduction the imagination of the sign exists, rather than the sign imagined. To this linguistic category Husserl opposed a communicative linguistic dimension, "indication," according to which meaning is intended, conveyed, objectified, but is not immediately present to the self. Derrida has therefore said of the reduction, as Husserl defined it, that it

"signifies the certainty, itself ideal and absolute, that the universal form of all experience (Erlebnis), and therefore of all life, has always been and will always be the present."15

In order to achieve this condition of transcendent self-proximity, the phenomenologist must work toward a temporal state of presentness, a temporal "essence." Among the hazards of Husserl's phenomenology is the fact that one can only approach the reduction in a state of vigilance, it being essential to eliminate from consciousness whatever persists in marking off the passage of time. Consequently, one must bracket from experience anything which attests to the constant state of differentiation and flux in consciousness that characterizes the relation of consciousness and language. Though time may be infinitely divisible, through the rigors of the Husserlian reduction such presentness becomes available. "The present of self-presence would be as indivisible as the blink of an eye."16

Hoyt Sherman also attempted to eradicate the dynamic and unstable conditions inherent in language from the environment he devised for securing that instantaneous flash of creativity, a flash which for him corresponded to a heightened sense of subjective autonomy afforded by that instant. By contriving this strobic pulse, Sherman's

laboratory situation fulfilled his desire to secure for the student a presentness whose potential expressive fullness is neither diluted by the vicissitudes of language nor time. This pedagogical project thus offered the individual access to a state of being which, uniquely well suited to generating a particular kind of aesthetic experience and object secures for the latter its capacity to bear witness to the distinct presence of the artist's absence. This course of instruction therefore preserves for the artist a place at the center of a world in which he or she will be empowered, through conditioning, to block whatever may threaten or impinge upon his or her sovereignty in that privileged position. From there, the artist can continue to create an imaginary world, endowed with that "intense unity" which issues from a position, and condition, that the perceptual trainee guards with a vigilance acquired in the flash lab. That vigilance is itself inseparable from "organized perception."

Just how could a course in "beginning drawing" have found its way out of the traditional studio and into the controlled environment of Sherman's lab? What could have led him to a conception of aesthetic value and to a manner of teaching it which so deliberately incorporated data and techniques derived from the psychology of perception and Gestalt? The notion that aesthetic experience requires

shelter from contingency is one of the most durable themes within the history of modern art and its instruction. But Sherman's positivistic appeal to science, his desire to perfect and legitimate his pedagogical goals through the latter, are signals of his late modern identity. This faith in science and technology, and the degree to which Sherman considered aesthetic experience independently of the traditional categories of fine art practice, set his course of instruction apart from high modernist pedagogies that were predicated upon a more tentative, skeptical interaction between fine and applied art, between art and science, art and everyday life. But before looking back to the historical conditions in which these themes and oppositions arose, it is important to describe the academic setting in which Hoyt Sherman could evolve a course in perceptual training and call it "Beginning Drawing."

When Sherman was appointed Assistant Professor of Art at Ohio State in 1931, his credentials for such a job were atypical, at best. Sherman was first a student at Ohio State, entering the College of Electrical Engineering in 1921. That is, his first experience with drawing consisted of mechanical drawing. Precisely because such drawing was considered devoid of aesthetic value by fine artists, it appealed to Dadaists like Francis Picabia. By that time Picabia had already inserted his variant on mechanical

drawing into the context of fine art, thereby challenging a normative system of classification which Sherman would attempt very to transcend differently, by teaching perceptual and organizational unity as the nec plus ultra of aesthetic experience.

During his sophomore year Sherman worked as a student assistant for Thomas E. French, Professor of Engineering. As late as in 1925 he assisted French in executing the illustrations for the latter's Engineering Drawing, still a standard text. Sherman entered the architecture department and withdrew after only one year, complaining of the conservatism of having students draw the classical orders while the departmental chair vilified the work of Frank Lloyd Wright. Sherman was interested in fine art -- though assuredly not in Dada -- and, in 1925, James R. Hopkins, chairman of the art department and an acquaintance of French's, asked him to become an "assistant instructor" of drawing. Sherman found the art program conservative too, felt there had to be a better way to teach art, and was encouraged by Hopkins to come up with one.¹⁷ Over the next several years Sherman continued to teach, made trips to Europe, and took on several jobs in commercial design.¹⁸

Sherman probably identified his special project during the summer of 1938.¹⁹ At that time he set about collecting

what turned out to be more than 300 photographs of "historically important drawings" with the intention of disclosing a set of transhistorical characteristics or, better, one master characteristic underlying all great art and design. Moreover, he was determined to find a way to standardize its instruction for the increasing numbers of art students who were enrolling in university art departments like Ohio State's which offered advanced degrees in art.²⁰

In the first publication of his aesthetic theory, Perceptualism; the Artist's Vision (1944), Sherman described the initial stage of his quest as follows:

The writer was pursued by the notion that underlying pictorial organization there was a key idea which had not yet been fully clarified, and that if this idea could be clarified, great improvements in teaching art might be possible, and perhaps the relation of art to other phases of modern life might be more clearly apparent.²¹

Sherman could not have arrived at this idea simply because of his discontent with the state of art training at Ohio State; nor because of a tension he could discern between the applied and the fine arts. Like so many other American educators during the period between the two World Wars, Sherman was aware of the high modernist theories of European artists and designers who emigrated to the United States

during the late 1930s, and he was enthusiastic about the ideas of John Dewey.²²

Dewey's belief that an aesthetic component can be immanent in all human experience was central to Sherman's interest in his philosophy, but alone this idea does not explain the depth of Sherman's involvement with the American philosopher's writings. Thomas M. Alexander has observed that Dewey's aesthetic theory, most fully articulated in his late work, Art as Experience (1934), cannot be understood adequately without a consideration of his earlier philosophical development. Similarly, when examining Dewey's philosophy as a whole, Alexander has noted that the philosophical works can only be isolated from the aesthetic theory at the risk of distorting and impoverishing his entire development.²³ As early as in 1904, when Dewey joined the faculty of Columbia University Teachers College and met Arthur Wesley Dow, the interaction between them was mutually beneficial for both men. For Dow, it reinforced his enthusiasm for the idea that widespread knowledge of "fundamental structure" could create a new, socially advantageous fusion of the applied and fine arts. For Dewey, it stimulated him to extend his already fairly longstanding project: to prove the fundamental "continuity" of all human experience.²⁴

Dewey referred to the aesthetic component in everyday life by emphasizing the term, "an experience." It is a truism of progressive education that Dewey meant, by having such an experience, that one follows an activity through to satisfactory -- and satisfying -- completion, thereby affording the individual a sense of its entirety or wholeness. But there is more to "consummated" experience than that. The latter must also, as Dewey would say, be emotionally "funded," or endowed with the significance that each individual brings to an activity as a consequence of related emotions accumulated over the past, and revived in present experience. Dewey characterized such experience as profoundly "interactive," recognizing the ongoing sense of reciprocal give and take that constitutes a given process. Thus, at the heart of Dewey's program for an aesthetic of living is a "metaphysics of experience" that entails so thorough an interaction between self and world that interaction becomes "participation and communication."²⁵

Deweyan "experience," like so much of his philosophical project, can be understood as an attempt to prove that meaning and fulfillment are available to modern human experience in more than the token sense embodied in an individual's experience of a work of art. Alexander has argued that so pivotal a concept for Dewey as "interactivity" -- the mutual implication of self and

environment without which his attempt to reveal the continuity between self and world, experience and nature, thought and feeling, art and experience would have been unthinkable -- date back to his late-nineteenth-century works on psychology. Dewey had studied at Johns Hopkins with G. Stanley Hall, a student of Wilhelm Wundt, as well as with the idealist philosopher George Sylvester Morris. When Dewey turned his productive energies to the "new psychology" he attempted to ground Morris's tendency to abstraction and to efface Hall's sensationalism by taking recourse to a psychology that privileges lived experience over logical abstraction. His view of this psychology depended upon the biologically derived notion of "organic movement and wholeness."²⁶ As early as in 1896, in an article called "The Reflex Arc Concept in Psychology," Dewey's synthetic aims were already evident. He challenged the prevailing atomistic concept of stimulus-response -- the "patchwork of disjointed parts" which he associated with behaviorist psychology -- and advanced in its place the notion of a "comprehensive or organic unity." This notion he supported with his understanding of "circuit coordination."²⁷ According to Alexander, Dewey proposed that "the organism (is) already dynamically involved with the world and aiming toward unified activity." Using the example of a child reaching for a candle and getting burned, Dewey rejected the conventional idea that, first, the stimulus exists; then the child sees

it; reaches out, is burned, etc.. Instead, as Dewey stated, "the real beginning is with the act of seeing, and not with the sensation of light".²⁸ He posited the whole "situation" in which the child interacts positively and dynamically with the environment to produce a meaningful result: meaningful insofar as the child's functional capacities increase and he or she learns from the painful experience. Dewey also described the notion of "undergoing and doing," thus attempting to counter the time-bound teleological thrust of conventional experience with a concept of the latter as a total "field of action" or "field-process."²⁹ Hoyt Sherman echoed Dewey's concept in his own "seeing-and-drawing" to describe the unitary experience of the perceptual trainee.

Dewey enlarged on the concept of interactivity so that, by the time he wrote the James Lectures which together would comprise Art as Experience, he could rely upon his fully developed theory of "transactionalism." While the child's experience, as an act, can be referred to in terms of "the genesis of a transactional situation on the level of organic behavior," transactionalism itself presupposes that individual experience, such as perception, can in no way be divorced from the distinctive meanings that the individual accumulates in past experience; nor from a sense of purpose that inheres in present experience and process.³⁰ Transactionalism also proved an essential concept for Hoyt

Sherman. Without it he could not have argued that, "Many people think that no two people should paint the same way, and I am one of them."³¹

Sherman believed that each individual possesses a particular sensitivity to the arrangements of color, form, and brightness as they interlock to achieve pictorial tension on the picture surface. He regarded the picture plane as a membrane-like tissue which the artist approaches and activates in a distinctive manner. Organization -- gauge of aesthetic achievement -- also carries the burden of originality in the work of art since, according to Sherman, any individual has a distinct way of reconfiguring into an aesthetic condition that portion of the perceptual field which serves as the "motif." In the early 1950s, when Sherman engaged in an exhaustive analysis of Cézanne's art, he concentrated on the theory of "isomorphism," as defined by Gestalt psychologists, to support his claim that when Cézanne transformed the landscape into his distinctive compositions the latter were partly determined by a "concentric field pattern" which the artist deployed "non-volitionally."³² The theory of isomorphism, as postulated by Wolfgang Köhler, holds that: "Any actual consciousness is in every case not only blindly coupled to its corresponding psychophysical processes, but is akin to it in essential structural properties."³³ Sherman argued that Cézanne's

"concentric field pattern" issued from a "cortical correlate" to the stimulus which was located in that part of the brain devoted to sight which is known as "area 17 of the visual cortex."³⁴ He was quite satisfied with this psychophysical account for what he insisted was Cézanne's process of pictorial construction, just as he was content that this theory would help him to interpret many of the latter's aphorisms concerning artistic method. But Sherman was less pleased with the theory of isomorphism when it came to having to account for Cézanne's unique style.

Sherman had already noted the telltale signs of the "concentric field pattern" in works by Rembrandt, among other artists. Therefore, he had to depart from this theory in order to allow for the fact that other artists possessed this same mode of aesthetic organization, while their works revealed wholly different approaches and results.³⁵ To his understanding of isomorphism he therefore added a supplement: the theoretical postulates of "transactionalism." The writings of Franklin P. Kilpatrick, Hadley Cantril, and Adelbert Ames, Jr., among others, may have helped Sherman to elaborate his understanding of transactionalism. They had noted that relativity was at the heart of all human perception; that perception does not yield its object unambiguously but provides data from which the individual identifies an object or intuits his or her

situation in space. This individuated result was a product of expectations and memories, habits of thought and associations, that were acquired prior to, and are evoked in the midst of, perception.

Adelbert Ames Jr. demonstrated this aspect of perception with a number of striking visual displays, first at Princeton University, and then at his Hanover Eye Institute in New Hampshire. Those displays so impressed Hoyt Sherman that he had them reconstructed on the Ohio State campus in 1949, thereby attracting visits by such luminaries from the world of advertising, broadcasting, and mass psychology as Hadley Cantril and Frank Stanton (figs. 27-34). Sherman may well have depended upon the laboratory displays of the "Visual Demonstration Center" to factor into his Gestaltist's outlook the categories of past experience, present purpose, and intention for the future. In this way, he could include in his own theory a still more individualistic account of perception and action. Nevertheless, he and his fellow transactionalists owed this concept to John Dewey in whose writings it had been elaborated. Sherman's hybrid theory suited his own purposes, as had his selective rearrangements and readings of Cézanne's comments on artistic procedure. Together they enabled him to assert that: "A given concentric pictorial pattern...must be thought of as a unique phenomenon, since

its particular configuration is a product of 'choice' determined by past experience, i.e., the various stages of development of the picture."³⁶

It would be wrong to assume that because Dewey argued for the widespread availability of an aesthetic component to everyday experience that Dewey's metaphysics of experience reflected the diminished appeal of the art object for him. On the contrary, he continued to hold works of art in special esteem. They were superior to an experience because they are produced as a kind of pure interaction, a process in which the individual and the materials of aesthetic production interact in "a rhythm of surrender and reflection" until a satisfactory, unitary resolution is achieved.³⁷ Moreover, the laws of aesthetic production and resolution are themselves governed according to an internally determined material economy; that is, under the influence first of Dow, and then of Albert C. Barnes, Dewey understood these laws to accord with properties that are inherent in the fine art media.³⁸ Dewey also privileged works of art as the product of a perception which, as the fullest embodiment of "transactionalism," becomes the most important model of experience, because in it the self and world appear to fuse.

The expressiveness of the object of art is due to the fact that it presents a thorough and complete interpenetration of the materials of undergoing

and action, the latter including a reorganization of matter brought with us from the past....The expressiveness of the object is the report and celebration of the complete fusion of what we undergo and what our activity of attentive perception brings into what we receive by means of the senses...³⁹

Dewey opposed perception to convention or recognition. As the first step towards initiating growth and change, perception promises meaning and fulfillment. As such, it must be the antithesis of convention which Dewey associated with the joyless tasks of everyday life and work in an industrialized society.

The existence of activities that have no immediate enjoyed intrinsic meaning is undeniable. They include much of our labors in home, factory, laboratory, and study....Yet they exist, and are so coercive that they require some attentive recognition. So we optimistically call them "useful" and let it go at that, thinking that by calling them useful we have somehow justified and explained their occurrence. If we were to ask useful for what? we should be obliged to examine their actual consequences, and once we honestly and fully faced these consequences, we would probably find ground for calling such activities detrimental...⁴⁰

Since Dewey believed "utility" -- defined in the commonplace terms of a degraded and expedient economy -- to be antithetical to an experience, he regarded such corollaries of utilitarian logic as convention and recognition to be the "enemies" of aesthetic experience. Nonetheless, the related term, "instrumentalist" still applies to Dewey's philosophy, inasmuch as he redefined this term more humanely, according

to goals that the prevailing means-ends logic would never concede.

The enemies of the esthetic are neither the practical nor the intellectual. They are the humdrum; slackness of loose ends; submission to convention in practice and intellectual procedure. Rigid abstinence, coerced submission, tightness on the one side and dissipation, incoherence and aimless indulgence on the other, are deviations in opposite directions from the unity of an experience.⁴¹

Because Dewey insisted that perception is not a matter of passive, receptive and isolated sensations but, rather, a continuous series of interactions between an emotionally funded individual and his or her environment -- "an act of the going-out of energy...not a withholding of energy" -- perception assumed a special role within Dewey's metaphysics of experience.⁴² The privilege Dewey granted such perception was supported by his understanding that the latter only occurs in a state of extreme self-consciousness in the midst of experience. Consequently he could refer to that perception which "occurs for its own sake" because it "is the full realization of all the elements of our psychological being."⁴³ Perception is continuous, and continuously accumulates meaning. Significantly, Dewey described it as "a process consisting of a series of responsive acts that accumulate toward objective fulfillment. Otherwise there is not perception but recognition". (italics added)⁴⁴ Accordingly, while such

perception requires reflexivity and duration, Dewey also insisted that it function im-mediately; that is, at the expressive level that Husserl identified, rather than the indicative level.

To combine Dewey's insistence that true perception -- the kind that constitutes an experience -- must be "unified perception," with his terse declaration that "what is not immediate is not esthetic" is to formulate the discursive preconditions for Hoyt Sherman's flash technique.⁴⁵ While Dewey used the phrase "unified perception" to denote an experience which is set apart from commonplace recognition, Sherman adopted it to describe both the habits acquired in the flash lab, and the common denominator of all aesthetic form. Sherman noted that the "prime essential is seeing with perceptual unity -- that is, seeing all points with relation to a focal point. One who sees with perceptual unity perceives the 'whole field' at which he is looking, and perceives it in such a way as to place the parts of the whole through referral to a focal point."⁴⁶ Dewey believed that unified perception results in meaningful experience, no matter how truncated the duration of perception. He described this potential fulfillment in an example that would have had special meaning for Sherman: an individual who is conscious of his or her situation in the temporal continuum views "a flash of lightning (which) illumines a

dark landscape" and extracts from this instant a meaningful perception.⁴⁷

Throughout Art as Experience, Dewey repeatedly dismisses recognition as part of the dulling conventions of everyday life that preclude fulfillment and meaning, and he contrasts it with the "accumulation of long gathered energy" that culminates in that perception which coincides with an experience.

To see, to perceive, is more than to recognize. It does not identify something present in terms of a past disconnected from it. The past is carved into the present so as to expand and deepen the content of the latter.⁴⁸

This notion of energies accumulating to form a higher consciousness emerges as one of the central themes of Art as Experience, and through it Dewey attempted to counter the reified logic inherent in atomistic cause and effect relations. His theory of progressive education may be understood in part as an attempt to promote such unified habits of consciousness among children, while sparing them the nefarious mnemonic practices of traditional public instruction. According to Dewey's logic, individuals whose education consists, to the greatest extent possible, of activities which engage them at every level of their being, will stand a far better chance of transforming potentially

empty situations into meaningful ones, thereby extending the availability of (aesthetic) experience into everyday life.

Through consciousness, he converts the relation of cause and effect that are found in nature into relations of means and consequence. Rather, consciousness itself is the inception of such a transformation. What was mere shock becomes an invitation; resistance becomes something to be used in changing existing arrangements of matter; smooth facilities become agencies for executing an idea. In these operations, an organic stimulation becomes the bearer of meanings, and motor responses are changed into instruments of expression and communication; no longer are they mere means of locomotion and direct reaction.⁴⁹

The art object provided Dewey with a model for the radical "instrumentalism," and for the self-critical view of democracy that were such prominent features of his philosophical and pedagogical legacy. We shall see in the next chapter that Dewey was actually participating within a reformist legacy which dates back to the middle of the nineteenth century, and which had defined instrumentalism radically by rejecting its sense as a narrowly defined utilitarian logic. Conversely, Dewey's understanding of instrumentalism led him to articulate his belief that the "eternal" value of great art is "its renewed instrumentality for further consummatory experiences..."⁵⁰ Deweyan democracy was "self-critical" insofar as he refrained from using the term to refer to the existing disposition of property and privilege embodied in the American State. Instead, the term denoted for him a potential realization of democratic social

relations, the success of which -- always a relative matter -- was predicated upon the transformation of society in accordance with a unitary, organic model of culture and communication. For Dewey, culture and communication were virtually synonymous, embodying at the level of social interaction the dynamic and "purposeful" character of an experience.

Not only is social life identical with communication, but all communication (and hence all genuine social life) is educative. To be a recipient of communication is to have an enlarged and changed experience. One shares in what another has felt and in so far, meagerly or amply, has his own attitude modified. Nor is the one who communicates left unaffected....Except in dealing with commonplaces and catch phrases one has to assimilate, imaginatively, something of another's experience in order to tell him intelligently of one's own experience. All communication is like art.⁵¹

From as early as his psychological works of the 1890's, Dewey had appealed to science as a model, but also as a support for his argument that life was marked by continuity, contextuality and interactivity. In Art as Experience there are numerous appeals to the sciences which demonstrate Dewey's conception of continuity while functioning as empirical proofs of his assertions. Physicists, he noted, were "forced in virtue of the character of their own subject matter to see that their units are not those of space and time, but of space-time." While arguing for the cultural variation on this unitary theme, Dewey noted that artists

had anticipated the physicists' discovery, being able to do so because they dealt with "perceptual instead of conceptual material, and, in what is perceived, the spatial and temporal always go together."⁵² Later in this work, Dewey returned to his youthful critique of the atomistic patterns of behavioral psychology, remarking the "extraordinary ineptitude of a compartmentalized psychology to serve as an instrument for a theory of art." To this he contrasted art's singular capacity to fuse "self and object," since art is "esthetic in the degree in which organism and environment cooperate to institute an experience in which the two are so fully integrated that each disappears."⁵³

Dewey applied the lessons of his contextual philosophy to interpret traditional psychology in terms of social concerns, noting that when the latter "holds to an intrinsic separation between completeness of perceptual experience (it) is...itself a reflexion of dominant social institutions that have deeply affected both production and consumption or use."⁵⁴ Implicit in such a critique is the possibility that a progressive, unitary psychology would be of assistance in teaching the fundamentals of art and (aesthetic) experience to the general population. Indeed, before writing Art as Experience, Dewey wrote in the Journal of the Barnes Foundation that such a modern psychology would provide a method of liberating art from the "ivory tower" in order to

further the productive potential and the happiness of the masses.⁵⁵ In the absence of a more democratic society, the art object would therefore be valuable insofar as it can be used to educate the public about the values and processes to strived for in a more just and equitable future. This may help to explain why the paternalistic businessman, Albert Barnes, appointed Dewey to head the educational program at his museum, which was chartered as an educational institution in the Deweyan tradition. It also helps to understand why, at the Barnes Foundation, the works of art are installed together with utilitarian objects. In such an installation the continuity between them might be demonstrated. Similarly, Barnes directed that works of art be brought into his manufacturing plant, and that lectures about art and aesthetic processes be offered there to employees in the hope that they might apply these lessons to their work and lives thereby achieving a greater degree of meaning and fulfillment.

Roughly a decade later, Sherman was formulating a mode of drawing instruction which could respond to his conviction that, because art instruction had entered into the general system of education in the United States, an efficient method of teaching the fundamentals of art was needed. In his view, it was as necessary to protect students from teachers who would mystify art with "intuitive" rather than

"scientific" methods as it was to avoid the stifling effects of nineteenth-century academicism. In 1940, Sherman still confronted the problem of how to codify a new, scientific, and universally applicable pedagogy of art. That he found the solution to his problem by looking into contemporary practices in American psychology attests not just to his continuing attraction to Dewey's influential thought, but to the prevalent faith in the potential of technology and science to solve every conceivable human and social problem, even on the brink of World War II.

We know little about Sherman's research into the pedagogy of art during the period when he helped to formulated a "foundation program" in 1940. However, we do know something of his overall goals in making his contribution, and can deduce more than a little about what he was reading and thinking at the time. With his collaborators from the art department, James Grimes and Robert King, he supported the notion that one "interrelate the studio disciplines": drawing, painting, sculpture, and design. Sherman later wrote in relation to this program: "Organization was emphasized as critical to the three studio disciplines." Attempting to explain precisely what he meant by "organization," Sherman discussed the idea that "the apparent influence of ground on figure (gestalt) provided a graphic means for directing attention to organization."⁵⁶

Precisely how he might have conveyed the practical significance of this idea I do not know. But by 1940 Sherman was searching for ways to integrate fundamental principles of Gestalt theory into a course. With its stress upon the unification of disparate fields, and its deployment of scientific methods to achieve this goal, his course would attempt to achieve Deweyan goals through highly technical means. Within a year he discovered the solution to his pedagogical problem. While it was to Cézanne that Sherman felt indebted "for the germinal idea" of perceptualism, it was to Rembrandt -- or so he wrote -- that he owed the idea that led to his distinctive method of teaching "beginning drawing." While reading a Rembrandt monograph by Hendrik Willem Van Loon, Sherman claims to have encountered his "illuminating cue."

Rembrandt, as a boy, one day happened to be looking at a cage of rats suspended from a rafter in his father's windmill. Inside the mill it was dark except for sunlight which was coming through a small window in such a way as to fall upon the suspended cage. Outside, the turning blades of the windmill alternately cut off and exposed the sunlight so that Rembrandt saw the cage in suddenly exposed flashes. The "picture" was strikingly clear, composed, whole, self-contained in features and background....Since forms seen under such conditions do set the problem of pictorial organization with unusual clarity, the notion grew that a similar arrangement might be a key to teaching perceptual training.⁵⁷

According to Sherman, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, he realized that it was crucial for American and allied naval air cadets accurately to identify aircraft and ships as friend or foe in order to be certain of targeting only the latter. The next day, while thinking about Rembrandt's view of the birdcage seen through the blades of the mill, he claims he got the idea of duplicating those conditions in order to train naval cadets in swift and accurate perception and recognition. But that was not all. Sherman also felt that this method could be used to train students of art to "see at the moment wichout eye movement, which results in perceptual unity. A mode of perception that is critical to esthetic vision."⁵⁸ In this way Sherman claimed to have discovered a single method for teaching drawing to art and design students, and "aircraft recognition" to navel cadets through his familiarity with a device called the "tachistoscope," which was invented by psychologists in the nineteenth century in order to control to within a fraction of a second the exposure of an image, word, row of number, etc.⁵⁹ Once Sherman was satisfied that his course did indeed endow his students with the special mode of seeing that he understood to be crucial to aesthetic production, he prescribed it for an astonishing range of activities. He recommended the "flash drawing course" for "reading, athletics, architecture, engineering design, landscape architecture, floriculture, photography, interior

decorating, window trimming, advertising, music, optometry, dentistry, newspaper and scientific reporting..." and, as already noted, for waging war.⁶⁰

That "esthetic vision" could prove to be similarly indispensable for such a wide variety of vocations may suggest the extent to which Sherman understood his project to be the incarnation of Dewey's aesthetic philosophy. Yet it also attests to the fact that, on the brink of war, "progressive" American art instructors saw art not just as a pleasant diversion, nor merely as a "palliative," in the sense Freud outlined in Civilization and its Discontents, but as a fundamentally beneficial activity whose skills were equally advantageous to productivity in general. By the fall of 1942, Sherman was conducting experiments in the first flash lab, or "perceptual training center." This studio, and the psychological principles which supported it, constitute Sherman's principal innovation in the pedagogy of art. Both his familiarity with the tachistoscope and with its purposes suggest that Sherman knew of experiments concerning perception and cognition which were being conducted at Ohio State since the early 1930's in the psychology department. Notwithstanding the epiphany he claims to have had while reading the Rembrandt monograph, Sherman has also admitted that it was in the Ohio State psychology department that he first observed a tachistoscope in action.⁶¹

In 1934, Professor Samuel Renshaw and his psychology students embarked upon a long-term investigation into the beneficial effects of tachistoscopic training on the capacity of individuals to perceive and to retain in memory long rows of numbers or letters.⁶² This amounted to an extension into the conventionally instrumentalist terms which best characterize so much educational practice at American universities before World War II of an inquiry whose antecedents can be traced to the last three decades of the nineteenth century in France, Germany, and the United States. During those early years in the history of psychology, scientists such as Wilhelm Wundt and Hermann Ebbinghaus attempted to disclose the workings of the human mind by applying to its various functions the experimental framework, the explanatory and topographical models of a mechanistic physiology. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, examinations of mnemonic capacity, especially among people with prodigious memories, were a common way to determine, in a manner that was consistent with the prevailing sensationalist or atomistic perceptual and cognitive model, the limits, and to speculate about the constitutive elements, of perception and memory. On an often less than scientific level, a veritable cottage industry flourished into the first decade of the twentieth century -- and beyond -- consisting in the publication of books about

how to improve one's mnemonic powers.⁶³ Judging from the example of Renshaw and his students, by the fourth decade of the twentieth century in the United States such studies had developed into investigations into the conditions of reception, and the kinds of configurations of perceptual data that are best -- that is, most quickly and efficiently -- grasped. Renshaw's findings provide considerable evidence of the assimilation into American psychology of the unitary model proposed by the pioneers of Gestalt: Max Wertheimer, Kurt Koffka and Wolfgang Köhler.

In the United States, the field of psychology was profoundly affected by the visits and eventual immigration of several founding Gestalt psychologists who persuasively challenged the assumptions of the atomistic, or behaviorist outlook. As early as in 1924, Kurt Koffka spent a year at Cornell University as visiting professor. Thereafter he remained in this country until his death in 1941, teaching at the University of Wisconsin (1926-27) and Smith College (1927-32). Since 1922, he published articles in American journals of psychology, many of which concerned perception, as conceived according to the unitary model of Gestalt.⁶⁴ His most important contribution to the dissemination of Gestalt theory to Americans was the publication in English on his Growth of the Mind (1921), and Principles of Gestalt Psychology (1935). The latter constituted an ambitious

argument for the adoption of the unifying Gestalt model and entailed a critique of the mechanistic and atomistic mappings of the mind and its functions. Koffka argued for the unification or, at least, coordination of the specialized and isolated physical sciences to help to establish a framework in which such historically incompatible philosophical categories as "nature, life and mind" could be reconciled.⁶⁵ Hoyt Sherman's apparently boundless enthusiasm for Gestalt was prompted by that aspect of the theory which led Koffka to say, for example, that in the face of a "world which has fallen to pieces" Gestalt was "particularly well fitted for the task of integration;" that "if inanimate life shares with life the aspect of order, then the respect which we feel directly and unreflectively for life will spread over to inanimate nature also."⁶⁶ Similarly, Sherman -- and perhaps Dewey -- would have been excited by Koffka's suggestion that Gestalt could "explain the creation or enjoyment of a work of art..." as no previous body of psychological discourse could.⁶⁷

In his Principles of Gestalt Psychology, Koffka's argument took the form of a lengthy critique of the fragmentary, additive relations between stimuli, context, and receptive organism -- the constituents of human experience, as they had been arranged in various permutations and combinations by earlier psychologists,

depending upon whether they be of the "introspectionist" (Koffka's term for atomist or sensationalist) or "behaviorist" variety.⁶⁸ Throughout, Koffka argued for the "molar" over the "molecular" model, and insisted upon the value of what Wolfgang Köhler had called "direct experience" to arrive at the distinctive understanding of reality which the psychologist depended upon to define the object of his investigation. The Gestaltists thus redefined that "objective" reality, taking into account the physiological processes and the experience of the subject as he or she apprehends objects in the world.

Above all, however, Gestaltists privileged "organization" as the precondition for the acquisition of knowledge, as well as for perception.⁶⁹ In every instance Koffka and his colleagues depended upon dynamic combinations of empirical data interrelating with a mediating subject; and upon models derived from the physical sciences as an ultimate court of appeals to define the parameters of their "objective" realm. Physics proved an especially rich resource. From it the Gestalt psychologists derived the crucial concept of "field theory," and the more speculative notion of "psychophysical isomorphism." Through their analysis of the physicist's method they postulated that since the physicist, like the Gestaltist, depends upon direct observation to assess a given system, the position of

the Gestalt psychologist should offer a similar potential for arriving at scientific truth.⁷⁰ The psychological terrain could thereby be revolutionized. It could be mapped out in terms of an essential orderliness and functional economy which is based upon a dynamic, more relativistic view of human reality as experienced reality. Furthermore, the Gestaltists could accomplish all this without sacrificing for psychology its authoritative status as an observational science.

Yet while Gestaltists profoundly altered the psychologists' conception of the relations obtaining, for example, between subjects and objects, and took into account the role of the individual in redefining "objective observation," it is significant for our purposes that their reconsideration of the character of human experience stopped well short of challenging the traditional "centered" subject of humanist culture. Indeed, this fact undoubtedly helped to secure for Gestalt its extraordinary appeal as a resource for European and American art instructors during the pre- and postwar period, most notably Rudolf Arnheim. Amid all the discussion of dynamic relations, vectors, etc., Gestaltists maintain a singular aversion to one particular dynamic field, especially in its constitutive capacity in the formation of the human mind: language. Although in the following statement he was addressing the issue of

observational precision, the annoyance which Wolfgang Köhler registered in relation to the unstable field of language could easily exceed its original, more limiting context:

Perhaps we should discipline ourselves to a less frequent use of language reactions in psychological experimentation, until eventually the danger of associating language with direct experience is overcome, and introspection has disappeared from psychology as science.⁷¹

The radicality of Gestalt psychology concerns its admission of the role of dynamic relations to the constitution of its scientific object. This was particularly evident, for instance, in the Gestaltists' contribution to the field of social psychology.⁷² However, it has been suggested from a more dialectical vantagepoint that what comprised the Gestaltists' "radicality," narrowly defined, may also be understood as a means of forestalling, by using the authoritative voice of the objective sciences, the effects of what one might call, metaphorically, a contaminating agent which would have proven inconvenient to this innovatively reinforced science of the mind. Protected by, and armed with, scientific status, psychologists could not admit into their realm of "hard facts" the dynamic, constitutive field of language and meaning; especially as the latter figure in psychoanalytic conceptions of subjective development and accounts of human experience. Paul Ricoeur has argued that "scientific psychologists" -- and he understands this group to be dominated by the

principles of Gestalt -- remain utterly skeptical about psychoanalysis precisely because of the crucial determining position of language and meaning in analytic theory and practice. Ricoeur has pointed out how the periodic assaults on psychoanalytic theory by scientific psychologists have centered on the notion that Freud understood human subjectivity to be constituted in and through the inherently unstable field of language. As a consequence, psychoanalysis has been defenseless against those who, speaking with the authority of the "objective" science of the mind -- the mind, that is, as the relatively fixed "subject" of humanist culture -- seek to "clarify" the terms of psychoanalytic discourse, to bring its object into greater focus, or to debunk psychoanalytic theory altogether. In this way Ricoeur disclosed the metaphysical component within the Gestalt project.⁷³

In Speech and Phenomenon Jacques Derrida located common ground between phenomenology and "classical psychology." Initially, he noted that the absolute "heterogeneity" upon which the phenomenologist insists between the privileged category of perception -- or "primordial presentation" -- and representation -- or "representative reproduction" (memory, images, signs) -- constitutes an "indispensable instrument for a critique of classical psychology...." But, he adds, it is a critique of limited value.

But can't one assume the necessity for this [phenomenological] critique of naive psychology only up to a certain point? What if we were to show, finally, that the theme or import of "pure presentation," pure and primordial perception, full and simple presence, etc., makes of phenomenology an accomplice of classical psychology indeed constitutes their common metaphysical presupposition? In affirming that perception does not exist or that what is called perception is not primordial, that somehow everything "begins" by "re-presentation" (a disposition which can only be maintained by the elimination of these last two concepts: it means that there is no "beginning" and that the "re-presentation" we were talking about is not the modification of a "re-" that has befallen a primordial presentation) and by reintroducing the difference involved in "signs" at the core of what is "primordial," we do not retreat from the level of transcendental phenomenology toward either an "empiricism" or a "Kantian" critique of the claim of having primordial intuition; we are here indicating the prime intention and the ultimate scope of the present essay.

To the extent that Derrida proved Husserlian phenomenology "an accomplice of classical psychology," Sherman's pedagogy of art, with its strong phenomenological component, reaffirms the metaphysical presupposition that is common to both, and in which Paul Ricoeur has implicated Gestalt psychology as well.⁷⁴

Notwithstanding its lack of scientific rank, psychoanalytic theory could, especially when considered in relation to the most basic presuppositions of Western humanist cultural production, contribute, or merely bear witness to, the problematization of that traditional model

of a unified, fixed, authorial subject with which scientific psychology -- Gestalt or otherwise -- has remained in ultimate accord. Over the course of the past century and a half, the universalization of the social relations inhering in industrialized capitalist market economies, and the progressive fragmentation of human experience which has been part of the cost for continually, and ever more efficiently, rationalizing nature and the mind have contributed to a cultural assault on the credibility of the humanistic model of a unified, self-generating and self-possessed cultural subject. While this is not the place to speculate about the precise identity of those historical factors, or their relationship to the particulars of cultural production, be it humanist or not, I mention this issue in passing because of its importance to modernist and avant-garde art.

One can, for example, consider a wide variety of cultural artifacts and interpret them in such a way as to discern in them -- in the constituent elements of such representations -- presuppositions regarding the individual subject. Frederick Jameson has postulated that, although difficult to grasp, the structure of the psyche has a history, one that comes to light in such a reading of literary and, by extension, other forms of cultural production.

The conditions of possibility of psychoanalysis become visible, one would imagine, only when you begin to appreciate the extent of psychic fragmentation since the beginnings of capitalism, with its systematic quantification and rationalization of experience, its instrumental reorganization of the subject just as much as of the outside world. That the structure of the psyche is historical, and has a history, is, however, as difficult for us to grasp as that the senses are not themselves natural organs but rather the results of a long process of differentiation even within human history.⁷⁵

The vulnerability of the humanistic model of subjectivity is detectible in the dialectical relationship between what Peter Bürger has identified, perhaps too reductively, as modernist and avant-garde art. This dialectic is apparent when one considers the cultural artifact as a site where the centrality and self-possession of the artist is simultaneously foregrounded and challenged. Artists can produce evidence of their autonomy as "creators" or, on the other hand, they can emphasize their dependence upon the imagery of mass culture or upon structures that derive from industry. Often, as in the case of Abstract Expressionism and Pop Art, the artist produces signs of subjective dispersal which then permit him or her to exhibit a degree of self-invention, or merely self-differentiation, upon which the currency of modernist humanism has depended. In keeping with the character of the dialectic, each work of art implies the presence, or the logical effect, of the antithetical position. The interaction of these differences within the work contributes to the determination of the

meaning of the object -- as will its position within the hierarchical framework of aesthetic reception and cultural institutionalization. Thus in the case of Pop Art, the ostentatious display of subjective dispersal, apparent in the directness of the artist's quotation from the mass cultural source, seemed to reject the philosophical presuppositions of Abstract Expressionists. But this strategy ultimately allowed Pop artists to preserve the conciliatory, illuminating character of modernist aesthetic experience. Pop could maintain the crucial measure of art's separateness from non-art in the midst of a spectacular consumer culture where that separation had become more questionable than ever; and it accomplished this by pretending that no such separation existed at all.

Jameson noted that another way to detect the erosion of the humanistic subject is to focus on aesthetic reception at given historical moments. Under certain historical conditions a fashion emerges for a form of art or literature which is so emphatic in its presumption of the omniscient first person that it can only signal the widespread fear of the latter's eclipse. Of the Cold War period Jameson noted:

Jamesian point of view, which comes into being as a protest and a defence against reification, ends up furnishing a powerful ideological instrument in the perpetuation of an increasingly subjectivized and psychologized world, a world whose social vision is one of a thoroughgoing relativity of monads in coexistence and whose ethos is irony and

neo-Freudian projection theory and adaptation-to-reality therapy. This is the context in which the remarkable transformation of Henry James from a minor nineteenth-century man of letters into the greatest American novelist of the 1950s may best be appreciated.⁷⁶

Education -- and in this case the pedagogy of art will serve as the primary example -- is a different kind of cultural product or text which enables one to address this situation. It offers insights into how the artist as a social subject can be engineered so that he or she will continue to provide the spectator with that kind of aesthetic object which offers, beyond sensual pleasures and resolutionary repose, a haven for the sovereign subject. By recruiting the unitary proofs of Gestalt, the late modern art instructor was able to rationalize drawing instruction, transforming it into a method of preparing students to extend the availability of aesthetic value. Perceptually unified, everyone could aestheticize life in the Deweyan sense. But Dewey's writings on education, democracy, and art do not themselves lead to a pedagogy of art like Sherman's. "Progressive" educational theory and practice developed within a larger discursive and institutional context without which the activities in Sherman's "flash lab" and the ideas that supported them would have been unthinkable.

When, in 1945, Dr. Samuel Renshaw published some of the results of the research he and his students in the

psychology department at Ohio State had conducted since 1934, he wrote that they wished to investigate:

the effects of practice on the development of superior methods to yield enhancement of performance, or to discover the means of making effective use of such methods in training people to see more accurately and more rapidly.⁷⁷

From this strictly instrumental point of view, the data which Renshaw and his students compiled led him to conclude:

Seeing, to be effective must be unitary, coherent, and fluent. Perceptual training by tachistoscopic methods enforces from the first this theoretically sound procedure.⁷⁸

The investigations which supported this assertion -- and which stimulated him to claim that for his trainees' skills, "no horizon was in sight"⁷⁹ -- also supported Sherman's understanding that in order to instill good creative habits in the student -- methods which Sherman described as "unity in seeing, unity in the process of seeing-and-drawing, and unity in the total creative act" -- one needs to create "conditions which foster, and in so far as possible require, an organic type of integration among all these elements as the student moves through the complete seeing-and-drawing act."⁸⁰ Sherman, who established these conditions in his first "flash lab," described the student who acceded to a certain level of proficiency in the following terms:

The pathways between his seeing and his kinesthetic actions were already well enough

formed to permit him to forget the technical problems of drawing, and to work with an ease which permitted his personality to play into the center of the process and place its stamp on the product. He was released to see the thing as a whole and let the personality as a whole come into the process...⁸¹

The presence of "personality" in drawing is understood as something which is "released" when the individual is freed from the constraints of technical problems; it functions, as noted above, in a Deweyan manner as an accumulated, expressive energy, and can be hampered by preconception or recollection. Samuel Renshaw again concurs with Sherman, but only to the extent that he would have agreed that the field of language or articulated thought can play no role in the experience of the perceptual trainee. The goal of the psychologist's project is so clearly concerned with the improvement of the subject's productive potential that seeing becomes secondary in this process to doing.

The perceiver who approaches virtuosity, for example, differs from the novice in the essential respect that he has come to utilize an entirely different set of functions. Imagery and the truly visual phases of the process tend to disappear. The emphasis shifts to the motor aspects of the total perceptual act.⁸²

The instrumental orientation of Dr. Renshaw's project suggests that the goals of the psychology department were consistent with the broader agenda for American universities, as the latter were re-formed by industrial, governmental and educational administrators ever since the

turn of the century, but most intensively and effectively since the end of the World War I. Since the late nineteenth century the mainstream of American higher education was redirected away from the limited goals of classical education to more practical studies including mechanics and sciences. No school better typifies this reformist spirit than Ohio State University, which was itself founded with such pragmatic considerations in mind, when it was chartered in 1873 as the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College.

According to Ross A. Norris, an historian of Ohio State, it was to have a "broad, liberal purpose."⁸³ One aspect of this combined practical and liberal education was the formation, in 1874, of a Department of Freehand and Mechanical Drawing which was oriented around practical purposes rather than narrowly esthetic ones. In 1872, E.E. White, Commissioner of Schools in Ohio, outlined the goals of the proposed college in the First Annual Report of the Board of Trustees and noted that instructors in all fields be "prepared to teach ... the primary facts of natural history, drawing, etc., and train their pupils to habits of observation and inquiry."⁸⁴ Thomas Mathew, a printmaker and photographer trained in Britain, was the first to run the new department, and there is reason to believe that he taught printmaking and photography in addition to drawing at the new college.⁸⁵ The combination of mechanical and liberal

tendencies of the Ohio Agricultural and Mechanical College were further underscored by the fact that in 1880 Mathew was replaced by William A. Mason, Jr., a graduate of Walter Smith's Boston Normal School of Art. That school was to remain the dominant American institution for training art instructors in the methods of popular -- useful, rather than merely recreational or "artistic" -- drawing instruction prior to the emergence of Arthur Wesley Dow's more liberal, modernist ideas concerning the value of art in general education prior to the first decade of the twentieth century. At the Boston Normal School of Art, Mason became an enthusiastic supporter of the practical, dry teaching methods which, it will be shown in the next chapter, evolved under the British government-sponsored curriculum at the South Kensington complex in London. The Smith method emphasized imitation, convention, and utility over aesthetic temperament and originality.

During and after the World War I, the realignment and reorganization of American universities like Ohio State continued at a greatly accelerated pace. Industrialists and politicians then engaged with university administrators in a mission, first decreed by war, and then extended by consensus into the postwar era. With the outbreak of war, business administrators and efficiency experts joined under the sanction of the federal government to form the National

Research Council [N.R.C.]. The council, with its specialized subdivisions in such areas as psychology, anthropology, educational and industrial relations, research information, etc. helped to restructure the universities and their curricula. Their goal was to further the wartime mobilization by creating greater cooperation between, and efficiency among, academic institutions with research facilities of their own, and those of industry. This alliance was to ensure the success of the nation at war by reducing waste in the deployment of all natural resources. In order for all this to work, American youth -- one of those resources -- had to be divided up according to wartime vocations for which they demonstrated the greatest aptitude. Consequently, the N.R.C. adapted the "intelligence scale" tests of Alfred Binet and Théodore Simon, dating back to 1905-08, for broad use in the progenitors of today's college board examinations.⁸⁶ After the war was won, it was clear to industrial, governmental and university administrators alike that the wartime mobilization of the nation's resources had had beneficial effects on increasing the productive efficiency. There was little dissent concerning the notion that what had been good for the country at war could be equally good for the country at peace. The new structures brought about by the N.R.C. were thus extended into the fabric of the postwar era in the hopes of preserving a sense

of national mobilization for the achievement of increasing profit and prosperity.⁸⁷

One of the more significant aspects of the coordination of the university with industrial interests during, and especially after, World War I was the increasing effectiveness with which entrepreneurs saw to it that scientific research in the university continue to function in tandem with industrial research. As if in fulfillment of Marx's concept that modern industry "makes science a productive force distinct from labor and presses it into the service of capital," industry provided the jobs and the grants for continuing research in schools.⁸⁸ Thus, in the postwar years, industrial administrators could and did become university administrators and university researchers became industrial researchers for the proliferation of industrial labs that emerged, as if to prove that Edison's greatest invention was indeed the independent research laboratory.⁸⁹ Prior to World War I, perhaps the most desirable product of the university -- aside from the chance of a patentable invention -- was the engineer. Here was a profession which was conceived in concert with capital, whose ongoing and determining logic was itself governed by the logic of capital.⁹⁰ The engineer, in his capacity as efficiency expert based on the model of Frederick W. Taylor sought those methods by which to lessen the cost of skilled

and independent labor, by employing human and if possible, non-human energy and matter most efficiently.

If some political economists drew a distinction between technology and capitalism, that distinction collapsed in the person of the engineer...⁹¹

While in 1900 there were already 45,000 engineers in the U.S., in 1930 there were 230,000. David Noble has noted that during this period "the growth of the engineering profession outpaced that of the industrial workforce and of the economically active population as a whole."⁹² The demand for university trained engineers was seemingly insatiable both before and after World War I. These upwardly mobile, young white males could find work in any number of industries that struggled to produce profits during a period when, during and immediately after the war, markets had shrunk. Thus, if they did not operate within the more technologically intensified areas of industry, they could be counted on to function in the newly "scientized" business of the industrial management, taking their cue from Taylor himself. While Harvey Braverman has said that the "key innovation (during this period) is not to be found in chemistry, electronics, automatic machinery...or any of the products of these science technologies, but rather in the transformation of science itself into capital," one might add that central to this achievement was the degree to which the American

university had been instrumentalized during the first four decades of this century.⁹³

It is in the context of these postwar developments in American educational administration that one can understand the formation of the Progressive Education Association [P.E.A.], whose rise and fall coincided with the period of John Dewey's greatest popularity and subsequent loss of esteem as an educational theorist during the Cold War years. Dewey's innovative, liberal democratic model of education responded in part to the drive for greater efficiency and increased rationalization which threatened thoroughly to dehumanize American education.⁹⁴ The popular success of Dewey's theories suggests that there was no insurmountable contradiction involved in moving the needs of the individual student closer to the center of pedagogical attention, experimenting over the years to disclose new and more humane techniques for assisting individual development, while remaining true to the larger productive and reproductive interests of the State. Dewey's progressive educational philosophy, with its emphasis upon individual need and worth, figured as just such an attempt to forestall, and even to counter, the debilitating effects of the historical tendency in industrial societies progressively to rationalize life and work.⁹⁵

Ohio State University never lost sight of the practical goals of modern education and was also a center of progressive educational theory and practice from the early 1920s. Columbus has been referred to as "a center of graduate studies in the philosophy of education that clearly rivaled New York in quality and importance."⁹⁶ At Ohio State, the latest notions concerning intelligence testing, the "engineering" of curricula, or -- depending upon the decade in question -- theories like "life adjustment" were tested and then documented in the organs of the P.E.A. or in theoretical monographs by such important educational theorists from Ohio State as Werrett Wallace Charters or Boyd H. Bode. At Ohio State, as on many other university campuses, the emphasis was on realizing "the cultivation of intelligence."⁹⁷ Undoubtedly, Hoyt Sherman -- the engineer who became an art educator in the Deweyan tradition -- was at the right place to research, and then to introduce, his conception of art teaching; especially if one considers that here was one university where it had long since been decided that, in Bode's own words, "Education must fit the individual to reorganize the world."⁹⁸ Insofar as Sherman's pedagogy attempted to reconcile Dewey's aesthetic and educational goals with the more conventionally instrumentalist orientation of Dr. Renshaw's laboratory techniques for increasing the capacity of individuals to manage ever greater amounts of information, his pedagogy was

bound to bear the scars of the contradictions out of which it developed at this formative moment in the growth of American education and art.

Might it not follow, then, that being taught according to the rules of such a system would lead to the production of an equally contradictory art? In Chapter One I argued that Pop Art -- far from being the wholly "anti-humanist" art it was initially perceived to be -- retained vestiges of the metaphysical purpose and conciliatory effects of modernist art. Paradoxically, it is at its most radical or uncompromising (in Warhol's case), that Pop reveals its metaphysical inclinations most clearly: in its attempt to envision artworks as common objects and vice versa. While the producers of "handmade readymades" incorporated popular images and serial structures into their art, they mediated those structures through formal organization and other forms of aestheticization. And by privileging direct perception of the object in experience -- thereby repudiating the instrumentality of commonplace recognition -- they "managed" the effects of those industrial structures. As I will demonstrate in my concluding chapter, late modern art teachers wanted to disseminate the fundamentals of a humanistic visual culture, while responding to increasing commercial demands. Believing in the congruity of science and technology with their goals, they allowed "rationalized"

structures to enter into their pedagogies of art. To a greater or lesser degree, modern art teaching is a means of guaranteeing organization and differentiation in the midst of an environment which opposes such qualities. Under the conditions which obtained in the United States during the 1940s, art teaching corresponded with, and facilitated the intersection of aesthetic and industrial structures, thereby making the latter seem more palatable. By relating these developments to other historical and cultural forces which led to the assimilation of modernist and avant-garde culture in the United States after World War II, it will be possible to explain how methods of art and design instruction that were intended to disseminate an essentially humanistic visual culture before the war ended up reverberating in a postwar art which must be described simultaneously as humanist and anti-humanist.

Sherman's course could not have been better conceived to prepare individuals to function optimally in the increasingly complex, automated, detached and productive society that Ernest Mandel has identified with the third technological revolution.⁹⁹ Sherman tended to mythify the accomplishments of his students, envisioning them as practitioners of new and miraculously dis-alienated labor. To condition people in the flash lab so they might not lose sight of the "whole," no matter what their activity, can be

understood against the backdrop of a living and working environment which militated against such a controlling indivisibility. As for the artist who Sherman trained, he or she would create images of order and harmonic resolution in which "personality as a whole come(s) into the process;" images which, according to Dewey's concepts, would serve as models for integrated living and working. By the fall of 1942, when Sherman was teaching his course, it fully accorded with the uptempo goals of the third Roosevelt administration. At that time the image of more prosperous, if not necessarily more just society was becoming visible, albeit through the distorting lens of consumer-oriented industries which, for more than a decade, had deployed an arsenal of sophisticated advertising and promotional techniques. Those techniques increasingly determined the American vision of the future, while limiting behavior in the present.¹⁰⁰ Notwithstanding the determination of consumer industries to imagine American life as a technological Arcadia, Americans would first have to contend with another world war.

Sherman's course promised to enhance the individual's powers -- power to survey, power to coordinate and to "reorganize the world." His perceptual trainee was the child of the prosthetic god Freud had described in Civilization and its Discontents. Freud observed that in seeking to turn

the forces of nature to his advantage, civilized man developed powerful mechanical inventions which he called prosthetic devices. These largely beneficial inventions tended, however, to "give him trouble at times."¹⁰¹ Sherman's students, trained to be vigilant to perceptual shock, could use their organizational skills to cope with such trouble. Remarkably, they were conditioned to solve such problems in a course that seemed to literalize a phrase which surely was unknown to Sherman: Husserl's "in the blink of an eye."¹⁰²

By the end of the fifth week of Hoyt Sherman's beginning drawing course, a dancer served as the model. She was asked to move through the stage-like space at the front of the studio in darkness while the strobe singled out poses for the students to draw. Again, it was from an afterimage that the students were to produce their drawings, an afterimage which would be accompanied simultaneously by the desired kinesthetic response. As time passed, in the more advanced portions of Sherman's course, the light source was left on for longer periods until finally, when the students were learning to use paint rather than charcoal, it was left on altogether. By then, the instructor could feel secure that they were sufficiently self-possessed, or perceptually trained, to maintain their organizational capacities, even in the face of losing the protection of the dark retreat

which Sherman contrived for them; even, that is, in the light of an ambient and contingent world. The final project for the students in his class was to go outdoors and to draw from nature. Though it may not seem so at first, it is eminently appropriate that this drawing course, so often plunged in darkness, conclude with "plein air" sketching. There is, as will become evident in the next two chapters, a significant historical precedent for such forays into the open air within a century-old tradition of innovative, sometimes popularly intended art instruction.

Sherman's course shared with many American philosophers, educators, and scientists during the period between the two world wars their desire to resolve the antipathies between many categories of experience: between the sciences, between science and art, between art and life, and between self and world. Like them, Sherman regarded this epochal reconciliation as possible, if not historically inevitable, and this, in part, is what made Gestalt psychology appear all the more irresistible to him.

The time has come in our culture when integration of all kinds must take place, and fortunately in the intellectual world they are increasingly able to take place because our science is becoming mature. For many decades science was primarily involved in dividing things up and putting names on them. Now it has progressed to the point where its own fulfilment (sic) requires the relations of many parts together in active processes, causing the establishment of new focal points in thinking around such words as relativity, dynamics, organic

integration, etc. The sciences are coming together inside themselves and in relation to each other. Being in this state, they are contagious for art, which is primarily integrative and dynamic in character.¹⁰³

Describing the perceptual trainee in the act of drawing, Sherman envisioned a state of integration, dynamism, and harmony with nature so complete as to mask the notion that such aesthetic organization may also be understood as a symbolic analogue for the domination of nature. This connection would become more apparent to philosophers after the war when Martin Heidegger stated that the "will to mastery becomes all the more urgent the more technology threatens to slip from human control."¹⁰⁴ Heidegger was not circumscribing the parameters of this intended mastery to the technological arena, but extended it to the symbolic level of cultural production, where mastery can appear in the guise of harmony. The view of aesthetic production as harmonic resolution of cultural antipathies is consistent with the Deweyan and American modernist conception of art production as a bastion of dis-alienated labor, and of the work of art itself as the material repository for such humanistic presence. As Sherman said of his students:

Their eyes, ears, hands, arms, bodies, subtle feelings inside themselves, and the world outside were working together in a harmony and freedom they had not often, if ever, experienced before.¹⁰⁵

The ideals and methodological strategies which informed this educational system did not spring, full grown and configured into such a pedagogical scheme, in the middle of the twentieth century in Ohio. Their antecedents can be traced to the nineteenth century, in the midst of a series of developments in Western Europe which can be dated, roughly - - for the sake of convenience -- to 1837: the year the British Parliament provided funds to establish a design and normal school of art at Sommerset House in London. Starting then, in an increasingly industrialized Great Britain, when competition between England and France was intensifying in the expanding field of industrial arts production, a discourse arose concerning the desire for a cross-pollination between industry and art. Among the demands for new educational institutions with new, more practically conceived pedagogical systems for designers and artisans, there emerged the semblance of a modern social subject: functional, obedient and equipped with extraordinary powers of coordination and organization. This model of a compliant, efficient worker was a response to the increasingly demanding conditions of industrial production. Another model subject appeared: the romantic modern artist, who also possessed great coordination and organizational skills, but who in every other respect was defined in opposition to that paragon of productivity. Each fulfilled the needs of their very different markets. Both seemed to emerge as if to

reciprocate for a fundamental sense of human inadequacy which coincided with the introduction of industrial systems of production and the social relations adhering to industrialized capitalism during its first dramatic period of expansion.

Chapter Three
For the Relief of Toil

When Hoyt Sherman devised his "beginning drawing" course, with its freight of scientific methods and proofs, he brought to American art instruction a positivistic attitude which informed a wide spectrum of professional activities and scholarly disciplines in the United States by the mid-1940s, be they social sciences, advertising or the humanities. By evolving a course of instruction which used scientifically derived techniques to teach the fundamentals of good drawing and -- in the process -- sharpen perceptions, improve manual dexterity, and shorten the time it took for an individual to respond cogently to perceptual stimulæ, Sherman found a way to demonstrate that what was good for art was also good for any number of other professional endeavours, whether art-related or not. While teaching individuals how to forge the unities and symbolic harmonies of art in the face of the accelerated fragmentation and disorder of mid-twentieth-century experience, he attempted to condition his students to remain focused on the entirety of their projects, thereby holding out the promise of greater fulfillment in work. The notion that one can enhance the students' control over the contingencies of their environment, and buttress their sense of the wholeness of everyday tasks combined with the

discovery that in fairly simple Gestalten one has located the transhistorical key to both aesthetic experience and judgment, brought Sherman's students to the threshold of John Dewey's democratic vision: that the experiential unity associated with aesthetic experience could become part of everyday life for everyone, regardless of vocation, class or cultural background.

To some extent, Sherman, like Dewey before him, was retracing the lines of a venerable romantic notion: that an organically based aesthetic could serve as a model for, or positive influence upon individuals and their everyday activities. This idea -- as well as the more general belief that its fulfillment was the ultimate purpose of an enlightened and humane program of general education -- existed in European and American thought throughout much of the nineteenth century, having acquired a degree of philosophical prestige as early as in the writings of Friedrich Schiller. To the extent that Sherman offered quantitative data to support his claims that his drawing course could improve productive skills and unify perception, his pedagogy can be seen to measure its historical distance from earlier manifestations of this determination to salvage individual coherence through aesthetic education, notwithstanding the divisive pressures of an increasingly more secure and expansive industrialism.¹ Sherman's goals

and their attendant philosophical and social presuppositions lead back, far beyond the buoyant period of American modernism to developments within European art and its instruction dating from the second third of the nineteenth century. With its unique mix of aesthetics and utility, engagement in real life and shelter from it, this pedagogy can be considered in terms of its complex relation to the heterogeneous discursive phenomena in which so many of its themes and strategies arose. It is sufficient neither to limit our purview to the great European art academies, nor to the independent schools of art which developed distinctive pedagogies along side them. It is necessary to turn, for example, to the new government-sponsored institutions which were inaugurated in Great Britain towards the end of the 1830s as part of the decision to introduce instruction in what was considered a practical form of drawing and a degree of good taste to large and varied segments of the population. At that time, drawing instruction for fine art purposes would be reshaped in a dynamic relationship with the conventions of industrial draughtsmanship, as well as with the broader productive and social conditions that made the latter necessary.

In 1835 the British Parliament appointed the Select Committee on Arts and their Connection with Manufactures in order to inquire "into the best means of extending a

knowledge of the Arts and Principles of Design among the people (especially the manufacturing population) of the country."² At that moment in British imperial history, changes in the structure and methods of production coupled with the initial expansion of international markets to make it imperative for local entrepreneurs in the industrial arts trades -- and for the governmental officials who so often heeded their demands -- to train the present and subsequent generations of designers, artisans and, to some extent, working men and women generally to function optimally under the more highly competitive market conditions. Although the discourse on "practical" art instruction pertains directly to this attempt to increase the wealth and prestige of variously industrialized nations, it also testifies on another level to the initial attempts to supplement and revise the system of general education by emphasizing practical skills. As such this discourse opens onto the conception of an ideal type of social subjectivity which might be forged through general education and vocational training out of the "raw material" embodied in the working classes. If successfully constructed, this subject -- a model of industry, temperance, loyalty, and tranquility -- could go on to secure the desired national prosperity in Great Britain without challenging the existing disposition of capital and privilege.

Great Britain was not the only industrialized nation to recognize the importance of drawing to industry, nor the only place where the periodic search for more effective teaching methods took place. In France, during the reign of Louis-Philippe and later, the privileges and educational processes of the Académie would be criticized and eventually be challenged while, in a related development, entrepreneurs and governmental officials called for the development of innovative techniques for popular drawing and design instruction. The goal was to retain continuous French dominion over the industrial arts marketplace despite the enormous productive potential of the British. Similarly, in 1870 the State of Massachusetts would legislate mandatory drawing instruction in general education, following the British lead both in the character of the legislative rhetoric employed to secure this educational goal and, to a great extent, in the choice of pedagogical approach. From the late 1830s through the 1870s, the different ways in which businessmen, social reformers, governmental authorities and variously innovative or conservative art instructors and art critics defined and/or responded to such calls for popular art instruction -- be it strictly practical or more "cultured" in kind -- together comprise the discourse on art education with which this chapter and the subsequent one are concerned.

Where basic reading and writing and a degree of familiarity with mathematics described the limits of primary education, and where secondary education for the more privileged was dominated by the "classical" orientation which also prevailed in universities, new practical pedagogies stressing "useful knowledge" were increasingly promoted during the second half of the nineteenth century as the goal of general education. "Mechanical and freehand drawing" assumed greater importance in public education because, as the world's fairs of London, Paris, and Chicago would demonstrate from 1851 on, the industrial arts trades -- exemplified in Great Britain by the giant textile manufacturers -- were to expand at an unprecedented rate of acceleration during the 1850s, when railroads and steamships opened new markets for these and other increasingly visible products.³ The members of the Select Committee on Arts and Principles of Design (1836) wanted to create an entirely new class of designers in order to compete with the French whose dominance was even felt in the role they played selling designs to the British textile manufacturers. These manufacturers needed better quality, original, and locally conceived designs; and the designers needed artisans who could read and execute their plans with considerably more precision than was customary among the English.⁴

In France, on the other hand, there had existed a longstanding tradition in decorative and industrial arts production, one which was not so severely dislocated by a rapid encroachment of industrial methods of production.⁵ In 1837 this institutional tradition, and the educational systems needed to ensure its perpetuation, were manifest both in the dominance of the French in these areas of international trade and in the presence of some 80 government-supervised and recognized schools of art, exemplified, regionally, by the Académie des Beaux-Arts in Lyons and, centrally, by the Ecole Gratuite de Dessin in Paris. This, at any rate, is what confronted the Scotch-born artist, William Dyce (1806-1864) who, as first administrator of the British Normal School of Design at Somerset House, visited France that year on his official tour of inspection of foreign design schools. As for the English merchants, one summarized his complaints in 1835 by noting: "I have never found a good designer in England," while another assessed matters by saying that the "arts extend lower down society in France."⁶ The Secretary of the British Central Society of Education summed up the official attitude towards drawing as a practical skill -- and an effective instrument by which to increase national productivity -- when he observed in 1836:

Drawing has hitherto been looked upon as a polite accomplishment in which it is graceful to be proficient...It however affords great aid in defining, expressing and retaining certain ideas...and must assist in the formation of habits

of attention from the circumstances of its requiring so much care and accuracy.⁷

How was one to acquire proficiency in such useful drawing? Precisely what kind of drawing were these men talking about? Those, like William Dyce, who first carried the burden of responsibility for evolving the British system of training art masters for local and regional school instruction and designers for industry, looked to continental Europe for their ideas. From the beginning, when Dyce returned from his tour of the European schools, he chose as his model the scientifically and industrially oriented Gewerbeschulen of Prussia over the French system which he regarded as more fine-art oriented. That orientation was evident in the existence of fine arts sections within the French design schools, and the fact that all students in these schools learned the fundamentals of drawing according to the same system.⁸ To its critics -- John Ruskin preeminent among them -- one of the more repugnant aspects of the British system for drawing and design instruction as it evolved into the 1850s was this deliberate decision to maintain a clear separation between design and fine art instruction; to shape the former so totally in accordance with a mechanical vision of the artisan's requirements.⁹

Dyce, and subsequent administrators of the central and regional branches of the government-sponsored schools of art and design, maintained a hostility towards the French educational system, yet not without encountering resistance in London and from dissenting regional schools and their entrepreneurial constituents. The history of the British "normal" and design schools and their curricula is marked, from its inception in 1837 through the termination of Sir Henry Cole's autocratic tenure in 1873, by systematic attempts to suppress creeping Francophilia -- the latter most often identified with the attempts of rebellious art masters and students to hold "life classes," or to use the "stump" technique in drawing rather than the British method of modelling. The latter, characterized as a "slow torture" by one of this system's alumnae, consisted of tiresomely calculated outline drawing, stippling, and then smudging with breadcrumbs.¹⁰ Neither at the central design school, in the teachers' training classes, nor at the regional schools of design was the program to produce "good draughtsmen in the artistical sense." This was how William Dyce put it when, in 1842, he acted to abolish a renegade life class from the agenda of only too popular and highly regarded a design school at Manchester.¹¹

Dissent had been fomented in London as early as in 1838 when the Society for Promoting Practical Design -- led by

the history painter, Benjamin Robert Haydon, the radical Whig from Liverpool, William Ewart, and the economist, Joseph Hume, among others -- opened a competing institution which offered lectures in anatomy, design, and color, as well as drawing classes from the live model. In regional schools like Manchester's the local manufacturers complained bitterly about interference from London in the administration of a school whose masters, George Jackson and, especially, John Zephaniah Bell -- a former pupil of Baron Gros -- apparently knew better how to run, at least in the opinion of their local supporters. The authorized program of copying from geometric figures and classical ornament was, from the vantagepoint of local entrepreneurs, ill-conceived for their needs. For example, it hardly prepared the students to invent original designs that would be materially well suited for the local calico trade.¹²

The British were, of course, in the business of doing business and the administrators from London, who controlled the purse strings for disbursing government grants to regional schools, demanded the strictest allegiance to their dry, de-aestheticized and specialized program of drawing and design instruction. The Drawing Book of the Government School of Design by William Dyce was among the first pedagogical products to be considered authoritative by the Council of the School of Design and, later, by the

Department of Science and Art. Students copied its plates, from simplest geometric outlines (figs. 35-36) to historical ornament (figs. 37-38). As a mimetic art, Dyce ranked drawing for the "ornamentalist" midway between fine art and mechanical art. Sharing neither the "moral expression" nor the fictitious character of fine art (a "fictitious resemblance of the object in which the beauty naturally resides"), the designer shared the latter's dependence on natural study as ornamental and structural source. But for the designer beauty was separable from natural objects, a separation which enabled him to "impress the cosmetic of nature on the production of human industry." Essential differences between the two kinds of art were to be enforced "through every stage of the tuition." Indeed, Dyce considered it unnecessary, wasteful, and harmful for a student to stray from the narrow path of a training which they were to elect upon entry to the School of Design.¹³ This divisiveness is remote from the technical and humanities-oriented Prussian system which Matthew Arnold described as "an instrument which the people use to procure the fulfillment of their own desires."¹⁴

Stuart Macdonald has argued that the origins of the inflexible British approach to design and drawing instruction are to be found closer to home than in their Prussian model; namely, in the hierarchical view of the arts

upheld by the Royal Academy, as was manifest in the relationship of fine art to the arts of design. Despite the fact that responsibility for the promotion of good design in England was among the responsibilities of the Royal Academy, its membership had to be coerced into assisting in the conception of the new design program. From the formation in 1836 of the governing Council of the School of Design -- whose membership was dominated by R.A.'s -- it was clear that they were determined to protect the special status of the Academy and the attendant privileges which its members shared. As if to make certain that the students in the government design school were in no way to approach parity with the exalted status of fine artists, let alone R.A.'s, the administrators of the design program remained vigilant regarding those who might trespass into the pedagogical domain of the fine arts. Dyce was only the first among administrators who so demanded conformity to this durable centralized rule.

Some time after Dyce relinquished his post as Superintendent of the Main School of Design in 1843 to the classicist Charles Heath Wilson, he assumed the post of Headmaster in an unpopular class of ornament. There he remained until he resigned in 1848, continuing to teach according to his belief that for a properly "scientific" approach to draughtsmanship and design instruction one

progressed by copying geometric schemas and historical design conventions, flawlessly.¹⁵ According to the National Course of Instruction for the Government Schools of Art -- drawn up by Richard Redgrave and Richard Burchett under Henry Cole's administration, and remaining in use in Britain from 1852 until 1889 -- life class would still be frowned upon, although it would be offered to the students in the most advanced stages of the course. Notwithstanding the fact that, between 1848 and 1852, Cole restructured and vastly enlarged the dimensions of the entire system of instruction in art and design, he ultimately did little to alter the overall orientation of this British system for drawing instruction.¹⁶ Strict and painstaking imitation in outline was still the rule for anyone who, for example, entered the program for training art masters and had to climb the seemingly interminable stages from the lowest grade of certification up to a top which few ever reached. Progress in this sense was achieved only through competitive examinations, and the structure of these competitions only redoubled the imitative goals of the curriculum.¹⁷

Cole found that the original design program, dating from 1837, had been a singular failure, and prompted the Select Committee on the School of Design (1849) to dismantle the its administrative structure. He reported at a meeting held at the Westminster Mechanics' Institute on June 4,

1852 that the failure of the existing curriculum was due not to its own wrongheadedness but to the fact that the students who entered it were so ill-equipped from the start to benefit from such instruction.

Experience in every one of the twenty-one schools has proved that students did not exist sufficiently qualified, but had to be trained, not merely to be able to understand and practice the principles of design (which was the mandate granted to the schools by the Select Committee in 1836), but to learn the very elements of drawing.¹⁸

As a consequence, one of Cole's most important goals became the establishment of elementary drawing schools in major British towns and cities. In 1853 he announced in his first report of the Department of Practical Art that "Elementary Drawing in national education was the new Principle brought into activity in 1852."¹⁹ One year later, elementary drawing examinations were introduced into the public day schools at the request of the Committee of Council on Education.²⁰ The British system of drawing instruction was structured to provide the future art school teacher, designer, artisan, and -- following Cole's logic to its eventual, though still remote, conclusion -- every British child, with a combination of discipline, a degree of manual dexterity and the powers to copy and retain in memory the draughtsmanly conventions which were deemed "useful training" for all.

Redgrave and Burchett's course of instruction was an amalgam of exercises devised to instruct students in the rudimentary conventions of a kind of drawing so matter of fact, so dry and objective in character as to suggest the positive absence of style. Despite the fact that none of these individuals -- including William Dyce -- was a classicist, the essentially utilitarian and scientific representational codes they all advocated for instruction were applied to an essentially classical formal vocabulary. Although conceived with efficiency in mind, Redgrave and Burchett's was a colorless, slow and tedious course in which students copied lines and curves, studied linear geometry and perspective, and did mechanical drawings of architectural details and ornamental combinations which, once based upon "natural" forms, had long since been reduced -- by Dyce and the other producers of the authorized copy plates -- to the conventions of a time-worn classicism.²¹ In order to ensure the regular curves and straight lines which were compatible with the goals of such practical drawing, the students were trained in the use of such devices as rulers and compasses.

After a first stage of copying the most basic linear, geometric and ornamental forms, the student proceeded to a second stage of "freehand" outline drawings of "rigid forms." Again they copied from the flat, though now without

the aid of instruments. Students first drew from a copy of a simple geometric object, and then move on to copies of more elaborate historical ornaments like the Tarsia Scroll, the Trajan Scroll, and the Trajan Frieze. Then they advanced to the third stage: outline drawing from solids or casts. Ironically, in the midst of an otherwise francophobic program, the casts might be of the lower portion of the classical pilasters from the gates of the Madeleine in Paris, or a portion of two pilasters from the Tomb of Louis XII. Shading was introduced in the fourth stage, when students began by using sharp chalk to copy from plates representing simple objects and then moved on to representations of classical ornamental details, where the effect of modeling was achieved using a disciplined crosshatching technique. In the fifth stage, the student practiced shaded drawing from solid objects and then from casts of classical ornament.

It should come as a little surprise to learn that in a drawing course devoted so much to copying, to learning geometry and perspective, as well as elaborate combinations of classical ornament and architectural detail that "sketching from memory" was introduced at this point in the course. Such memory drawing is akin to learning a poem by rote; or a Latin declension, a history lesson or the geography of the Empire, which is precisely what most

British school children did at this time in the nineteenth century. Memorization was the operational heart of this educational tradition which was consistent with the prevailing sensationalist and associationist psychological outlook.²² On the other hand, in contemporary Prussian Gewerbeschulen drawing from memory seems not have been practiced at all, thus suggesting that in Great Britain this practice evolved from the native tradition of catechistic instruction.²³ Memory drawing remained a feature of the National Course, even in many of its more advanced stages: those devoted to classical figure and flower drawing, in which authorized plates and copy-books again served as the preliminary objects of imitation. It was also prominent in the painting and modeling courses which students could pursue only after completing the drawing course. To the design school administrators drawing from memory must have seemed a crucial teaching aid since it was commonly understood that if the students memorized the classical vocabulary of form, they would then be equipped to recombine its elements in the countless permutations with which design "innovation" was then associated.²⁴ However we shall see that this was neither the only time, place nor way in which memory drawing was to be advocated by nineteenth-century European drawing instructors, artists and critics. There were telling differences among the attitudes towards such memory work on the part of individuals like Richard

Burchett, Walter Smith and John Ruskin, among the British and Americans; Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Elizabeth Cavé, Viollet-le-Duc and Charles Baudelaire, among the French.

As is evident in the engravings and casts which the students were to copy so faithfully, drawing instruction was intended to enable students to see and render objects within the normative conventions of a "mechanical" and/or classical representational codes. When the most advanced students drew natural forms -- whether in the eighth stage of the drawing course, when they might actually draw from the draped or nude human figure, or in the tenth, when they drew from flowers and foliage (in both cases, having first drawn from casts) -- it was to enable them to render more competently the natural forms which functioned in their supporting role within a post-Renaissance tradition of ornament and figural design. Drawing from memory therefore contributed as well to the maintenance of the existing horizon for invention in design; it could help to forestall the erosion and eventual disintegration of historicist design traditions in the face of the progressive rationalization of production methods that would result from revolutions in technology, among other factors. To the late twentieth-century observer this seems a remarkably conservative way to try to achieve the goals outlined by the British planners: to increase originality of indigenous industrial arts design and improve

the quality of product manufacturing. There were some notable exceptions for fee-paying design students. In 1852 Cole established "Special Technical Classes" on the second floor of Marlborough House. There Gottfried Semper conducted classes in metalwork, pottery, furniture design, woven textile fabrics and chromo-lithography which were consistent with his belief that designers must directly experience materials and working procedures. When Semper left for Zurich in 1855, Ralph Wornum (Professor of Ornamental Art) and Richard Redgrave, neither of whom believed in the necessity for such hands-on experience, returned the special classes to the more conservative and ineffectual domain of abstract design instruction. In general, then, there existed an incongruity between the curriculum and the problems to which it was intended to respond. This incongruity opens onto other contradictions within the simultaneously utilitarian and conservative educational ideology which Sir Henry Cole believed in with such conviction.²⁵

Consider how an individual like Richard Burchett, the most outspoken of the "rebels of 1845,"²⁶ articulated the rationale behind the British program of art instruction, and the desirability of its broadest possible application in Britain when, in 1857, the Central Art Training School at Marlborough House -- of which Burchett was Headmaster -- was being relocated to the South Kensington complex. Caught up

in the buoyancy of the moment, Burchett touched on a number of different themes which together comprise an overview of the dominant attitudes in Great Britain concerning practical and popular art instruction. Burchett's report demonstrated that such practical art instruction had to be described in exclusively utilitarian terms if anyone of influence was to be convinced of its value. He located the need for useful art instruction well within the concerns and terminology of the increasingly industrialized conditions of production in mid-nineteenth-century England. Burchett comes close to invoking the spectre of Mary Shelly's Frankenstein when he writes that in "the present state of mechanical science...man must be the ruling and directing master of the machinery, or he will become its slave."²⁷ Such "slavery," he suggests, can be averted only if the state cultivates the laborer's two most important faculties: the "perceptive" and the "reproductive."

Regarded awright, drawing in general education is the most potent means for developing the perceptual faculties, teaching the student to see correctly and to understand what he sees. Drawing, if well taught, is the constant practice of the analysis of forms, and by this practice the eye is quickened and rendered incomparably more accurate, and as the eye is the most open and ready road through which knowledge passes to the mind, the full development of its powers can be a matter of no small importance to all; in this respect then, as an educator of the eye, drawing is a most valuable means...But there is another faculty engaged in this study, that one which distinguishes man from the cleverest animals -- the hand is employed, and it also is educated and

trained to be more completely under control of the will.²⁸

As steam production was extended throughout the British system of commodity production and distribution by the middle of the nineteenth century, discipline, perception, coordination and retention of knowledge were perceived to be matters of the utmost importance. Not only did these capacities acquire meaning in the context of production, they can also be read appreciably in terms of the political struggles which inspired fear and the application of repressive measures in Britain and, even more dramatically, on the continent from the late 1840s into the early 1850s. Burchett shared in the sometimes paternalistic rhetoric of reform when he described the British state as the "wise father" of a social "family" who seeks to secure prosperity by developing the "intellectual and physical powers of each of its children..."²⁹ Referring to the preconditions for, and the parameters of, the new educational agenda, he noted that the "moral and intellectual development of our people is undoubtedly the great social problem of the present day..."³⁰

Although the central and regional design schools would, by the 1860s, achieve some degree of success at improving the competitiveness of the British design trades at the international expositions during that decade, it paid little

more than lip service to that other goal that was articulated as a part of the national plan for popular art instruction: improving the capabilities of poor artisans through education and training.³¹ According to utilitarian wisdom in nineteenth-century Great Britain and elsewhere, education and work together constituted the best recipe for social reform. "Self help" was the only politically palatable manner in which to speak of the need for change, even among reformers.³² Idealistic visions of social mobility through education, as envisioned early in the century by men like Robert Owen who held that children of "any one class in the world may be readily formed into men of any other class" figured little in the priorities of the South Kensington system. If Jeremy Bentham's dictum of the greatest happiness to the greatest number of people appealed to the proponents of an extensive system of practical art instruction, this was because of the largely Malthusian rationalism which determined the limits of that "number" and that "happiness."³³ For example, unlike Owen, and long before Richard Burchett, William Dyce proceeded from the High Church position according to which society, divided into classes, should provide for a training deemed absolutely necessary in order to fulfill his or her divinely predestined social duty.³⁴ Henry Cole, during whose administration of the Department of Practical Art of the Board of Trade it had become customary to make claims about

educating the masses and providing government- or industry-supported scholarships to the design schools for poor artisans, was also prone to arguing -- as he had in 1844 -- that "the instant you begin to distribute public money -- any amount you give never affords any satisfaction."³⁵ From the start, Cole proved that among his most remarkable skills -- and remarkable they were -- was that mode of institutional administration which, recently revived by educational administrators in our own time, attempts to place much of the burden for fiscal support squarely on the shoulders of those whose situation the system of public instruction is supposed to improve.³⁶

Thus Cole would devise the system of paying regional schools on results of competitive national examinations given their students, a system which he instituted partially from 1854 and exclusively in 1863. Cole's administration finally came under attack in 1863-64 for placing too much emphasis on financing the museum at South Kensington instead of properly paying masters and funding the instruction of poor students. While in 1863 there were 368 students attending the Manchester school of design, of that number only 46 could be classed as artisans. What's more, at South Kensington nine-tenths of the student population were fee-paying, relatively privileged students. By 1864 all pretenses to teaching "design for trade" to the poor was

dropped when the so-called "artisans' class" -- populated by clerks, builders, engineers and young architects -- came to be called more accurately, "night classes."³⁷ No doubt there is also reason to believe that under the conditions of life and work in mid-nineteenth-century Great Britain, it was unrealistic for educational planners to expect industrial wage laborers to attend classes in which they were expected to engage in nothing more nor less than additional repetitive, unrewarding and, of course, scrupulous work in the form of drawing from copy book plates and casts during time set aside for them in the very early morning or early evening. As Edmund Potter, former president of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce and head of the Manchester school, said in 1864 of the young calico printers, "...it is not likely that, tired and dirty at six o'clock they will walk one or two miles to Art School before they go home; they will not and do not do it."³⁸

While the training system for designers and art masters, and the institution of art instruction in the "schools for the poor" did not actually extend very far down into the economic netherworld to the proletariat, it may nevertheless have consolidated a degree of support among those members of the somewhat less poor whose lives it did touch. The systematic instruction of designers and art teachers and the introduction of drawing into the British

system of general education was ostensibly a practical response to the economic requirements of manufacturers who required greater numbers of better designers and more highly skilled artisans -- skilled in the sense that they could draw and read plans with precision. Here, according to the commonplace analogy, was a form of visual literacy which led relatively liberal figures like Burchett to state: "...and what is writing but the drawing of a series of arbitrary signs...the art of writing is, in fact, nothing but drawing from memory."³⁹ Consequently, improving memory may well have been among the curriculum's ancillary goals. According to the logic of this pedagogical system, the visual literacy afforded by popular drawing instruction had as much if not more value for the manufacturer who employs the student than literacy less metaphorically understood, since it alone might result in a more highly skilled, yet socially static labor force. On the other hand, there were those who, like Burchett, implied that knowing the fundamentals of draughtsmanship might help to facilitate learning how to read and write. In the latter case, the popular dissemination of drawing instruction may have contributed to the "embourgeoisement" of that small segment of the artisanal class who would then be in a position to join what Marx and Engels called the "labour aristocracy."⁴⁰ It was necessary, and not that difficult, to inculcate in that fraction of the working poor who might achieve their modicum

of upward mobility the Christian virtues of discipline and hard work, and a belief in their eventual reward.

One might also consider in this regard the much vaunted museological component to the London design complex which Cole envisioned and realized. In 1851 Cole appointed Owen Jones to select the first objects for a new museum of "ornamental manufactures." Plans for this museum were inseparable from the goals of the design and normal school curricula which it was to supplement. More than just another imperial showcase, the museum was conceived to guide the nation's manufacturers, designers, craftsmen and consumers in properly cultivated traditions of design and taste. Jones selected its first artifacts from the displays of the Great Exhibition, itself administered by Cole, and these objects would become part of the nucleus of the future Victoria and Albert Museum. Moreover, the decision to create a "traveling" version of this collection underscores how widely these didactic goals were to be applied.

The Architectural Museum at South Kensington -- the envy of Europe and America -- would instill in British citizens proper patterns of consumption, a matter of taste which, however, should not be isolated from the larger issue of assimilating people to the middle classes or, failing that, invoking loyalty to them. The conception and

construction at South Kensington of a vast museum of architecture, design and decorative art was intended to offer students, designers, artisans, manufacturers and the general public access to, and appreciation for, the design tradition it excavated and privileged.⁴¹ For manufacturers, designers and artisans to view their work as an appendage of an illustrious tradition enshrined at South Kensington was to instill in them a degree of allegiance to the more empowered classes, an allegiance that would stem from a sense of entitlement, of participating in the cultural patrimony. No doubt, it was also hoped that the museum's collection would serve as a damper on the tendency of manufacturers to pander to the more flamboyant whims of the marketplace. Charles Dickens demonstrated that while the museum, then (1852) still at Marlborough House, may have failed initially to improve the quality of industrial and decorative arts products for export, and the taste of consumers at home, it still functioned, with little assistance from the parodist, as a stage upon which to observe that tension between the classes which becomes discernible in matters of taste as they manifest group or class identity.⁴² That is, the proper industrial arts commodity might bear traces, however faint, of the legitimating imprimature of an aesthetic tradition. And as Charles Dickens's pedant, Thomas Grandgrind, knew only too well, these matters concerned aesthetics; aesthetics

understood as facts, and facts as aesthetics. Hard Times, published in serial form in 1852, set the standard for caustic accounts of this increasingly utilitarian educational system. Dickens singled out for special mockery the anti-illusionistic bias, not to say, piety that was then being articulated by Owen Jones, Richard Redgrave, and Gottfried Semper.⁴³

According to those who supported the interlocking British systems of government-sponsored schools for designers, artisans and art masters who would go on to teach drawing in the elementary schools, popular art instruction might well secure for the student something more than the intended perceptual acuity, manual dexterity, and superficial knowledge of geometry and ornament. The introduction of practical drawing skills proceeded from the commonplace assumption that such a program served as one way to instill in the working classes the desired "habits of industry, frugality, veracity, docility, etc.", as William Dyce listed the advantages of such training as early as in 1819.⁴⁴ Or, in the words of the Reverend Richard Tyrwhitt: "Teaching children good drawing is practically teaching them to be good children."⁴⁵ According to this logic, popular instruction in the fundamentals of practical drawing was one solution to the welter of problems inherent in an economy as it shifts into the more accelerated and highly specialized

conditions of industrialized production and expansion -- conditions whose numbing effects on the individual became the object of so much scrutiny and theorization before the middle of the century.⁴⁶ Through such training, the individual worker might acquire enhanced powers of observation, greater coordination and retention, while industriousness, patience and docility were assured. Meanwhile, the shop owner or manufacturer could bring more profitable commodities to market. Among consumers, those who visited the museum of design or its touring component and who aspired to the more cultivated patterns of consumption -- then being redefined by these and other institutions -- could surrender themselves to those goods whose allure might now be attributed to traces of the officially sanctioned design tradition.

Discursive logic like Burchett's persisted later, when the need for practical drawing instruction arose as a topic of discussion and, ultimately, as a matter for legislation in the United States. The notion that the dissemination of practical drawing instruction coincides with the requirements of expanded industrialization is reinforced by the conditions of the former's emergence in the American northeast. During the early 1840's, Horace Mann brought to the attention of the Massachusetts State Board of Education the utilitarian and, to some degree, liberal arts-oriented

..

Prussian educational system. Mann recommended instruction in the drawing course that Peter Schmidt devised in Berlin between 1828 and 1832. Beginning in 1844 in his Common School Journal, Mann published Schmidt's method of teaching drawing in a graded system of 24 lessons. The course departed from earlier methods by featuring as its centerpiece the use of nineteen rectilinear blocks, a ball, a cylinder and a niche -- all made of wood -- which the students studied and drew.⁴⁷ By 1848, this course of instruction was being taught in some Massachusetts grammar schools in the hopes of eliminating idleness, instilling in students a degree of accuracy in judging the relative size of objects in space, and providing them with a method of schematic representation. And as in Great Britain, Mann understood such disciplined drawing instruction as a way of inducing patience and sensitivity to matters of taste. In the United States, however, Mann's innovation only underscored the absence of qualified instructors. Combined with the annual expenditure by Americans of tens of millions of dollars to the British and French for industrial arts imports and designs, this problem made it inevitable that, after the Civil War, a growing number of Americans would perceive the need to increase the number of qualified instructors to teach drawing.⁴⁸ Only then could the future American labor force become more adept at reading and drawing plans for old and new designs, and thereby improve the balance of trade.

In 1870 the Boston School Committee appointed Walter Smith to become the first State Director of Art Education, and Director of Drawing for schools in Boston. On May 16, 1870, the Massachusetts State Legislature had issued a decree stating that courses in "mechanical drawing" were to be mandatory for students fifteen years old and over in the public schools.⁴⁹ In 1873 The Massachusetts Normal School of Art was formed with a technical orientation that was the equal of its British counterparts. Smith was an Englishman who had been educated at Marlborough House when Redgrave and Burchett were among the dominant figures at the Central Art Training School. In 1859 Smith joined the Leeds School of Art, where his zealousness concerning the benefits of practical drawing instruction led him to become headmaster, and to disseminate such popular art teaching even beyond his proper constituency to the neighbouring Yorkshire towns. Under his stewardship, the students at Leeds achieved some of the best examination results in Britain, resulting in the award by the Department of Science and Art to Smith of a monetary prize and a trip to France where he could investigate the work of French students. That trip took place in 1863 -- the year the French government instituted sweeping reforms in the structure of the Académie des Beaux Arts. Smith promptly wrote a report on the French schools of design which left Richard Redgrave little choice but to

suppress it. The report, which Smith published independently in 1864, contained an indictment of the British method of drawing instruction ("a slow torture of stippling with the chalk point"), and suggested that they would "be better" advised to adopt the "incomparably superior" French system of mechanical drawing from actual machines parts, building elements and furniture, rather than cones, cubes, and cylinders.⁵⁰ While his report indicates that Smith had grown somewhat critical of the method of drawing instruction in use at South Kensington, it does not necessarily follow that he would denounce Cole's policies altogether. Far from it. His own writings on the subject of art instruction reiterate to a great extent the rationale behind Cole's administration and its pedagogical approach. There were, to be sure, significant differences between the British National Course of Instruction and Smith's pedagogy as it evolved in Massachusetts. While Smith continued to accept much of the logic behind the formation of the pedagogical institutions clustered together at South Kensington, his deviations from it attest to the different attitudes toward drawing instruction and the value of its broadest possible application that emerged during the period of increased international activity within the field of popular art instruction during the 1860s and '70s.

In his book, Art Education, Scholastic and Industrial (1872), Smith explained the need for mandatory art teaching in the public school system by noting the high level of industrialization in Boston and the rest of the state.⁵¹ Smith wrote metaphorically of the program he envisioned as a prospector's instrument, whose primary purpose is to find in every man that "rich vein of ore" which, once mined and refined, can be harnessed for the betterment not just of some, but all.

Men's capacities lie buried within them, like precious stones in the mine, or minerals in the hillside...the iron ore and the coal lying uselessly beneath the earth require first to be found, and their value to be tested, and then comes the Newcastle pitman, with a mine of natural science yet undiscovered within him, who combines the properties and capacities of those two materials into the locomotive engine -- an instrument of civilization which has done more for every person in this century than any one other material agency for human happiness!⁵²

Echoing his mentors at South Kensington, Smith viewed the absence of such a program as debilitating to the productive well being of the nation. Underlying his assertions, once again, was the presupposition, so crucial to British -- and American -- legislators, that art education is practical.

It is only very recently that, driven by necessity, the English speaking race has recognized in art education any practical value at all...⁵³

Although Smith suggested that art be understood as a power in "ministering to the highest requirements and capabilities of men," he seemed especially sensitive to the value system of those who might judge his ideas harshly. In order to rout these would-be opponents he deployed a properly mercantile logic and utilitarian rhetoric to justify his program for compulsory drawing instruction. It was in similar terms that he promoted his plan for a central school in Boston where art masters and designers could be taught.

Within the last five and twenty years, we have seen a wonderful change in the money value of the manufactures in England. Whilst the cost of producing most of the products of industrial art has decreased by about one-half, through the intervention of various machines and the discovery of labor-saving processes, the actual value of the manufactured article, taking one branch of manufacture with another, has nearly doubled.⁵⁴

At the basis of this account for the increased "money value" of commodities like textiles, porcelains, furniture, and other industrial arts products was Smith's contention that, first, increased industrialization had lowered the costs of production and thereby created the potential for higher profits. Second, he understood that there were three constituent elements which determined the value of such commodities. Evidently not entirely committed to Ricardo's classical political economy, Smith understood them to be: first, raw material; second, labor; and third, what he called "the art character."⁵⁵

Smith continued to stress the "practical" in his advocacy of popular art instruction, and this politically astute educator also had the good sense to link his conception of a well rounded practical and moral education to that distinctly American agenda: manifest destiny. The form of education he prescribed would thus:

...fit men for their work in this world, and not interfere with their prospects in the next. Look at the extent of the country to be subdued and conquered and tell me whether it is to be done by Latin and Greek, or by the arts and sciences. Turn out a thousand graduates from this modern industrial university every year, and you would soon double the producing power of the land and the people.⁵⁶

Like Cole, Smith was a politically adept promoter of practical art instruction, and he adjusted his rhetoric to function in the context of the industrialized post-Civil War northeast. When it suited him (which was most of the time), he reiterated the position of Cole and Burchett by clearly disassociating his utilitarian understanding of art instruction from "those more ornamental or professional branches of art which people study rather as an amusement or gratification, or as a lucrative profession", describing it, rather, as "an important element in the success of trades and manufactures."⁵⁷ Similarly, Smith repeated the understanding of writing as, "in fact, only drawing from memory: and the page I am now covering...is nothing more nor

less than a drawing from memory of signs which visibly imitate the thoughts passing through my mind."⁵⁸ Moreover, Smith claimed that in London, in 1852, one half of the elementary school time devoted to writing was in fact being spent drawing, "with the result that writing had been better and the power of drawing was a clear gain." Anticipating the democratic ideals of some twentieth-century art educators -- among them, Gropius and Hoyt Sherman -- he stated that "...a hundred percent of school children could be taught to draw well, and [this] demonstration shattered the ancient notion of genius monopolizing art powers."⁵⁹ Similarly, Smith departed from the prevailing wisdom which held that talent is indispensable in learning how to draw: "It is a matter of mere conjecture," he noted, "whether such gifts exist at all..."⁶⁰

As in the system at South Kensington, Smith's The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions and Original Designs for Public Schools, Drawing Classes, and Schools of Art in America (1872) presupposed that students could learn to draw properly by copying the clearly outlined forms in this four section volume of plates. The first plates consist of comparative studies of straight lines and geometric linear configurations, until curves are introduced (figs. 39-44). In the introductory remarks to the Standard Reproductions, Smith noted that, while he had produced original designs for

the books, many of his engravings were reproductions of "such works as have been tested and found valuable in European schools". Thus the six already noted are derived from William Dyce's copy books.⁶¹ There are, of course, plates designed to familiarize some students with classical ornamental conventions (fig. 45). Others (fig. 46) respond to the problem of how to sustain an individual's interest by grouping a more sensitively limned flower or plant, the growth patterns and organic symmetries of which underly the more abstracted classical configuration with which they are juxtaposed. This was not the only technique which Smith used to counter the inherent boredom of the copy-book system; nor was it the only way in which he attempted to train students to see and render parallels between natural and manmade objects. Some plates juxtapose an outline drawing of a natural object -- like the pear in figure 47 -- with the images of common objects -- in this case, fruit knife, spindle and spoon -- to demonstrate congruencies at the varied levels of use, form and representational schema. Or a plier and trowel may share the page with two classical ornamental elements (fig. 48), as if to underscore the dignity of the useful common object. Smith even inserted the occasional plate bearing images of domestic and wild animals (fig. 49), both to amuse the student with varied motifs and to prove that the representational tricks of the trade which the students can learn in copying floral motifs and

ornamental designs can recur, for example, in the flame-like tufts of animal fur. As in virtually all such drawing books, the imagery in Smith's becomes more complex as one proceeds towards the end, where the student is confronted by more elaborate -- and daunting -- ornamental and architectural forms and by outline drawings of classical sculptures (figs. 50-51). These last were derived from such sources as the engravings of Raphael Morghen (1761-1833), to whose Princippi del disegno (1833) Smith alludes in his introductory remarks.

Because the chief problem in Massachusetts was the dearth of qualified instructors, Smith's pedagogy was intended to take less time than the British system to yield results.⁶¹ Consequently, students were encouraged to draw with greater speed, not to spend months on the same exercise as did their British counterparts.⁶² Smith displayed special enthusiasm for one feature of the British course of instruction: drawing from memory:

I attach the very highest importance to the systematic development of memory drawing as an element of education; and art education is incomplete without it. Beginning with geometric forms of a given size, it will be possible to lead even the children in primary schools to reproduce entirely from memory the copies which they have already drawn, however elaborate and full of detail they may be. The memory exercises will consist of special examples or of recently finished drawings, the proportions of which will be easily remembered; though at first it may be necessary that the teacher should describe to the

class some of the leading characteristics of the example given, or sketch it freely on the blackboard to refresh the memory before the pupils proceed to draw it.⁶³

It is tempting to speculate about the reasons why Smith chose to emphasize this aspect of the British system for his American constituents. By the time he arrived in Massachusetts, memory drawing had become a somewhat more complex, diversified matter in Great Britain than it was when Redgrave and Burchett incorporated it into the National Course of Instruction. A notably different kind of memory drawing than the sort described above had acquired considerable prestige in London, despite its French origins. This French conception of drawing from memory and its conflicted relationship to the more narrowly mimetic, instrumental character of memory drawing in the British design and normal schools will be discussed in detail in the next chapter. Suffice it to say for now that in France this practice was conceived more romantically, and that it functioned in the context of a system of drawing instruction that did not isolate drawing instruction for fine arts purposes so thoroughly from its instruction for the decorative and industrial arts. The French deployment of memory drawing was intended to foster originality in the students' work, by encouraging them to distill the essence of their perception. Moreover, it was understood to supplement that distinctive response to seeing an object

with recollections of past masterpieces, whether from European art or design traditions, thereby endowing a work with a degree of cultivation and good taste.

First systematized in 1847 by Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran (1802-1897), this technique was the object of much discussion among instructors, bureaucrats and artists, especially during the 1860's, when the French administration enacted its teaching reforms, and when Walter Smith visited Paris.⁶⁴ Had Smith managed to hear nothing about Lecoq's technique at that time and place (which is extremely unlikely), he would have heard of the latter's program for the "education of pictorial memory (l'éducation de la mémoire pittoresque)" in London, since it would insinuate itself inside the government-sponsored South Kensington complex by the mid-1860's. At that time Alphonse Legros (1837-1911) -- adept in Lecoq's mnemonic technique, having studied with its author during the previous decade -- was teaching a popular course in etching at the National Art Training School. By 1871 he was teaching at the new Slade School of Fine Art. Legros had achieved considerable notoriety for his deft, expressive and, above all, swift drawing method. In 1871 the first director of the Slade, Edward Poynter was too busy with his own work as a successful painter to devote the time necessary for academic duties. As a consequence, he hired two artists familiar with

French drawing techniques to assist him: F. G. Slinger, one of the lesser lights to emerge from Gleyre's Parisian atelier, and Alphonse Legros. Legros's speed and skill so impressed Poynter that he virtually entrusted him with the direction of the school. Legros' friendships with Whistler, Fantin-Latour, and others, was indicative of his -- and therefore the Slade's -- positive relationship to the kind of nineteenth-century aestheticism the work of these artists embodied. Memory drawing, as it evolved in Great Britain from this exposure to Lecoq's method, continued to have a significant impact on drawing instruction well after Legros assumed the chair of the Slade in 1876. In at least one remarkable instance, memory drawing can be seen to underlie subsequent methods of instruction well into the twentieth century.⁶⁵

The drawing techniques advocated by the Slade faculty underscore the degree to which this forward looking school of fine art defined itself in opposition to the utilitarian logic of the South Kensington programs. This is apparent in its openness to French methods of instruction, such as the romantic use of memory drawing instead of its dry, instrumental application in the schools of design. Yet just as the Anglo-American attitude towards drawing from memory emerged within the businesslike context of a rigorously utilitarian conception of art instruction, the French

application of this mnemonic technique also originated in response to demands for innovative methods of drawing instruction in the context of international competition in industrial arts trade. Be that as it may, in France it first evolved within the atelier of an academically trained artist. Lecoq's independent studio was such that Auguste Rodin, his most illustrious alumnus, could state: "in spite of the originality of his instruction, he upheld tradition and it may be said that his atelier was of the eighteenth century".⁶⁶ At the French schools of drawing and design (referred to in variations of the name, "Ecole de dessin," "Ecole de dessin et de mathématiques," "Ecole des arts du dessin appliqué à l'industrie" and, finally, "Ecole des arts décoratifs"), future fine artists often went to learn basic drawing skills prior to, or as a supplement to, academic training. There, everyone initially learned to draw according to the same method. It was often only after acquiring a degree of competency as draughtsmen that students chose their special field of interest, be it in the decorative arts, architecture, or fine arts. Typical of what the British merchant, quoted above, observed to be the broader-based awareness of art within French society, or of what Stuart Macdonald has called the less hierarchical disposition of the various arts in France (relative to Great Britain), the evolution of this pedagogy within such a studio by an artist trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts did

not prevent his course from moving to the center of a lively discourse on popular and practical, as well as fine art instruction in France.

All manifestations of memory drawing in England, the United States and France coincided with the introduction and widespread dissemination of industrial processes of production and the widening dominion of the commodity form which, together, characterized the period extending from the later years of the Industrial Revolution through the "first technological revolution."⁶⁷ The use of memory training in "practical" education was in its limited way to prepare the student to cope with the more specialized, standardized and accelerated conditions of mechanized industrial production in the more competitive conditions of European trade during the 1850s and 1860s. In the case of fine art, the kind of memory work epitomized by Lecoq's course coincided with the desire for "originality" in the international art marketplace, whether as a trivial manifestation of the marketplace for artistic novelties or as a response to the progressive elimination from everyday life of other manifestations of individuality.

Insofar as the object of memorization can be considered the training of the conscious or empirical mnemonic faculties, its widespread use within general education can

be considered among the nineteenth-century historical processes whose goal was to discipline the body and mind. Thus its effect was to isolate and exploit conscious, "instrumental memory."⁶⁸ Consequently, the rise at mid-century of the romantic practice of, and rationale for, drawing from memory for more exclusively aesthetic purposes can be seen as a means of carving out a cultural refuge from instrumental memory. This approach thereby contributed to the construction of that separate domain of aesthetic experience which, defined by art and literature ever since Romanticism in opposition to utility, privileges unconscious over conscious, instrumental memory, and signals the presence of "aesthetic memory."

One should not conclude from the fact that Walter Smith emphasized the practical and pecuniary reasons for popular art instruction that he was entirely indifferent to characteristics of a more frankly aesthetic kind. He wrote, for example, that those who learned to draw with less regard for the productive imperative would gain significantly from the skill they acquired:

A refined perception of the beautiful in nature and art, and the enjoyment arising therefrom, will be ample compensation for time spent in art study by those who derive no pecuniary or social advantages from it.⁶⁹

Consistent with Smith's unwillingness to segregate practical drawing instruction altogether from the unitary and harmonic promise of a less narrowly defined "art," he left no doubt that the same art which increases the money value of industrial arts products could also improve the quality of life for the general public.

To change these relics of the past into the living reality of the present and germinating seeds of the future; to translate this as yet unknown tongue into the vernacular language, so that all men shall read it with ease and profit, there will need to be an interpreting medium -- the education of the classroom and lecture theatre. The museum will be the granary, and education is the husbandman.⁷⁰

Smith envisioned the museum as a storehouse of cultural artifacts which could embody in its organization the undisturbed continuity of a cultural progress that depended for its ongoing effect upon its position within a broader agenda of public instruction. Though Smith had criticized Cole for his realization of so sumptuous a museum at South Kensington, once he settled in Boston, he envisioned an ambitious union of cultural institutions that would be suitable for the adopted home he called "at once the Athens and the Venice of the New World."⁷¹ Loosely based upon the South Kensington precedent, he wanted the Boston Museum of Fine Art, then being completed, to function in tandem with the Massachusetts Normal School of Art, either as part of the museum itself or "as an adjunct to it." Furthermore,

this cultural Acropolis was to embrace other institutions, including the Boston Institute of Technology (the future MIT), the Museum of Natural History, a horticultural garden, a school of "naval science," architecture, anatomy, medicine, etc., thereby outstripping on the plane of an imaginary synthesis the reality of the continental model.⁷² His utilitarian rhetoric notwithstanding, Smith's vision therefore shared in the utopian conception of the unity of the arts and sciences that is commonly associated with the philosophical presuppositions of modernist and avant-garde art and theory.

And thus art and science seem indissolubly united, the one being the ready servant of man's necessities, the other ministering to his enjoyment of the beautiful; and their relationship to each other is that of the body and the soul.⁷³

Seeking to advance the cooperation -- if not the unity -- of the arts and sciences, Smith promoted popular drawing instruction in Boston in terms which, while stressing utility and monetary reward, also bore traces of romantic, even Hegelian ideals. Smith was not limited in his understanding of the rationale behind popular art instruction to Sir Henry Cole's brand of utilitarian pragmatism. At the conclusion of Art Education, Smith disclosed his ardent admiration for the writings of John Ruskin, a man of few kind words either for Cole's pedagogical program or for its results. Of Ruskin's thought

it has been said on more than one occasion that it is "dialectical" and, perhaps unwittingly, Hegelian.⁷⁴ Smith went so far as to turn over the last several pages of his book to a lengthy excerpt from Ruskin's The Two Paths, from that portion of it which had served as a lecture in March 1859 to an audience of manufacturers in Bradford. Ruskin chose that site to speak about what he regarded as the "natural" responsibility of the privileged, and the acquired responsibility of manufacturers, to set a good example in matters of dress for the poor who tend to a "flimsiness and gaudiness arising mainly from the awkward imitation of their superiors."⁷⁵

Smith was not the only alumnus from South Kensington who could represent the agenda of the British national schools of design while sounding at times like its most outspoken adversary. Richard Burchett had summarized his understanding of how popular drawing instruction might foster new skills among students in such a way as to anticipate the intentions regarding art and its role in general education which John Ruskin outlined in many of his essays and lectures during the late 1850s and 1860s.

One great object of all education must be, and is, to draw out or develop the faculties; and, perhaps, the highest class of education may safely be said to be that which concerns itself most with the training of the mind as shall enable it to perceive and work for itself, disciplining the mental faculties to become acute and powerful;

while a far lower and less efficient mode of teaching is that which contents itself with cramming the receptive faculties of the mind, loading the memory of the student with knowledge...which he is never taught to use...⁷⁶

Although Ruskin could easily have supported such a description of the goals of drawing instruction in general education, he certainly would not have agreed that the students in the government-sponsored schools of art were being taught correctly. He vehemently parted company with Burchett, Smith and the entire South Kensington establishment over precisely how to accomplish even those limited goals which they held in common. Ruskin regarded their curriculum, with its emphasis on copying in outline and memorizing the highly conventionalized elements, and something of the syntax, of mostly classical historical ornament as nothing other than "cramming the receptive faculties of the mind, loading the memory of the student with knowledge...which he is never taught to use."

Between 1856 and 1857 Ruskin wrote his his own drawing manual, The Elements of Drawing. He never intended the ideas in his book to supplant the drawing programs at the government schools of art; neither did he consider it a singular guide for professional artists, whom he felt should pursue the "academy schools," as had Turner and the Pre-Raphaelites. Nevertheless, embedded within the pages of Ruskin's surprisingly pleasant and picturesque Elements are

many insights into his own understanding of how drawing should best function for the general population. When considered in relation to other essays he wrote during this period -- those which address the related matters of the design trades, the government-sponsored schools of art and design, social reform and popular art instruction -- it becomes possible to outline many of the facets which together comprised his compelling, often contradictory position regarding drawing's broadest social applications. Ruskin addressed his readers in the first "Letter" of his book as follows:

...but if you wish to learn drawing that you may be able to set down clearly, and usefully, records of such things as cannot be described in words, either to assist your own memory of them, or to convey distinct ideas of them to other people; if you wish to obtain quicker perceptions of the beauty of the natural world, and to preserve something like a true image of beautiful things that pass away, or which you must yourself leave; if also you wish to understand the minds of great painters, and to be able to appreciate their work sincerely, seeing it for yourself, and loving it, not merely taking up the thoughts of other people about it; then I can help you, or which is better, show you how to help yourself!"⁷⁷

In formulating such a drawing course, Ruskin was addressing a fairly broad constituency. He was not limiting his leadership to a leisure class whose interest in drawing would relegate the latter to the realm of polite accomplishment. In order more fully to appreciate this fact, it helps to know that he largely based The Elements of

Drawing on his drawing course for the students at the Working Men's College. The latter, founded in 1854 by the Christian Socialists, Frederick Dennison Maurice and Thomas Hughes, included among its drawing teachers, Ruskin, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Ford Madox Brown.⁷⁸ When it opened, the founders of the Working Men's College excerpted from Ruskin's "The Nature of Gothic" as a manifesto of sorts, thus identifying the purposes of the school with Ruskin's understanding of the atomizing effect of the profit-based processes of capitalist industrial production on work and on workers. The college was intended to instruct those from lower down the social scale than the "lower middle-class clerks, and shopmen" who, since 1823, had frequented the Mechanics Institutes.⁷⁹ Classes were offered in a supportive environment which was to help the worker, as the prevailing reformist wisdom of the day would have it, to help himself. The revolutionary unrest overseas, and the social turmoil of the 1840s at home -- culminating in the Chartist's mass demonstration in London on April 10, 1848 -- contributed to the fact that the college offered classes with a more "spiritual," moral message concerning the purposes and effects of social reform through education than those offered earlier at the Mechanics' Institutes. This is another way of saying that the Working Men's College was dominated by the views of the Christian Socialists, among whom Maurice was the "chief practical as well as spiritual

guide..."⁸⁰ The college was never intended to contradict the substance of Ruskin's oft-stated belief that, "No state of society, nor stage of knowledge ever does away with the natural pre-eminence of one man over another..."⁸¹ Rather, it corresponded with his understanding that the purpose of popular art instruction should be directed, as he told a Royal Commission in 1857, "not to making a carpenter an artist but to making him happier as a carpenter."⁸² It may therefore be noteworthy that Samuel Smiles's widely read book, Self Help, was published two years after Ruskin's Elements.

Influenced by the Chartist movement, as well as by the ideas of Owenite reformers, the Working Men's College aimed to instill in those who attended it a desire for self-improvement and independence, and a receptivity to forms of co-operative effort which might facilitate such goals. Since Christian Socialists intended to suffuse the movement for social reform with "Christian" values that would deter violence and revolution, the college responded positively to the development of "voluntary bodies" including trade unions, "friendly benefit societies," temperance societies, and mutual improvement groups. In J.F.C. Harrison's opinion, these should not to be denigrated by later observers because they "did so much to mitigate the worst excesses of mid-Victorian industrialism."⁸³ The Working

Men's College provided John Ruskin with one of his first opportunities to engage in social action, to the extent that the latter is embodied in teaching at such an institution. It also served as the platform from which he evolved a drawing course which, in many important senses, he defined as if in willful opposition to the curriculum offered at South Kensington.

While Ruskin appeals to a fundamentally instrumental logic when he accounts in his Elements for the value of drawing by noting that it extends learning, enhances communicative powers, preserves one's perceptions of the "many beautiful things which pass away," it should not be forgotten that utility, in and of itself, is not the issue here. Ruskin was very careful to define the character of utility in a manner that was wholly inconsistent with the requirements of most nineteenth-century utilitarians. He regarded it as anything which "avails for life," a phrase which he defined with some care.⁸⁴ The introductory remarks to the Elements amounts to a challenge to the Department of Science and Art. The latter had, in his view, confused the character of "art as applied to manufacture, with manufacture itself."

...the skill by which an inventive workman designs and moulds a beautiful cup, is skill of true art; but the skill by which that cup is copied and afterwards multiplied a thousandfold, is skill of manufacture: and the faculties which enable one

workman to design and elaborate his original piece, are not to be developed by the same system of instruction as those which enable another to produce a maximum number of approximate copies of it at a given time. Furthermore, it is surely inexpedient that any reference to the purposes of manufacture should interfere with the education of the artist himself. Try first to manufacture a Raphael; then let Raphael direct your manufacture.⁸⁵

Central to Ruskin's argument was his view that by stressing only "skill of manufacture," while isolating from the latter the broader considerations of aesthetic form and structural logic, the design school program had doomed itself to failure, and to complicity with the industrial division of labor. For Ruskin, the heart of design instruction was neglected in a system which devalued, when it did not altogether omit, the study of natural form and structure. Similarly, the fact that it offered no guiding principle for determining the materials best suited for individual product designs also condemned it to disappointment. Only coherent instruction based upon such a set of principles could lead to the manufacture of objects that would be worthy of the term "art" in the higher sense in which he used it. Little good would come from a curriculum which reduced drawing instruction to a system of conventions to be learnt by heart, remaining indifferent to the varied needs of the future artisan, designer, and school master. But most alarming to Ruskin was the fact that, by segregating instruction at the government-sponsored schools

from the structural principles which he understood as the foundation of all aesthetic experience, the administrators of the central and branch schools were perpetuating an existing separation of art from everyday objects and daily life.

Ruskin deplored and sought to repair such fragmentation within industrialized Great Britain. These feelings motivated his remarks at Bradford when he told the local manufacturers: "Beautiful art can only be produced by people who have beautiful things about them, and leisure to look at them; and unless you provide some elements of beauty for your workmen to be surrounded by, you will find that no elements of beauty can be invented by them."⁸⁶ In this sense at least, Ruskin believed that art could improve the quality of life for all social classes. Conversely, in the portion of his lecture that Walter Smith quoted in his book, Art Education, Ruskin uncovered what he regarded as the ultimate social implications of some highly venerated art: "The names of great painters are like passing bells: in the name of Velasquez you hear sounded the fall of Spain..." He envisioned for England an art that would aspire to the "loftier and lovelier privilege of bringing the power and charm of art within the reach of the humble and the poor..."⁸⁷ Such art would no longer "fail by its narrowness and its pride," but would "prevail and continue by its

universality and its lowliness."⁸⁸ To the extent that Ruskin sought to redefine utility and art so that aesthetic experience might be integrated with everyday life, his theories look forward to John Dewey's sweeping vision of a continuous process of democratization in an American society where art would no longer be isolated from the rest of human experience.

Ruskin's lecture for the manufacturers at Bradford was one of five essays published in 1859 as The Two Paths. He delivered them to several audiences between January 1857 and March 1859 and, as such, they are contemporary with the publication of The Elements of Drawing. Each of the essays challenged some aspect of the government-sponsored schools of art. In the lecture he delivered at the Manchester School of Art in February 1859 entitled, "The Unity of Art," he criticized their course of instruction -- and foretold the future -- by insisting that "art may be healthily associated with manufacture, and probably in the future will always be so..."⁸⁹ Like Sir Henry Cole, Ruskin also wanted to see the quality of British industrial arts design improved, but he considered it crucial, if such an agenda was to have any significant merit, not only to improve design and the taste of British consumers, but to link this to the overall reform of British society. For Ruskin, such reform would have to respond positively to the industrial destruction of the

British landscape and the pitiable living conditions of the British working poor. Because he understood that the value of art cannot be separated from its social context, Ruskin's was of necessity to be a multi-faceted, sometimes contradictory attitude towards the purposes and methods of practical and popular art instruction.

Ever since 1857, when Ruskin started to publish the essays comprising his Political Economy of Art -- an attack on the views of the political economist David Ricardo and the utilitarian philosopher John Stuart Mill -- he prescribed a return to the "guilds of trades" in order to set in motion the social transformation he envisioned. Ruskin looked to such a revival as a way to redress the profit-based, industrially driven division of labor, which he understood to be the dominant factor in the progressive fragmentation of work and the estrangement of workers from their labor and its object. As he noted earlier in the decade, in the most familiar passage from "The Nature of Gothic," such specialization, informed by the competitive logic of a profit-based market economy, had broken men "into small fragments and crumbs of life." In this way his views paralleled the theory of alienation which Marx outlined in 1844 in his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts.⁹⁰ Unlike Marx, Ruskin believed that a guild revival could effectively solve this problem by restoring to workers a greater degree

of individual involvement with the entirety of the processes in which they were engaged, achieving, as a result, an increased appreciation for the fruits of their labor. Of course Ruskin also recognized that such goals required, beyond the emulation of the medieval guild training system, a more skeptical and measured regard for the productivist imperative that could only come about if patterns of production could be severed from their dependence on profit. The answer, Ruskin emphatically believed, did not lie in revolution, but in the moral regeneration of the British people. Ruskin found such moral value in Christian doctrine, but also discerned symbolic evidence of its truth in studying organic structures in the natural environment.

Ruskin understood that the guilds could solve the problem -- nowhere addressed as cogently at South Kensington -- of "ascertaining the principles of art proper to their business, and instructing their apprentices in them, as well as making experiments on materials, and on newly invented methods of procedure..."⁹¹ He outlined this proto-modernist inquiry into the character of materials best suited for particular objects of manufacture -- the notion of truth to materials -- when he described the decadence of late Gothic traceries, as in his statement, made in October 1858 before the Cambridge School of Art, that workers "must be led to study quite different characters in the natural forms they

introduce in their various manufacture." Of course, nature and its crucial relationship to scientific knowledge and ethical truths, as well as to successful art and manufacture were matters of the very greatest importance to Ruskin. Such relationships could not be limited to a concern for the proper subject matter of art, nor the proper motif for design, but had a deeper, structural aspect. As Robert Hewison succinctly put it, the truth of Gothic tracery was, for Ruskin, "its organic form not as flowers or leaves but as stone."⁹² Thus, when he followed this logic to criticize "the deteriorative power of conventional art over nations" -- a phrase which served as the title of a lecture which he delivered, significantly, on January 13, 1858, for the opening meeting of the museum at South Kensington -- he was striking not only at the notion of traditional forms of art, but at the very heart of the National Course of Instruction.⁹³ His antipathy towards pictorial and ornamental conventions, such as those which served in the school of design as the primary objects of investigation -- and memorization -- would therefore explain Ruskin's hostility to anyone who, like Cole or Burchett, could assert that the students at the government-supported schools of art were being taught well.

Although Ruskin, like Burchett, believed that "drawing, so far as it is possible to the multitude, is mainly to be

considered as a means of obtaining and communicating knowledge," the knowledge to which he referred consisted not of a series of draughtsmanly and ornamental conventions, but "the earnest and intense seizing of natural facts."⁹⁴

Whether addressing the needs of the school child, artist, designer or "operative," the study of natural facts was central to the method which Ruskin prescribed. Like other Romantics and proto-modernists, he regarded nature as the preeminent model for mankind; a virtual Holy Grail, nature offered definitive solutions to aesthetic problems. It was the singular model for practical, moral and ethical problems as well. As Hewison has pointed out, once Ruskin established a link between nature and "the social art of architecture, [he] was led to apply the law of organic form to society itself."⁹⁵ Ruskin believed that all "judgment in art thus finally finds itself on knowledge of nature."⁹⁶

Conversely, insofar as he felt that art mediated between man and nature, Ruskin could look to art in order to learn many of the lessons nature had to offer.

The social transformation which Ruskin envisioned entailed the rejection of the "law of Mammon," and its supersession by a fundamentally Christian ethic. As an approach to social change, adherence to this ethic necessitated education in the dominant, reciprocal ideologies of work and self help. Central to this formula

was the understanding that, among social evils, the most insidious and damaging, the one to be condemned among both rich and poor, was idleness. To imagine Ruskin's system of social value instituted throughout society is to evoke a more humane, productive and still decidedly hierarchical disposition of class and privilege. For Ruskin, one of the more important lessons to be learned in microcosm from an effective program of popular art instruction and the study of the natural model would be recognition and acceptance of a fundamental and eternal social inequality among men.

He only can be truly said to be educated in art to whom all his work is only a feeble sign of glories which he cannot convey, and a feeble means of measuring, with ever-enlarging admiration, the great and untraversable gulf which God has set between the great and the common intelligences of mankind...⁹⁷

Regarding work in general as praiseworthy, Ruskin was prone to accepting the Tory radical's horizons of social possibility, as when he retained the traditional role of apologist for the durable notion that an intellectual's work -- "headwork" -- is inherently nobler than manual labor: "There is rough work to be done, and rough men must do it; there is gentle work to be done, and gentlemen must do it."⁹⁸ Combining this with his critique of the profit motive, his rejection of the revolutionary path to social change and his understanding that there exists an essentially God-given, hierarchical division of mankind into

classes analogous to nothing so much as the disposition of the species in nature, it seems inevitable that Ruskin would be described as Christian Socialist "in all but name."⁹⁹ The Christian Socialist movement in Victorian Great Britain, with its criticism of profit-based competition, its pious regard for work, its paternalistic concern for the exploited classes and its belief in the need for non-revolutionary methods of achieving limited social reform, was to find its most suitable emblem in Ford Madox Brown's exhaustively annotated painting, Work (1852-64, fig. 52). As Albert Boime has argued, this painting inscribes as myth the ideology and contradictions at the heart of Christian Socialism by embodying them in an aesthetic system of value.¹⁰⁰

Brown's scrupulously recorded urban view was the product of on-the-spot studies of Heath Street in Hampstead. It therefore personified a working method with which one would expect Ruskin to have been entirely sympathetic. Surely its message as well would have appealed to the critic. Nevertheless, Ruskin remained silent regarding its merits. For that matter, he seems to have refrained from commenting in print on Brown's work in general. There was, however, one occasion when Ruskin did mention Brown's work. In a letter dated March 12, 1862, in response to an inquiry from Miss Ellen Heaton, he commented upon Brown's absence of artistic merit. In unmistakable terms he stated that she

would be far better advised not to buy a painting by Brown, but to buy one by Edward Burne-Jones instead.

Do not buy any Madox Brown at present. Do you not see that his name never occurs in my books -- do you think that would be so if I could praise him, seeing that he is an entirely worthy fellow? But pictures are pictures, and things that ar'n't ar'n't.

Well, you can, I think, do real good, and very, very much please and oblige me by helping Jones a little just now. He has been very ill...¹⁰¹

It is tempting to speculate that in terms of its overall aesthetic effect Ruskin would have faulted Brown's curiously contradictory and obsessive painting; this, notwithstanding his sympathy for its message and his affection for more than one of its protagonists (on the right stands Thomas Carlyle; to his right, Frederick Dennison Maurice, founder of the Working Men's College, itself noted at left in an announcement posted on the wall). Onto his cityscape the artist superimposed a figural composition, the innumerable anecdotes of which variously testify to social injustice, the muscularity of manual labor, the nobility of intellectual labor, and the vileness of otiosity. Yet so teeming is this composition with anecdote, and so inexorable is Brown's desire equally and empirically to record the countless details that, despite its heavily triangulated, hierarchical composition, it generates a striking lack of conviction both as composition and as polemic.

Ruskin conceived of drawing as a pleasurable activity whereby working people could acquire "useful" knowledge from natural observation, enhance their powers of perception, their manual precision and patience. If it accomplished these goals, it would be "useful" in the Ruskinian sense of that which "avails for life". In The Elements of Drawing Ruskin minimized the importance of outline, relegating it to the practice of a strictly defined mechanical drawing. Later, in the mid-1870's, Ruskin reconsidered his earlier denigration of outline drawing in a revision of the Elements. That unfinished revision, entitled, The Laws of Fesole (1877), was written partly for the purposes of teaching at the "Ruskin School of Drawing" at Oxford, and partly as a pedagogical model for the schools of the "ideal community" he planned for the Guild of St. George.¹⁰² As such, it is marked by the signs of Ruskin's effort later in his life, while he struggled with a deteriorating mental condition, to envision a reformation of the social order, and of the natural sciences and humanities in which the social order inscribes and reproduces itself. So vast was this reformation that it necessitated "a new system of names for all things on earth."¹⁰³ As part of the great synthesis to which he would devote his later efforts, he sought to strengthen the link between drawing and other endeavours. Education, centered on the study of natural history, would

yield a greater awareness of the hidden, symbolic meanings to be gleaned from the study of nature. That awareness was rooted in Ruskin's evangelical upbringing, to whose influence he seemed to return late in life.

Despite his condemnation of outline drawing -- itself perhaps motivated by the strength of his opposition to the National Course of Instruction -- Ruskin's Elements did include a suggestion that the reader copy from the simplest outline engravings in such collections as William Baxter's British Phaenogamous Botany. Curiously, this was intended to break up the monotony of the first exercises which otherwise stress the importance of accuracy and delicacy in using the drawing implements. At this stage, this attentiveness pertained less to mimetic accuracy than to the proper and careful use of materials in their fullest expressive range. As a result, "Letter I," which initiates "first practices," is devoted to improving manual skill and perceptual sensitivity, and consisted of shading; shading, however, in the abstract, in order to facilitate patience and dexterity, and not yet for the purposes of describing volume. The reader was first to use pen and ink -- the favored implements at this stage -- in order to produce in squares ruled on paper the subtle gradations of tone which, as Ruskin maintained, could be observed looking through windowpanes to the sky.¹⁰⁴ This is among the first of many

suggestive analogies that pepper Ruskin's text as he tries to keep the reader interested, admitting that this will not be easy. Next, one was to use a hard (H or HH) lead pencil, kept very sharp, to score the space between two parallel, horizontal lines, creating a range of values from palest to darkest. For this exercise he suggested keeping a strip of silk ribbon nearby, likening proper modulation on the page to the gradation of light on the length of fabric. Smudging and the use of stump were discouraged, thus offering one sense -- that of time-consuming, technical fastidiousness -- in which Ruskin's course may not be so dissimilar from the odious and Francophobic National Course of Instruction.¹⁰⁵

Exercises were numbered and organized from simplest to most complex. By the fifth stage of "first practices," the reader was advised to copy the letters of the alphabet -- using plumb lines and compasses -- first shaded in with point, and then outlined with a ruler to ensure accuracy. Curves, however, were to be judged by the eye alone. The sixth stage entailed the first attempt to draw natural forms: a tree, nearly bare against the sky or a wall washed with light. Ruskin emphasized the importance of negative space as a method of achieving figure-ground tension in describing this first nature study. He clarified its value by employing a lively, mercantile analogy that when drawing this tree, when it came to the interstices between its

twisted limbs, the reader should attend to them "with as much scrupulousness as if they were little estates which you had to survey and draw maps of, for some important lawsuit, involving heavy penalties..."¹⁰⁶ Because Ruskin recognized the difficulty of transcribing a three-dimensional object onto a two-dimensional surface, as a transition he advised the reader to begin with an object that appears utterly flat in perception (hence the silhouette-like conditions he had recommended for drawing the tree). Only later did he recommend that the student advance to a tree which appears with "full rounding."¹⁰⁷

Soon after, the reader was introduced to watercolor and brush, this time filling in the squares on a gridded piece of Bristol board so that each row described one color in its full range of chromatic intensities, from palest to most intense. Ruskin directed the reader to repeat this sequence in reverse in the subsequent two columns of squares, since steadiness and subtlety in application was the goal. Next, the student was to fill in circles in a sequence that advanced from flat to volumetric. "Rounding," or shading of a form, constituted another first practice, since nature "is all made up of roundnesses."¹⁰⁸ To this end, the reader was instructed to find a small stone, neither too light nor dark in tone, to move his or her desk nearby a window, and to use a compass to mark the true length and width of the stone on

paper. Then, using the sharp pen, the reader was to sketch in the stone, with an emphasis upon its perceptual dependency upon the relative light or darkness of the areas surrounding it. A rather loose crosshatching technique would achieve the illusion of "rounding" and the effect of the stone's embeddedness within an immediate environment. All of the first practices therefore had as their goal the exploration of basic materials and the most basic draughtsmanly techniques, always with an emphasis upon fostering patience, perceptual and manual precision in exercises whose value extended to their parallels with natural structure. Through frequent recourse to analogy, Ruskin endowed these exercises with an associational value; in this sense he "funded" them emotionally, to resort to Deweyan terminology.

As opposed to the National Course of Instruction, Ruskin was not interested in teaching perspective to his readers. (In 1859 he would, however, publish The Elements of Perspective.) Meanwhile, following the practice which, as he points out, was first suggested by Leonardo da Vinci, he directed the reader to take a piece of glass the size of their paper, hold it up at a sufficient distance from the eye to frame the motif, and draw in its principle lines which then could be traced onto paper.¹⁰⁹ Ruskin also thought it unnecessary to burden the reader with figure

drawing because he felt that "figures, as chief subjects, can not be drawn to any good purpose by an amateur."¹¹⁰ He did, however, prescribe copying from prints by the old masters; Dürer and Rembrandt's etchings he considered well suited for such practice. He found Rembrandt somewhat too atmospheric, and Dürer too precise. Leonardo would have been perfect, but as copies of his drawings were not readily available, Dürer was deemed the best choice.¹¹¹

It is notable that even after the initial exercises of "First Practice," Ruskin continued to advocate a relaxed approach to drawing, a certain sketchiness -- though never sloppiness -- on the part of his readers, which is also evident in the vignettes he used to illustrate the book. The low regard for too clear a delineation also informed Ruskin's understanding that one must "quit(ting) the outlines occassionally, and scratch(ing) in a few lines for shade.

"A good artist habitually sees masses, not edges, and can in every case make his drawing more expressive...by rapid shade than by contours; so that all good work whatever is more or less touched with shade and more or less interrupted as outline."¹¹²

This taste for a degree of artful ambiguity in delineation, so crucial to the tendency towards flatness which Ruskin elsewhere encouraged in art, may suggest a rationale for supporting the idea that Ruskin would have regarded Ford

Madox Brown's Work as an aesthetic failure.¹¹³

Notwithstanding the fact that Ruskin is discussing drawing, not painting, Brown's congested composition produced a kind of pictorial unity which, as an effect of crowd control, countered Ruskin's taste for more naturally achieved effects of unity.

"Letter II," subtitled, "Sketching from Nature," began with the advice that one must seize only the essentials of the natural array. As such, it delves deeper into that contradictory realm where the attention to detail required for nature study confronts the stipulations of Ruskin's more purely aesthetic concerns. For Ruskin, the contradiction could be resolved through his understanding that nature's lessons are learned subjectively, and could even be learned by examining art which has emulated nature at a deeper level than mere surface imitation alone can achieve. The subjective component in perception takes on a value in excess of a more or less encoded empirical "truth." To acquire an eye for the essential aesthetic truth which he sought in the landscape, Ruskin recommended that the reader make wash drawings after Turner's Liber Studiorum, and copy photographic reproductions of drawings by old masters. After making these copies and availing themselves of the latter's "unity of tone and line," Ruskin instructed the reader to go outdoors and do drawings in a brown or grey wash, using a

quill and ink to supply whatever detail was in keeping with Ruskin's formula for the resolution of painstaking observation and more artful generalization.¹¹⁴

Also in the second letter, Ruskin shares with the reader his "laws of nature drawing." Preeminent among them was the "ruling organic law," with its emphasis upon the action of growth. Adherence to this law would assist the student to make the correct choices when faced with the fugitive character of drawing from life, a contingency that Ruskin found challenging, if not disquieting.

Try always, whenever you look at a form, to see the lines in it which have had power over its past fate and will have power over its futurity. Those are its artful lines; see that you seize on those, whatever else you miss.¹¹⁵

The "laws of nature drawing" are more than a series of how-to's and, in keeping with Ruskin's vision of an incipiently Hegelian synthesis between the arts, and between art and life, they cannot be limited in their significance to drawing practice alone. Rather, these laws open onto the realm of human conduct in general for which art, and the judgment necessary to create art from the observation of nature, serves as a guide. Metaphoric reasoning proved indispensable to Ruskin's course (as is implicit in his use of analogy), and this is never more apparent than when, after describing the value of liberty and relaxation to both

art and life, he states: "There is no moral vice, no moral virtue, which has not its precise prototype in the art of painting..."¹¹⁶ When Ruskin discusses composition in his "Letter III," he notes that "in these matters of beautiful arrangement in visible things, the same rules hold that hold in moral things."¹¹⁷ Resorting to a civic metaphor, he describes composition as "the type, in the arts of mankind, of the Providential government of the world."¹¹⁸ For Ruskin, the goal of composition is not very different than it is for anyone who maintains for art a compensational function as a symbolic repository of order and resolution in a life perceived as bewildering in its randomness and contradiction. Thus, when he states that the "great object of composition [is] to secure unity; that is, to make out of many things, one whole..." we can recognize that he, like later modernist critics and artists, is describing aesthetic experience in terms of the positive absence of such fragmentation and contingency.

Good composition for Ruskin -- a stable and hierarchical model for human affairs -- also has communicative powers:

It seems to be appointed in order to remind us, in all we do, of the great laws of Divine government and human polity, that composition in the arts should strongly affect every order of mind, however unlearned or thoughtless. Hence the popular delight in rhythm and metre, and in simple musical melodies.¹¹⁹

Ruskin elaborates upon these romantic and social analogies when offering some "simple laws of arrangement" in order to assist the reader in setting forth "what goodness may be in your work in a more telling way."¹²⁰ These additional laws were necessary because Ruskin understood that the "essence of composition lies precisely in the fact of its being unteachable, in its being the operation of an individual mind of range and power exalted above others."¹²¹ Ruskin pursued his musical metaphor, excerpting from the scores of Bellini's La Somnambula and from Mozart's Don Giovanni to demonstrate the notion of a dominant, inherently memorable element which prevails over supporting ones to yield melody. This he follows with numerous organically derived "laws," including repetition, continuity, curvature, radiation, contrast, etc.¹²²

Ruskin introduced the use of color with the suggestion that the reader "need not hope ever to produce anything more than pleasant helps to memory, or useful and suggestive sketches in colour, unless you mean to be wholly an artist." Even for the artist, he warned, to color well "requires your life." He then urged the reader to practice "breaking various colours amidst each other" because that way they might create a "nobler translucence."¹²³ Earlier in his book Ruskin had emphasized both the need of judgment to

choose from the natural array, but also of "speed to seize certain things that are principle or fugitive."¹²⁴ He therefore prescribed drawing "at the utmost possible speed, the whole range of the clouds", devising an abbreviated notational system, and keeping a book of memoranda in order to supplement memory and better equip the individual for recalling the transient effect of the landscape for that work which remained to be completed indoors.¹²⁵

When addressing the problem of teaching "the multitudes," Ruskin had recommended drawing explicitly as a means of strengthening memory. On the other hand, when addressing the readers of his Elements, he emphasized the quick sketch as valuable memorandum.¹²⁶ There is a subtle difference here which suggests that for Ruskin, who understood that people from different classes required different preparations for their qualitatively different lives, the need for good memory was a matter of one's situation within the social order. Like so much else, it was dependent upon class, the character of one's work and the degree to which one had to defer to immediately higher authorities. Among the "multitudes" memory needed to be improved through conditioning. On the other hand, when he addressed the middle and upper classes, he was inclined to accept the given limitations of individual memory which

could anyway be supplemented with the sketches and photographs he or she might execute at work or leisure.

Because, for Ruskin, fine art echoed natural structures, the notion of drawing from memory, rather than from life or from the quick sketch done after life, would not appeal to him. In this context, Ruskin's taste for "striking" colors against one another was a method of stimulating the recollection, or facilitating the recreation of one's encounter with the mutable outdoors. Making colored sketches was therefore an aid to memory which was inherently flawed; it was a human frailty which was emphasized in the ambience of a natural setting. It is not surprizing, therefore, that one observer has noted that such contingency provoked some anxiety in Ruskin.¹²⁷ A painting based upon such studies might then be completed in the studio, where one's observations from life could be checked against the standard of Ruskin's models for aesthetic accomplishment: Turner, preeminent among them. Though Ruskin, unlike Baudelaire, did not make it a principal theme of his criticism, he evidently regarded successful works of art -- like the melodious compositions with which he compared them -- as inherently memorable.¹²⁸

There can be no doubt that Ruskin would have regarded drawing from memory, as prescribed by the National Course of

Instruction, as senseless. Immutable truths could be learned only in direct and vivid encounters with nature and great art. At that time in England, the only things that were being learned by drawing from memory were the linear conventions of geometry, historical ornament and the equally conventionalized linear formulae for rendering simple objects, plants, and figures in perspective. Consistent with Ruskin's view of the "deteriorative effects" of such conventions, the very idea of a designer, a future art master or -- even worse -- a child or artisan who occupies what little time was reserved for drawing instruction in school by memorizing lessons from copy books and casts would have been anathema to him.

As part of his overall plan for the synthesis of hitherto antithetical experiences and practices, Ruskin saw more to popular drawing instruction than its potential for increasing productivity. In his lecture, "Education in Art," which he read before the National Association for the Promotion of Social Sciences in the autumn of 1858, Ruskin noted that in an ideal educational scheme, the peasant, or the child of the lowest class could find "a means of giving him helpful and happy pleasure and of gaining for him serviceable knowledge" through proper art instruction. To Ruskin, the "helpful and happy pleasure" came first for these individuals because, "undergoing due discipline of

hard labour in other directions, such children should be painlessly initiated into employments calculated for the relief of toil....their attention should be pleasureably excited."¹²⁹ Combining this playful aspect of drawing with the latter's potential for helping the individual to acquire "serviceable knowledge," Ruskin -- and this was not the last time he would discuss the possibility -- positions recreational pleasure at the threshold of utility, thereby conceiving of a method for stimulating attention, facilitating productivity and securing a measure of acceptance of one's place within the social hierarchy.¹³⁰

Arriving at a vision of learning and work to which engagement and pleasure have been restored, Ruskin mapped out a more humanely defined utilitarianism. Ruskin's writing on this subject therefore emerges as an important part of a tradition of nineteenth-century reformist thinking without which John Dewey's formula for an extension of aesthetic experience into the fabric of everyday life in the early twentieth century would not have been possible. To be sure, Dewey envisioned a secularism and a degree of social mobility through education that would have been unthinkable to the Victorian.

Many of the themes that would characterize the American progressive education first surfaced at the interface of the

utilitarian ethos early in the nineteenth century and the unitary, restorative attitudes regarding that value of art that were part of the legacy of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Romantic thought. But in order to account more fully for the philosophical presuppositions of the perceptual theme and the strategies that assumed normative status in European and American art education from the twentieth century, it is necessary to consider that mode of drawing from memory and the mnemonic critical theme which surfaced, respectively, among Parisian art instructors and one prominent art critic -- Charles Baudelaire -- between the 1840's and the 1860's. There, many of the themes already introduced were diversified, giving rise to a type of drawing instruction which, still pertinent to the discourses on practical and popular art instruction, general education, productivity and the search for a fugitive social and subjective stability, also pertain to an emergent critical theory of modernism. It is with this diversity of goals for art and its instruction that we shall return to the scientific and unitary approach to the education of the artist and the training of a productive public with which this investigation began.

Chapter Four
A Memory for Tradition

On November 15, 1863, the "official newspaper" of France, Le Moniteur Universelle, published the text of a decree which significantly altered the structure and curriculum of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts for the first time since 1819. The decree appeared on the first three columns of the front page of the newspaper where only government news of first priority was printed, thereby underscoring the importance accorded this cultural event in France. Signed by the Minister of State, the Maréchal Vaillant, the Decree outlined the administration's decision to seize control of the Ecole from the self-governing and largely self-serving faculty. It made certain that the internal administration, the structure of the faculty, the governing of curriculum and competitions -- virtually the entire range of the school's activities and privileges -- would concur with the dictates of a conseil supérieur, whose own composition would be determined by the administration.¹

Under the terms of the decree, the curriculum was altered in order to equip each student at the Ecole with a somewhat broader familiarity with the various arts, as well as of history and archaeology. Other courses in perspective, anatomy, elementary mathematics, descriptive geometry,

geology, physics and chemistry were required, or merely offered, depending upon one's area of specialization, thereby introducing a more technical, less exclusively classical orientation into the academic program. For example, the reforms were devised to make students of architecture more aware of the material and technical aspects of their profession, thus eroding the traditional hierarchical separation between the theoretical "art" of design and the more commonplace "craft" of construction. Similarly, workshops were instituted in each of the Ecole's major fields: architecture, painting, sculpture, and engraving; again, with an emphasis on the more technical aspects of each practice. The instructors of the workshops - - be they members of the academy or not -- were chosen by the conseil supérieur in another decision that undermined the authority of the Ecole faculty over what formerly was a part of its sovereign jurisdiction.

Some provisions of the decree were conceived in order to foster originality among the students. The rules for the annual competitions were reorganized in such a way as to arrest the aesthetic uniformity which resulted from the fact that, year after year, the entrants tended to imitate the style and finish of the jurors' own works and those of previous winners. Similarly, within the new atelier system, the traditional academic method of scrupulously drawing

copies from engravings using sharp pencil and cross-hatching became less exclusive, allowing for the more spontaneous exercises in charcoal and stump.²

Another important aspect of the Decree saw to it that special courses, which the conseil deemed "useful" could be taught by outsiders at the Ecole in classes that were opened without charge to the general public. Such a decision underscores the extent to which the teaching reforms were informed by the views of individuals who wanted to expand popular art instruction in France. Especially important for the purposes of this study is the fact that the terms of the Decree, as Albert Boime has argued, did not "spring full grown from the head of the administration."³ Nor was it purely a matter of reforming the internal organization of the Ecole in order to bring about a less moribund official French painting and sculpture, or a more historically erudite French architecture. Boime has described the decree as "the culmination of over thirty years of demands for pedagogical reform...past efforts on the part of concerned industrial entrepreneurs and art teachers, who called for an end of Academic elitism and urged the popularization of art instruction." As such, the reforms were an important manifestation of the international discourse on an emergent popular art instruction. From the late 1830s in France this discourse was marked by the demands of entrepreneurs who

were contending with the threat of increased competition within the expanding international marketplace whose most spectacular stages were to be the universal expositions.⁴

The French had recognized the need for nationally administered schools of drawing and design long before the British. The "Ecoles de dessin" -- exemplified by those in Paris and Lyons -- were to France what South Kensington and the regional schools of design were to be to Great Britain. In France the movement to evolve educational systems that would yield better design and execution in the industrial arts production was accompanied by attacks on the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, just as in Britain one of the first signs of determination to initiate new design training programs was the perception that the Royal Academy was failing to carry out its mandate as the leading national school, not just for art, but for design.

During the July Monarchy, entrepreneurs and government ministers, aware of the British decision to improve their competitiveness in these trades by creating new schools of design and initiating more practical approaches to general education, applied pressure on both the government and the administrators of the écoles de dessin to encourage the development of innovative pedagogies of art. This resulted in a host of new, often abbreviated systems for teaching the

rudiments of drawing. More often than not, these systems stressed the importance of capturing in drawings the whole of an object, or the unified, overall effect of an ensemble rather than of copying the minutiae of printed images. From this alone one can deduce that "originality" was accorded considerable importance by the authors and sponsors of these courses. Implicit in the pedagogies developed by individuals like Antoine Etex, Elizabeth Cavé, André Dupuis and Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran, among others, was a belief in the value of popular drawing instruction to help liberate the individual's unique creative capacities, thus holding out the promise of self-fulfillment in work. That is to say, some of the individuals who were pressing for reform entertained Saint-Simonian ideas about art and education.⁵

The methods employed in some of these pedagogies were similar only to the most efficient aspects of British courses like Ruskin's nearly contemporaneous Elements of Drawing (1859). In the case of Madame Elizabeth Cavé's system of "drawing without a master," one is reminded of Ruskin's recommendation to follow the advice of Leonardo da Vinci and use a piece of glass on which to trace the motif in order to compare this direct record with one's freehand representation. In this way, one could avoid the difficult problems associated with learning a system of perspective. Madame Cavé advised her readers first to trace the motif

onto a piece of gauze which has been stretched over a small wood frame called a "calque" or "Rouillet" -- this last named for the teacher who, belonging to Cavé's generation, first popularized this device. The pupils drew the model: first, an engraving; second, an object like a cast of a sphere, a hand or a head; third, a tree or an animal from life, using the "calque" for comparative purposes. Finally, the student was to draw the motif from memory, repeating this exercise later that same night.

Eugène Delacroix, who recommended Madame Cavé's course as early as in 1850, also noted the value of using photographs for similarly comparative purposes. He cautioned, however, that in the hands of the inexperienced the unique strengths of the photograph might lead them astray.

...we should not lose sight of the fact that the photograph is only a translator whose office it is to initiate us beforehand in the mysteries of nature, for notwithstanding its wonderful truths in some respects, it is still only a reflection of the real, only a copy -- false to a certain extent, from the very necessity of being exact.⁶

Cavé's pedagogy was recommended for instruction of children eight to twelve years old, and was adopted during the early 1860s in normal schools such as those in Caen and Douai so that teachers instructed in these schools would then go on to apply its principles to their students. Long before then,

the Inspector General of Fine Arts, Félix Coitereau, articulated his understanding of the special importance of the memory work involved in this course. He wrote to the Minister of the Interior on March 28, 1851. In remarkable terms he advocated this course for public instruction:

Thus, by exercising the memory of children, giving accuracy and firmness of hand at the age when their organs, still tender, are docile, Mme. Cavé renders them better qualified for the industrial professions, makes them skillful instruments in all the trades which pertain to art. With the old methods one could not learn to draw before the age of twelve, a period which terminates the education of the working-classes, because the judgement is not developed. With the ingenious teaching of Madame Cavé, the child, learning almost unconsciously to observe and compare, forms his own judgement, at the same time acquiring that skill which is indispensable in every species of manual labor. Here, then, we have a genuine improvement in the education of the children of the people.⁷

Coitereau commended drawing from memory as the method of the "masters" and the source of their "originality." The edition of Mme. Cavé's course which reprints this letter also includes a student's testimonial. This student's choice of words makes it possible to grasp another aspect of the appeal underlying popular drawing instruction for "the people." To consider Coitereau's reasoning and this student's is to bracket popular art instruction between its two preeminent rationales.

What a change! I look at nothing with indifference! Everything interests me. The objects that pass before my eyes have a form, color,

detail that I never perceived until now, I seem to have entered a new world.⁸

In the context of the political and social tensions which threatened to disrupt the desired social stability and national prosperity during this period of post-revolutionary retrenchment, there would be many within the Administration who would look hopefully to such forms of public instruction as potentially effective and humane methods to effect a productive, efficient and docile populace. Since Louis Napoléon was consolidating the forces of order that would ultimately enable him to maintain the position of Emperor of France, there were those for whom the prospect of what Boime has called "self-fulfillment" among the masses -- implicit in the capacity to regard "nothing with indifference," and to conceive of everything as part of a new, colorful, and beautiful world -- would have seemed an especially attractive prospect. Such a restorative course of instruction would also have seemed desirable in France where the application of steam power as the principal motive force in the production of commodities had just become a pervasive national fact of life and work. Consequently, it is noteworthy that the most influential authors of articles and commissioners' reports to criticize the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, to call for the popular dissemination of drawing instruction, and to adopt that unique blend of pragmatic and romantic logic concerning art's practical, yet liberating

potential were not just philosophical apostles of Saint-Simon but the intimates of Louis Napoléon and his court -- his Surintendant des Beaux-Arts, the Count Nieuwerkerke, the Comte Léon de Laborde, Viollet-le-Duc and Prosper Merimée. Their ideas, above all, would determine the substance of the teaching reforms.⁹

Only months before the coup d'état of December 1851, which resulted in the installation of Louis Napoléon as Emperor, the Comte de Laborde was sent to London to head a commission of inquiry into the Great Exhibition. Laborde's report was the most comprehensive response to the possibility of British progress in the field of industrial arts production. Although in 1851 -- to judge from contemporary descriptions of the industrial and fine arts products on display inside Paxton's "Crystal Palace" -- there was little cause for immediate French alarm, when Laborde finally published De l'union des arts et de l'industrie in 1865, the educational complex at South Kensington was nearing completion, and served as a palpable manifestation of British resolve.¹⁰ The desired cross pollination of art and industry which underlay the complex of institutions at South Kensington lent a degree of urgency to Laborde's argument for closer ties between art and industry in France. Central to Laborde's plan for the renewal of the arts in all parts of France was his desire to make drawing

instruction "a component of elementary education to be disseminated among the masses."¹¹ Consistent with this desire to extend the benefits of art to the masses, Laborde suggested that night courses be offered at the Ecole des Beaux Arts to the general public in such subjects as the history of art and architecture, anatomy, literature and archaeology.¹²

Consistent with the romantic inclination of Laborde's logic, he emphasized that no good system of popular art instruction should tamper with the individual student's "originality." Boime has summarized his views, noting:

This [respect for distinctiveness in a student's work] was a result of safeguarding idiosyncratic approaches in order to encourage a pupil to achieve self-realization: "L'originalité, le sentiment, la passion et ce souffle poétique qui anime vivent de nos qualités et de nos défauts."¹³

Among the methods that were developed in France for teaching people the rudiments of drawing, drawing from memory was considered especially well suited to insure the presence of the "defects" Laborde regarded as indices of originality in art. Central to this mnemonic practice, as it was first developed in the late 1840s by Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran, was the idea that if one were left to one's own resources, with memory rather than the motif as one's principal guide, each person's conception will differ from all others. Memory drawing, according to Lecoq de Boisbaudran, was not the

painful catechistic exercise that was practiced at South Kensington. It was, in the contrary, much closer to the critical suggestion which William Wordsworth offered concerning Sir Walter Scott's working method:

He should have left his pencil and note-book at home, fixed his eyes as he walked with reverent attention on all that surrounded him....Then, after several days have passed by, he should have interrogated his memory as to the scene. He would have discovered that while much of what he had admired was preserved for him, much was also most wisely obliterated; that which remained -- the picture surviving in his mind -- would have presented the ideal and essential truth of the scene, and done so in a large part by discarding much which, though in itself striking, was not characteristic.¹⁴

As a function of the historical dialectic which informs the discourse on the modes of drawing instruction that apply for the purposes of fine art and/or the utilitarian arts, Lecoq offered one constituency a view of memory drawing as a romantic means of ensuring a virtually involuntary production of compositions that echo with the Western European aesthetic tradition. For constituents of a more purely businesslike persuasion, he -- like the Inspector General Coitereau -- could justify this practice in the utilitarian terms of a powerful memory for sheer data. Lecoq promised that memory drawing would strengthen the individual's capacity to grasp a proliferation of objects and imagery such as those in the teeming environment of Paris at the dawn of the Second Empire. Such powers would

also prove invaluable to the artist or amateur who wished to record his or her experience in the more bucolic transitoriness outside the great metropolitan center.¹⁵

At a time of increasing appreciation for the goals of popular drawing instruction in France, ambitious art instructors would have to function effectively within the more competitive and complex pedagogical field. In France, more than in Great Britain, the promise of utility would have to cohere more thoroughly than ever before with that of more purely aesthetic rewards to serve as the brick and mortar of pedagogical self-promotion. This union of utilitarian and aesthetic themes, however self-contradictory it may appear in Lecoq's texts, appealed to his administrative supporters, just as it did to two of Lecoq's most powerful and enthusiastic advocates: his friend and colleague from the Ecole de dessin, Viollet-le-Duc, and Prosper Mérimée.

Born in 1802 in Paris to an old family from Poitou, Lecoq de Boisbaudran was educated during the Restoration at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts under Peyron and Guillon-le-Thière. After exhibiting at the Salon without notable success between 1833 and 1844, he abandoned any ambitions to succeed as a painter in favor of teaching art full time. In 1844 he was appointed Professor at the Ecole Royale et spéciale de

dessin where he had been adjunct professor since 1841.¹⁶ He first published his drawing course, L'Education de la mémoire pittoresque in 1848. As such, his was one of the last products of the campaign, initiated during the July Monarchy, to respond decisively to the news of the British decision to create their national system of design instruction. The faculty of the Ecole met periodically with Louis Belloc, its director, to discuss new pedagogical ideas. It was at one of these meetings on February 1, 1847, that Lecoq first presented to his colleagues an outline of his ideas and requested a leave from his academic duties to try his system on two groups of students: one, between the ages of 9 and 12; and the other, between 12 and 15.¹⁷ Other new methods for teaching drawing would break more radically than Lecoq's with the academic tradition of drawing scrupulously from the flat, and then gradually progressing to three dimensional objects and anatomy. Virtually all of them participated in the overall plan to disseminate art instruction for a variety of purposes, as is evident, for example, in the title of Antoine Etex's Cours Elémentaire de dessin appliqué à l'architecture, à la sculpture, et à la peinture, ainsi qu'à tous les arts industriels, comprenant les éléments du géométrie de la perspective, du dessin, de la mécanique, de l'architecture, de la sculpture et de la peinture.¹⁸ Yet among all the new systems for teaching the fundamentals of drawing, the only one to proliferate

internationally and to endure as late as into the third decade of the twentieth century was Lecoq's.¹⁹

In order to gain the approval of authorities in the field of official fine art instruction, he submitted the results of his experiments to the Institut in 1851. Attempting as well to secure a place for his course within the Ecoles de dessin, whose mandates extended beyond painting and sculpture into the industrial arts, he submitted it for testing in 1856 to the Société d'Encouragement pour l'industrie nationale.²⁰ His original tract of 1848 included arguments which, consistent with the political requirements of professional success, would have appealed to the reader on the basis of memory drawing's effectiveness for both fine art and industrial purposes. Lecoq also offered enthusiastic testimony concerning the need for art instruction within general education. Attempting to bridge the gap between utility and aesthetics, he described memory drawing in instrumental terms as a way of strengthening perception, dexterity and sheer mnemonic capacity. Yet more convincingly, in the same document he attested to its value as a well-spring of the aesthetic imagination, a beacon for fine art production and good taste. It was simply a matter of pedagogical proportion: one had to balance mnemonic exercise with the exercise of every other human faculty. Lecoq insisted that he did not want to

produce distorted, unnatural minds teeming with undifferentiated data. In each case he had the support of unlikely alliances of academicians, independent artists, administrative officials and scientists. For example, in 1848 he had the support of Paul Delaroche, Prosper Mérimée, Léon Coignet, Viollet-le-Duc, Eugène Delacroix, Baron Taylor, Horace Vernet, François Arago (Secretary of the Academy of Science) and Eugène Chevreul, among others.²¹

Lecoq represented his course as "the best preparation of a child's brain for almost every study he might take up later," thereby corresponding with the demands for more effective systems of general education, while anticipating Hoyt Sherman's mid-twentieth-century vision of art instruction as a panacea for all walks of life. Work in the sciences, Lecoq noted, "still needs for purposes of comparison to observe and recall the shape and color of objects." Lecoq understood the value of his course for people working in any endeavour where recollection was conceivably helpful; for example, in "mechanics" which he saw as "at once, art, science and industry." He even ruminated about philosophical attitudes regarding the origins of ideas, concluding that original thoughts, whether derived from visual images in memory or from more abstract sources that enter the mind through the senses, could only

gain from "the power to seize more precisely and to retain with more certainty the images of objects."²²

The value of memory drawing lay in its capacity, if regularly practiced, to keep memory "in a state of efficiency," and Lecoq urged that it be directed "to the acquisition of useful knowledge." Without a memory trained for such observation -- "a faculty of the first utility" -- he added, "our brains are deformed and underdeveloped, and its neglect is only comparable to the sadly persistent neglect of the left hand."²³ An individual trained in drawing from memory could engage in a task and, no matter how dull or fragmentary it might be, maintain a sense of the entirety of his or her project. As Lecoq put it, "...all classifications and nomenclatures would thus lose their dryness and become easier to remember, because they would call up in the reader's mind an exact image of the objects they dealt with."²⁴

Never intended to replace other courses, Lecoq's was conceived as preliminary to them, and therefore may be understood as an early manifestation of the twentieth-century "foundation" course. Its goal was, broadly speaking, to train the student's memory for storing visual information in the belief that this would stimulate the imagination and result in distinctive designs and works of art. Consistent

with his view that the course would prove beneficial, even beyond the limits of fine art application, Lecoq argued that it improved coordination between three crucial and interconnected faculties: "accuracy of eye, skill of hand, and memory."²⁵ In this way he described in the atomistic language of nineteenth-century sensationalism the factors which the twentieth-century perceptualist would seek to unify more completely in accordance with the involuntary model of Gestalt, of "unified perception," and a virtually instantaneous kinesthetic response.

Concerning the direct relationship between memory drawing and originality, Lecoq wrote:

Each person, given entirely to his spontaneity, will see nature in his own way, will feel a different emotion, and find a particular way of expressing it. Nothing could be better than these exercises for endowing true emotion with life for developing personality, that is, true originality.²⁶

From the earliest edition of his course, Lecoq admitted that memory training, if too zealously pursued, could jeopardize the spontaneity and individuality of an artist's work. It could result in the loss of "ideas of their own." To this he responded that one should not cultivate one faculty to the detriment of others; that one must foster the use of intelligence, taste, tact and judgement together, and turn to nature as "the living source."²⁷ Indicative of the

constituency Lecoq targeted mostly, he was careful to urge his art students not to practice the sheer memorization of innumerable details, but instead to foster a memory for essential relationships, associations and values which then could serve as the basis for aesthetic production. The progressive training of youths in drawing from memory was therefore not only supposed to secure imaginations "teeming with images," but with selected images. That is, the student "would have acquired at a young age the faculty of seizing and retaining aspects of objects, places, persons, the effects (les effets), colors and the combinations which their view suggested to him."²⁸

Lecoq clearly thought he could have it both ways. He promoted his course with an empiricist's appeal to industry, and with an aesthete's appeal to the fine art establishment. It thus makes perfect, if contradictory, sense that in his pamphlet Lecoq invokes the "nom populaire de Horace Vernet" as the artist who, naturally endowed with a strong memory, exemplifies "what memory can add of power to talent."²⁹ The contradiction is cast in sharper relief when one considers that, as the century progressed, Lecoq would echo the more purely aestheticist position embodied in Charles Baudelaire's critical discourse on memory and art. In that discourse, Vernet would emerge as the epitome of a populist taste for petty and vulgar manifestations of "good memory."

Lecoq's probable interest in Baudelaire's critical point of view becomes even more apparent in 1877, when the art instructor published his Letters to a Young Professor (Charles Cazin). There he included the following account of his attitude towards photography and the relationship of photographic imagery to painting.

Truth in art is not photographic truth, as many people seem to think nowadays. Numbers of painters seem, under the influence of this idea, to be entering into a rivalry with the camera, as laborious as it is futile. I grant that in the direction of detail and illusion they have achieved results such as the great old masters neither dreamt of nor tried for. Yet to appreciate this triumph of the moderns at its proper value, let us suppose for the moment that photography were to succeed one day in reproducing and fixing colour. In that case where would the most detailed and most successful imitation be in comparison with pictures of nature that were similar to a reflection in a looking glass? While the works of great masters, such as Raphael, Titian, Michaelangelo, and others would not only not lose by comparison with the mechanical pictures of photography, but would appear all the finer. What makes real art would then be far better understood, and it would be admitted beyond question that art is not just nature, but is the interpretation of nature through human feeling and human genius.³⁰

By defining aesthetic value in opposition to photography, Lecoq was echoing not only the sentiments of his friend and sponsor, Viollet-le-Duc, but also those of Eugène Delacroix and Charles Baudelaire, the principle critical spokesman in the mid-nineteenth century for an aesthetics of memory. Describing art in opposition to photography, Lecoq provides further proof that he was less interested in formulating a

course of instruction that would suit industrial requirements than he was in evolving a more effective method of teaching fine artists.

Nature scatters her lovely pageantry of color far and wide for all men to look upon, but he alone will seize and fix her fleeting beauties who can store them in memory.

-Lecoq de Boisbaudran³¹

How, precisely, did the "education of pictorial memory" work? The students began with the standard practice of observing a line and drawing it to scale in sharp pencil on paper. Other simple geometric figures followed: a series of angles, a square, then a circle inside a square, bisecting the latter for aid; then irregular curves, establishing precise contours and extensions by referring these various extremities to intersecting vertical plumb lines and horizontal base lines.³²

After these and other exercises with simple geometric figures, the students approached the problem of drawing the human figure, starting with parts of the head. Using two-dimensional sources -- the ubiquitous academic engraving -- they began with the nose, then other features, all drawn frontally and then in profile. Eventually they drew the

entire head, and continued to other parts of the body. So far, Lecoq's course differs in no significant respects from orthodox academic introduction to drawing. He stressed the need to copy scrupulously while in the fundamental stages of learning how to draw because this trained the students in patient observation and precise execution, and prepared them for their mnemonic exercises. Later, he suggested that the students select one element of a motif which would function like a modular cue, helping to bring the complete image back to memory.³³ It was while working on the structure and appearance of individual anatomical elements that the students were told to take the day's drawing home and study it at night so that they could draw it from memory the next day in class.

After the completion of studies from two-dimensional sources, the students advanced to the three-dimensional model: to the white plaster geometric forms -- cube, prism, pyramid, cylinder, cone and sphere -- and to casts of the partial figure. When the students began to draw from three-dimensional objects, the instructor carefully corrected their renderings. Yet as Lecoq insisted, one of the higher priorities in his course was to avoid monotony in leading the students through the course. He wanted to encourage individuality in their work and, therefore, in his discussion of "la bosse élémentaire" (introductory drawing

from the round), he added, "I refrain from prescribing too monotonous a pace, in order to leave a freer scope for the action of spontaneity and for individual procedures."³⁴ This romantic, one might say humanitarian, view coexisted with Lecoq's conviction that art students must learn the principles of anatomy virtually by heart:

But there is an utterly fundamental study which must be found at the base of all drawing instruction, before all specialization and, like the common root to all the stems of one plant, upon which it depends to achieve its destined height: I wish to speak of anatomy. This knowledge of the structure of the human body...can and should be considered a kind of syntax of the arts of drawing and, as such, should be learnt by heart; and as we see in the study of languages that grammar is taught to beginners as a way to exercise memory and at the same time to furnish the fundamental principles, we must stress in its entirety this precious analogy. It is up to the professor to create attractive conditions to surmount whatever is painful and severe in such study.³⁵

Once the students had achieved familiarity with the component parts of the human figure, the first stages of Lecoq's course were complete. At this point the motif became progressively more complex, ranging from studies of the antique to old master paintings. By working closely from canonical examples of the Western European tradition, the student was understood to fix in memory only the most distinguished and refined representations of the figure, figure groups, perspective and architecture. Lecoq used live models very rarely; only when they had "great beauty,

so as to avoid storing ugliness in memory." As if in fulfillment of another of the imperatives for popular and practical, as well as fine art instruction, he noted: "cultivation of memory is at the same time the cultivation of taste."³⁶

This was a very important matter for Lecoq since his mnemonic pedagogy was definitely not supposed to secure for his pupils the recollection of such unseemly observations as populated Gustave Courbet's Realist paintings of the period. Lecoq was quick to remind his readers that "a true lover of nature...does not see her imperfections, but discovers beauties that escape the eye of the ordinary observer. These he combines and idealizes in his work, impressing them with the stamp of his own personality."³⁷ According to this logic, the deployment of memory as a resource in the production of art affords an idealization which will guard the artist, as well as the spectator, from having to see the more infelicitous aspects of the environment; and this capacity for idealism Lecoq likens to the "stamp of...personality."

To judge from the available evidence, it seems that this lesson did not fall upon deaf ears. Among his students, Alphonse Legros, Charles Cazin, Leon Lhéritte, and Fantin-Latour -- to name a few of the better known -- all seemed to

operate from the presumption of this idea. In doing so they reveal how Lecoq's pedagogy helped extend into the Second Empire the cultural legacy of the July Monarchy: eclecticism. In their works the liberal cultural agenda of the "juste-milieu" lingered on into the latter half of the century in the form of a small-"r"- realism. In Fantin-Latour's case the spirit of compromise and of reconciliation virtually split his oeuvre in two. On the one hand there was the hot house sensibility of his exquisite, quintessentially bourgeois flower paintings which he claimed to resent painting for a living; on the other, there were his preferred works: the mythological or commemorative allegories in which only too keen as a recollection of Venetian figure groupings, devoid of both material and textual gravity, float in romantic mists. The greatest work which may have been influenced by Lecoq's approach was not by a student of his at all. Judith Wechsler has argued effectively that in Le déjeuner sur l'herbe, "Manet can be said to have carried Lecoq's method to a literal conclusion."³⁸ Indeed, as a representation of a directly observed contemporary scene which reverberates with memories of the Renaissance tradition it embodies the mnemonic aesthetic as no work by a student of Lecoq's does.

In the third stage of Lecoq's course, that of "advanced study," the students, presumably equipped with more powerful

visual memories, left the studio to draw from nature or, rather, from their recollections of it. Not only did they venture out into pastoral settings -- with or without nude and clothed models -- but, significantly, they also worked in urban ones. Perhaps atypical of the latter, Lecoq noted that he and his students went to Louis Duc's newly completed Palais de Justice where they drew the classically draped model posed inside its grand Beaux-Arts interiors. In 1858, when Viollet-le-Duc published an article in praise of Lecoq's course, he suggested the broad range of settings in which his friend took or directed his students to go and work.

Afterwards he took them to public places, to troop reviews, to marches and, the next day or that same evening, without doing sketches on the site, the young men would render what they had seen on paper. M. Lecoq de Boisbaudran indeed offered for our viewing a large number of these drawings done from the memory of nature, and I admit that I remain confounded. These were animated scenes: a fire in the Rue de Pari, a public auction; and I found in these pencil studies [ces esquisses au crayon] a delicacy of observation, a truth, a sensitivity to general effect, a movement which too often is lacking in works studied in passing [etudiées a loisir]. There was, among other studies, a spirited exercise of a denuded dusty plain, bounded by one of those lines of trees bordering the roads, the sky tormented by the wind, the quarter-squadrons of soldiers, vigorously differentiated against a grey background; one found there that consistent ease of movement which endows our troops with a particular allure; the attitude of the officers behind their companies, the agitation of the superior officers' hair, the lines of smoke stirred up by the wind, all that was rendered with a true simplicity, a calm, a stylistic brilliance which transformed this sketch into a little

masterwork. Complete absence of chic, of conventional poses, of contrived effects; this was nature rendered without that meticulous dryness of photography."³⁹

A casual reading of this passage could well remind the reader of many similar themes which Baudelaire touched on in articulating the subtle, shifting, often ironically inflected critical position he set forth in his Salon of 1846. From Viollet-le-Duc's invocation of contemporary scenes of urban life to his condemnation of "chic" and "pansif"; from the esteem in which he holds unconventional, seemingly casual dispositions of figures as a novel mode of composition to his consideration of the proper role of memory in the production of artistic images, his comments echoed issues raised in Baudelaire's then twelve year old article. As for Viollet-le-Duc's critique of photography's "dry" representations of reality, which he finds incompatible with the goals of art, it actually anticipates Baudelaire's similar condemnation of the popular taste for photography -- and for any art which slavishly records the minutiae of everyday life -- which he would publish one year after the appearance of Viollet-le-Duc's article. For the first, but not the last time, in his Salon of 1846 Baudelaire deployed memory as one aspect of his critical apparatus. In The Painter of Modern Life, published in the pages of Le Figaro at the end of 1863, he devoted an entire section to "Mnemonic Art".⁴⁰

Baudelaire first wrote about the importance of memory as a significant factor in the production and critical evaluation of art when, in the Salon of 1846, he expounded on the characteristics of a properly Baudelairean Romanticism: that most "modern expression of beauty."⁴¹ Such art could neither be based exclusively upon a study of the art of the past ("...to call oneself a romantic and to look systematically at the past is to contradict oneself.") nor upon an empirical description of nature. Romanticism was "a mode of feeling" and an artistic "idea". Notwithstanding subject matter, this passionate and orderly conception had to be conserved in, and conveyed through, the work of art.⁴² For Baudelaire, a painting must therefore be conceived of as an economic and harmonious whole. The artist -- and here Delacroix served as the model -- must therefore "suppress(ed) the accessories in order not to damage the clarity of his idea."⁴³

In his subsequent section, "On Color," Baudelaire further emphasized the economy of Romantic art, referring to it as "an abstraction and a sacrifice of detail to the whole", in which one must concern oneself above all with masses.⁴⁴ "On Color" includes an evocation of an imaginary landscape which Baudelaire described in synaesthetic allusions to the musical resonance of its principal colors:

"green is nature's ground-bass, because green marries easily with all other colors....red sings the glory of green".⁴⁵

Baudelaire clarified the purpose of this bucolic idyll, still in a synaesthetic mode, in one of the more remarkable passages in this discussion of color and color theory.

Harmony is the basis of the theory of color. Melody is unity within color, or overall color. Melody calls for a cadence; it is a whole, in which every effect contributes to the general effect. Thus melody leaves a deep and lasting impression on the mind. Most of our young colorists lack melody. The right way to know if a picture is melodious is to look at it from far enough away to make it impossible to understand its subject or to distinguish its lines. If it is melodious, it already has meaning and has already taken its place in your store of memories."⁴⁶

Baudelaire refers to melody, itself an implicitly narrative and economic structural whole, and invokes the landscape in a synaesthetic web of associations. Together this reiterates, however unwittingly, various ancient and modern techniques for, and attitudes about, recollection. By stressing the simplicity of a profound aesthetic conception, and finding that this "gift of unity" is one of the "requirements of...memory," Baudelaire echoed the Aristotelian and Thomasian view that, as Gestalt psychologists would later agree, "those things are better remembered which have order in themselves."⁴⁷ The authors of the Greek "art of memory," a subsection in the study of rhetoric, proposed that in order to memorize a speech it was best to secure its parts in memory by associating them with

images that one situates at imaginary loci in the plan of an equally imaginary building. The ancient orator thus remembered his talk by taking a mental stroll through this ideated building. In each of its rooms, he would encounter an image which triggered his memory of the associated portion of his speech.⁴⁸ Those imaginary architectural configurations therefore tied the images together in a sequence, an order that was more easily remembered. In doing so the mnemonic blueprint established spatially conditions which, in classical music, are achieved temporally through melody.

In the nineteenth century, such elaborate mnemonic schemes were replaced by the more pragmatic formula that the more associations one establishes to a thought or object one wishes to remember, the more likely one's success.⁴⁹ In this sense, because synaesthesia multiplies the avenues of sensory address, thereby securing a sensation vividly in memory, it can be considered as a mnemonic trope. Baudelaire's appeal to synaesthesia -- his kind of association -- calls to mind another route to memory which, according to Freud, obviates consciousness from the act of recollection. By appealing to one sense in order to stir another to life, synaesthesia circumvents the calculations of "artificial" or "voluntary" memory, the instrumental memory one practices in order to summon the past at will. In

his essay Baudelaire is privileging what Proust would call "involuntary memory," through the agency of which the narrator of A la Recherche du temps perdu successfully revived the past.⁵⁰ By denigrating "artificial memory," Baudelaire's critical theory resisted the rationalization of the human subject, as this process was manifest at the level of memory. This kind of memory, privileged in the West throughout the nineteenth century by Church and State, entrepreneurs and educators, was the object of utilitarian colonization. This distinction between different forms of memory, and the attendant condemnation of one kind as inappropriate for the purposes of art, makes it possible to establish on the level of human experience and imagination the way in which Baudelaire's critical theory is predicated upon an opposition to the means-ends rationality that increasingly dominated bourgeois life in the West by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Among others, Stendahl also recognized this colonization of memory when he wrote Le Rouge et le noir.

Along with a fiery temperament, Julien had one of those amazing memories so frequently found in combination with dullness. To gain the old Priest Chélan's favour, for he clearly saw that his future depended on him, he had learnt the New Testament in Latin by heart. He also knew the whole of M. de Maistre's work on the Pope, and believed the one as little as the other.⁵¹

In this way Julien Sorel, son of a peasant carpenter from the Franche-Comté, began his perilous climb from the bottom of French Restoration society to the vertiginous heights of Parisian drawing rooms like the Marquis de la Mole's. His remarkable ascent was made possible, not so much because of the pale beauty which, true enough, endeared him to so many women along his path, but because of his prodigious mnemonic feats. It was, after all, the latter which justified his rise, by securing his usefulness, in such noble homes. His feats of memory elicited awe at every dinner table that marked the several plateaux along his fatal ascent to an all too brief moment of aristocratic tenure as M. Julien Sorel de la Vernaye. That this single quality, more than any other, should provide the rationale for the protagonist's elevation, and help to set the stage for the unfolding of Stendahl's narrative, attests to the value placed on powerful memory in France from the first third of the nineteenth century.

Baudelaire expanded upon, and further refined, his consideration of memory as a factor in creating and judging works of art in a later section of the Salon of 1846, in which he mounted a scathing critique of eclecticism. He defined two pervasive qualities in contemporary French painting -- "chic" and "poncif" -- which, in his view, had supplanted genuine observation and insight in art had left

only cliché in their place. Baudelaire defined "chic" as "an abuse of memory".⁵² By way of contrast, he noted that there are artists "who are gifted with a profound memory for characters and forms -- Delacroix and Daumier -- and who have nothing to do with it [chic]."⁵³ Baudelaire demonstrated his contempt for the popularity of art which traffics in "chic" by abjuring the military spectacles of Horace Vernet, those "Meissonniers as big as houses."⁵⁴ Vernet suffered from two "outstanding qualities -- the one of deficiency, the other of excess; for he lacks all passion, and has a memory like an almanach!"⁵⁵ To this Baudelaire added a footnote, conceived as if in recognition that the relationship between memory and art was a rich and complex issue -- and a minefield of contradiction. The footnote, a prescription for "true memory," he quoted from a text by E.T.A. Hoffman. It established for Baudelaire the correct parameters for a positive use of memory in art.

True memory, considered from a philosophical point of view, consists, I think, in nothing else but a very lively and easily roused imagination which is consequently given to reinforcing each of its sensations by evoking scenes from the past, and endowing them, as if by magic, with the life and character which are proper to each of them -- at least I have heard this theory upheld by one of my past teachers who had a prodigious memory, although he could not carry a single date or proper name in his head. My teacher was right, and in this matter there is, no doubt, a difference between sayings or utterances which have embedded themselves deep in the soul and whose intimate and mysterious meaning has been grasped, and words which have merely been learnt by heart.⁵⁶

Hoffman distinguishes "true memory" from the "manual" variety; the latter being the kind of prodigious memory which Stendahl attributed to Julien Sorel, and which he so frequently "found in combination with dullness." This is, once again, the instrumental memory that -- along with mimesis -- functioned as such a desirable trait within the National Course of Instruction in London, and that would do so, after 1870, in the schools of Massachusetts.

That Vernet and Delacroix would both recommend Lecoq's pedagogy may seem contradictory, but it can be understood in a number of ways. It would not have been very difficult to solicit testimonials from these artists for such a promising, simultaneously conservative and innovative course of instruction. This union of artistic opposites also reflects the division of mnemonic labor into the commonplace and exclusively aesthetic categories, an increasingly rigidly defined set of categories whose construction can be observed in the discourse on art and education during the second third of the nineteenth century. It is a union which testifies to the continuously tense interaction of utility and aesthetics; in this case, to capital's pursuit of the skills, prestige and even, perhaps, the conciliatory powers of fine art to facilitate its expansion. Moreover it attests to the rearticulation within the field of art and its criticism of the old concept of aesthetic separation as a

flight from that pursuit. Thus while Lecoq de Boisbaudran looked to applied scientists like Eugène Chevreul for the broadest institutional legitimation for his course, some of its alumni, like Fantin-Latour and Alphonse Legros, and their closest colleagues -- J.M. Whistler preeminent among them -- would go on to develop a resolutely anti-utilitarian aestheticism.

Baudelaire seems to have avoided discussing these pedagogical issues altogether, although he seems never to have missed an opportunity to say, mockingly, of an artist like Vernet, "Who knows better than he the correct number of buttons on each uniform, or the anatomy of a gaiter or a boot which is the worse for innumerable days' marching, or the exact spot on a soldier's gear where the copper of his small arms deposits its verdigris?"⁵⁷ Likewise, he recognized how such an "abuse of memory" was useful to the masses of eclectic artists: the "doubters" or "emacipated journeymen who lack the force and the sovereignty of genius."⁵⁸ Or, in the words of one precient contemporary observer: "L'écléctisme a fait du mal, çela est vrai, mais il a surtout fait des affaires."⁵⁹ Baudelaire described this hack -- or "artistic ape" -- in an analogy which cast the eclectic as kin to an "anarchic republican" whose desire for universal and complete freedom corresponded both with a love of "utensils" (the "practical" mind of the petty

bourgeois) and an utter disdain for "the great tradition" in art and literature. Such individuals lacked the passionate conviction that Baudelaire considered essential both to the "great tradition" and Romantic art. A mercantile mentality had supplanted conviction, filling the Salon to bursting with the kind of "originality" that Baudelaire debunked by transforming that term into one of derision, as he did with others in his Salon.⁶⁰

Baudelaire described how eclectic artists level difference in their indiscriminate pillaging of artistic imagery, so desperate are they to be original. And as a function of their "contradictory borrowings" -- their ignorance of what it is that they nevertheless see fit to purloin -- and of their small-minded, trivial products, Baudelaire concludes: "an eclectic's work leaves no memory behind it."⁶¹ In the midst of condemning the surfeit of works which, paradoxically, achieved only uniformity in striving for differentiation, one can detect in Baudelaire's essay a metaphoric subtext, which directs the reader to a different aspect of human "equality" in bourgeois society: the equivalence that is enforced through the unwritten laws of the commodity form and mass production. During the July Monarchy and, especially, during the Second Empire the mass production of commodities and the introduction of new methods of, and spaces for, retailing transformed the

character of Parisian life. This period was the first during which individuals could, and did, refer meaningfully to a culture of copies. The roman-feuilleton, the cheap newspaper, illustrated magazines -- whose titles: Le Magazin pittoresque, Musée des familles, evidence the intermingling of art and commerce -- emerged during this period as central to the workings of this early consumer culture. Cheap plaster-stearine "objets d'art," colored lithographs, wood engravings and, finally, the photograph were either invented during this period or became objects of unprecedented dissemination.⁶²

It is in the context of such a discussion of eclectic "freedom" and "originality" that Baudelaire problematized the use of both these terms in their relation to art. He managed this by inserting into his discussion an unlikely reference to what would surely have struck the bourgeois reader -- to whom he dedicated his essay with more irony than is sometimes thought -- as a contradiction in terms: "collective originality", the loss of which Baudelaire deplored.

The glorification of the individual has necessitated the infinite division of the territory of art. The absolute and divergent liberty of each man, the division of effort and the disjunction of the human will have led to this weakness, this doubt and this poverty of invention... Individuality that little place of one's own has devoured collective originality.⁶³

Division, disjunction, invention, individuality -- by mapping out the site of such emphatic, and utterly inconsequential forms of privatized originality, Baudelaire scans the terrain of aesthetic production using a terminology equally well suited to describing the effects of industrial production on human beings. With the poet/critic's language thus inflected, whether consciously or not, by the concerns of the entrepreneur and the political economist, he illuminates some of the historical conditions which had condemned the art of his time to the status he deplored. The sheer fragmentation of the community of artists, the growing privatization of aesthetic experience, the utter insignificance of the originality artists sought in a desperate pursuit of differentiation, relegated them to the status of "emancipated journeymen". It is at this point in his essay that Baudelaire does some curious leveling of his own: he reminisces simultaneously about the reigns of Louis XV and Napoleon. Then there was "a school -- that is a faith -- that is, the impossibility of doubt."⁶⁴

Baudelaire wrote The Painter of Modern Life between November 1859 to February 1860, but did not publish it until it appeared in three installments in Le Figaro on November 26 and 28, and December 3, 1863 -- right on the heels of the administrative decree announcing the reform of the Ecole des

Beaux-Arts. At that time, over a dozen years after he first raised the issue of memory as a factor in judging contemporary art, he seemed unequivocal in his support for the concept of drawing from memory; unequivocal, and seemingly more narrow in his understanding of its application for art.

He draws from memory and not from the model, except in those cases -- the Crimean War is one of them -- when it may be urgently necessary to take immediate, hasty notes, and to fix the principal lines of the subject. As a matter of fact, all good and true draughtsmen draw from the image imprinted on their brains, and not from nature.⁶⁵

For Baudelaire, the thirteen years that followed his Salon of 1846 were productive yet, as Jean-Paul Sartre has observed, they already mark the beginning of his lengthy decline from a youthful period of brilliant experimentation and discovery. Notwithstanding the accumulating pressures on him -- his mounting debts, his perpetual transience, his injurious, sadistic relationships with the mother he could never manage and the mistress he could neither live with nor without -- in certain ways this period does mark Baudelaire's final maturation, for better or worse, as person, poet and critic. Toward the end of 1847 he experienced the profound affirmation of his own ideas which was his discovery of, and immersion in, the works of Edgar Allan Poe. Yet never would he profit from his two lucrative volumes of translations. Is this a measure of the

debilitating effects of his creditors' pursuit? Surely it also testifies to his incapacity (aversion?) for shrewd calculation, for a strategic deference to the future which might in some small way have helped make his life more bearable. Be that as it may, these considerations shed some light onto the nature of his profound estrangement, both from himself, and the social reality in which he lived.

Georges Bataille has observed in a critique of Sartre's essay on Baudelaire that his "denial of Good was basically a denial of the primacy of the future."⁶⁶ Choosing "Evil," Baudelaire improvidently expended energy for immediate, eventually fatal pleasures. He thus rejected that socially sanctioned "Good" which, in obeissance to the logic of utilitarian, or instrumental, reason, must always preserve itself in deference to an all-determining future. In a dark contradiction, Baudelaire chose against this "mature" economy of the future, even though he revered the critical judgement of posterity. A poet, first and foremost, through his work he would ultimately defer to that future and thereby affirm the Good he intended to disdain.

To be sure, during this period Baudelaire continued to compose many of the poems which, together with works written earlier in the 1840s, comprised Les Fleurs du mal. On June 25, 1857, after many delays and disappointments, Pouillet-

Malassis's edition of that volume finally appeared -- only to be followed by the poet's humiliation in having his work censored to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior, Billaut. Again, his defense could not have been better devised to achieve a worse effect.⁶⁷

There had also been the brief period of revolutionary activity, during which Baudelaire reveled in the struggle for the Second Republic with a vengefulness that may be the special preserve of those who, by birth if not by choice, belong to the forces of order. This moment of youthful, desperate joy was, however, followed by the revenge of his class, as the bourgeoisie consolidated its power base by resorting, first, to authoritarian brutality and, second, to reaction, repression and the more or less subtle reproductive powers of ideology. These dozen years bear witness to the wild vacillation in Baudelaire's public posture, as he moved away from loyalty to the left -- never more dramatically witnessed than in Levaisseur's account of the poet fighting along side the insurgents during the June Days -- to the more persistently ambiguous posture of political disillusionment that ensued after the coup d'état of December 1851. Then he would write to Poulet-Malassis: "I've decided to remain henceforth aloof from all human polemics."⁶⁸ And although he never did quite manage that, he was inclined toward a common expression of disgust for all

politics -- for bourgeois, leftist, and anarchist alike. Factors such as these seem to measure the breadth of a gulf which opened up for Baudelaire between 1846 and 1859. But how does his art criticism differ on the other side of this historical divide? There were changes, to be sure, yet how considerable were they?

While in 1846 Baudelaire had referred to the glut of "emancipated journeymen" among Salon artists, in the Salon of 1859 he changed metaphors, but hardly dampened his acid criticality. Instead, he noted the arrival of the "spoiled child" to the Palais des Champs Elysées.⁶⁹ Whereas in 1846 he attacked the emancipated journeymen for eclecticism, in 1859 he criticized the crippling infatuation of the spoiled child with the surface of things, the putatively objective imitation of which informed their overwhelmingly popular project. In the well known second section of his Salon, entitled, "The Modern Public and Photography," Baudelaire postulated that an art which limits its aesthetic horizon to mimetic functions outside the domain of art, properly speaking. Like the eclectic before him, the "positivist realist" relinquished all contact with the historical legacy of painting as a material and textual practice. Baudelaire attributed the popular taste for such realism to a cultural narcissism that he imputed to the bourgeoisie; to the demand of this "idolatrous mob" for an "ideal worthy of itself and

appropriate to its nature." Concerning the mass appeal of the daguerreotype, he concluded: "Narcissus to a man, to gaze at its trivial image on a scrap of metal."⁷⁰

To Baudelaire, the bourgeois audience's attraction to its own fixed image had supplanted the uneasy flux of "dreaming," by which the poet referred to the associative resources of a "constructive" imagination. According to him, the faculty of imagination made possible a positive connection to the art of the past, to the "great tradition" from which he had registered his sense of separation. Imagination, which, according to Delacroix too, is a function of "true memory," establishes a profound connection to a past which the "positivist realist" has, with characteristic arrogance, foreclosed.⁷¹ Thus, it is wholly logical that when Baudelaire commented upon the contemporary taste for photographs of staged "scenes from ancient history," as opposed to what he regarded to be photography's proper use as an instrument of science and, as Freud would later concur, as a powerful aide mémoire, he noted that here was a fad which risked "disseminating a loathing for history and for painting."⁷²

Baudelaire distinguished between those who copied nature and those others who might be faithful to what Baudelaire, with his Swedenborgian affinities, regarded as a

higher truth. As was the case with Ruskin, whose position was always more moderate than that of the intemperate Baudelaire, the way to reach this essential realm was to supplement sensual data with the powers of imagination. Yet the relationship between the senses and the imagination, far from being simply additive, or mutually supporting, is antagonistic. Imagination, "Queen of the Faculties" has "a positive relationship with the infinite."⁷³ As such, its effect on sensual data is that of a corrosive agent.

It [imagination] decomposes all creation, and with the raw materials accumulated and disposed in accordance with rules whose origins one cannot find save in the furthest depths of the soul, it creates a new world, it produces the sensation of newness.⁷⁴

According to Baudelaire, imagination, like the conditions of remembering, allows for the creation of a different world by removing one from the precinct of empirical reality. Only when the artist stops imitating the surface of that reality has he or she acceded to the precincts of art.

Baudelaire went on to define imagination as a constructive faculty which surveys, organizes and associates with remembered images.⁷⁵ Imagination has analytic and synthetic powers which must be used, especially when consulting nature. For Baudelaire, nature is a dictionary one consults in order to ascertain the genealogy and etymology of those elements which, when combined, form the

artist's composition.⁷⁶ That is, through imagination an image may be seen to resonate in such a way as to reveal an historical relation to the "great tradition."

...the whole visible universe is but a storehouse of images and signs to which the imagination will give a relative place and value; it is a sort of pasture which the imagination must digest and transform.⁷⁷

Baudelaire considered his immediate physical and social environment as inherently hostile to the "great tradition" in art. As a consequence of these conditions he noted that for artists to persist in the production of significant art had become "infinitely more meretorious [than during a period like the Renaissance], since it has triumphantly evolved in an atmosphere and territory which are hostile to it."⁷⁸ He still found access to the great tradition in the contemporary works of Delacroix and a few other artists, yet only as a product of their skepticism and vigilance, their manner of retaining a reserve, an essential aloofness from trivialities and from contingency itself. They were armed, as it were, for struggle. He described Delacroix as, "this man who, though advanced in the number of his years, is yet stamped with the stubbornness of youth, and who since his earliest manhood has consecrated all his time to the exercise of his hand, his memory and his eye for the forging of ever surer weapons for his imagination..."⁷⁹

In this context it seems noteworthy that, as early as between January and May of 1824, among the first entries in Delacroix's Journal, he frequently complained about the fragility and frailty of his memory. At a time when the artist was losing the companionship and example of Gericault, and beginning to work on the Massacre at Scio, he struggled with depression, and one symptom he often complained of was his diminished mnemonic powers.

I want to set myself to learn a good deal by heart so as to improve my memory. A man with a bad memory has nothing to rely on, everything plays him false....Every evening, I come home feeling like a man to whom all manner of things have happened. I end by being in a state of mental chaos that makes me utterly bewildered.⁸⁰

Only by insulating himself against the social world he found so alluring and unsettling could Delacroix achieve a sense of the stability and self-possession that he considered essential for artistic production. The words he used to express his awareness of the dangers inherent in Bohemian social intercourse offer an interesting insight into a horror he felt but could not name: "I cannot understand it but I seem to need diversions....Who would believe it? The things that are most real to me are the illusions which I create with my painting. Everything else is a quicksand."⁸¹ Regretting what he understood to be the squandering of his creative energies on nightlife, he worried: "When memory has nothing important to feed on, it pines and dies." His advise

to himself was always the same: to withdraw to the studio and lead a more solitary existence. Yet even this would not suffice: "The enemy is within my gates, in my very heart; I feel his hand everywhere....Think of having peace of mind and a reliable memory, of the self-control that a well ordered life will bring..." In another entry, he regretted not writing in his journal daily, since it could have served him, prosthetically, as an aide mémoire:⁸¹

I regret the gaps. I feel as though I were still master of the days I have recorded, even though they are past, whereas those not mentioned in these pages are as though they had never been....Am I then so weak that these flimsy pages will be the only record of my life remaining to me? The future is all blackness. The past, where I have not recorded it, is the same....Even one task fulfilled at regular intervals in a man's life can bring order into his life as a whole; everything hinges upon it. By keeping a record of my experiences I live my life twice over. The past returns to me.⁸²

On June 1, 1824, Delacroix's entry recorded his visit with Dr. Bailly. By then the "enemy within," less conclusively identifiable as masculine, had manifested itself in fears of sexual impotency. Yet this was not a subject he deemed suitable for posterity.⁸³ In his entry that day he implored the muses, to whose service he renewed his commitment, to help to restore his youthfulness. Specifically, he deplored the fact that he had "an imagination that embraced everything, and less memory than the humblest shopkeeper."⁸⁴ As late as in 1857, when

Delacroix finally got around to writing some notes for his "dictionary of the fine arts," although he had evidently come to acquire the psychic means adequately to manage his anxiety, he -- like Baudelaire -- continued to write about the importance of memory, for example, in relation to "imagination" and the potential for "interest" in art. Never, would memory lose its importance on his list of necessary resources for the production of fine art.⁸⁵

By writing The Painter of Modern Life the same year as he did his Salon of 1859, Baudelaire effectively removed himself, for the duration of its composition, from the "great tradition." Its legacy was supposedly sustained in the annual ritual of the Salon. Instead, he turned his attention to a decidedly more ephemeral and modest form of contemporary cultural practice for which the poet had shown the greatest appreciation: the fashion plate and, in the case of Constantin Guys, the newspaper illustration (his drawings had been published in the Illustrated London News since as early as 1843). The circumstances of writing about Guys' popular images alone lent to this project a distinctive character. It allowed an earlier preoccupation with a "great" tradition to be displaced for the time being by another kind of cultural history: that of contemporary

social rituals and political events, fashion and manners; as Baudelaire put it, morality and ethics. This was also something of an extension of an earlier interest. In 1845, when Baudelaire wrote his first Salon, he had also begun work on an essay he referred to as "De la Caricature."⁸⁶

The organization of the essay into brief chapters seems to recreate the poet's experience as he perused Constantin Guys' heterogeneous imagery, as if he were perusing the artist's portfolios, classified according to social ritual or subject matter: modernity, war, the oriental, the soldier, the dandy, the woman, cosmetics, the whore -- a form of social browsing, and a method of creating order and stability amidst flux. Under these circumstances, in Baudelaire's prose the Crimean War takes on the character of a colonial pageant. More likely, the discrete sections of his essay evoke the character of newspaper layout and reportage. Walter Benjamin identified the effect and the purpose of the newspaper as the capacity effectively to distance the spectator from the event about which he or she reads. It "manages" or mediates the horrors of war in a representation that turns grim reality into an opportunity to note military fashion, etiquette, posture -- one play of manners sharing space on a page among so many others.⁸⁷

The organization of Baudelaire's essay, and the matter-of-fact tone which he maintains throughout, contribute to a barely detectible boredom that accumulates just below the surface of his ostensibly appreciative writing until, near the conclusion, it surfaces with unusual clarity. There, in a compounded metaphor, his account opens onto the interior spaces of the new retailing palaces of Second Empire Paris. These he likens, in an allusion to the inevitability of their multiplication and to the circulation of high and low life through the city's thoroughfares, to the effect of gravity upon water: "And so they run on, those endless galleries of high and low life, branching off at intervals into innumerable tributaries and backwaters."⁸⁸ What great tradition, the reader might well ask, could flourish amidst the reflective surfaces of these reified vistas?

To be sure, the "great tradition" does figure in this essay, yet it occupies a distinct place and purpose. Baudelaire projects himself into a future where these popular images would appear as the object of an imaginary archeology of the present as past. He postulates that such art would be "worthy one day [of] taking its place as 'antiquity'." In fact, Baudelaire introduced his essay with invocations of the names Raphael and Racine only to point out that their works do not "contain the whole secret...the minor poets too have something good, solid and delightful to

offer."⁸⁹ He noted that some collectors already prized the eighteenth century colored engravings of Debucourt and Saint-Aubins, and that he looked forward to the time when images like Guys' will also "have found their places in the dictionary of artists who are worthy of study."⁹⁰ As opposed to the "general beauty" of the classics he therefore proposed the "particular beauty" inherent in a distinct, even everyday historical milieu as the fashion plate and newspaper illustration registered it. By referring to the future "antique" status of such imagery, in which condition it would embody all the ethical and moral tragedy of the nineteenth century, Baudelaire again invokes the critical conception of memory. However, he would elaborate his concern with the connection between art and memory -- that is, true memory, in the section of his essay devoted to "Mnemonic Art."

Baudelaire again deploys the anarchic-republican metaphor which he used in 1846, now to inform his contempt for an art of undifferentiated mimetic detail. Furthermore, this trope provides us with a different method of gaining access to the critical discourse on memory. In the relevant passage he describes an artist with a "perfect sense of form but one accustomed to relying above all on his memory and his imagination." He ventures out into the city and, confronted by the urban spectacle, finds himself "at the

mercy of a riot of details all clamouring for justice with the fury of a mob in love with absolute equality."

All justice is trampled underfoot; all harmony sacrificed and destroyed; many a trifle assumes vast proportions; many a triviality usurps attention. The more our artist turns an impartial eye on detail, the greater is the state of anarchy.⁹¹

This artist, still a flaneur, is nevertheless a flaneur with a difference. No mere idler, he has a mission. He immerses himself in the ebb and flow of the urban spectacle, anonymous yet intoxicated in his anonymity at the epicenter of the city. However, he is also a spectator and must retain a necessary reserve. It is crucial for him to ward off the numbing effects of the city's crowded streets and the din of the arcades -- the effects of what Walter Benjamin would call the "phantasmagoria of capitalist culture" -- in order to continue to see "everything in a state of newness."⁹² In response to his realization that Paris had become the site of a kolaidescopic and distracting equivalence (might this also be one aspect of the "absolute equality" which so disturbed Baudelaire?) a place where the preservation of "naivete" was, to put it mildly, problematic, he prescribes drawing from memory. In this sense one can grasp the significance of René Char's comment that: "If man did not shut his eyes in a sovereign manner, he would end up by no longer seeing things worth looking at."⁹³

According to Baudelaire's account, the artist had to retreat from the transitoriness of the urban stage to the solitude of a room in whose stillness, during the darkest hours before sunrise, he would work in a frenzy, "as though afraid that the image might escape him."⁹⁴ There, resorting to the resources of memory and imagination, he could finally "distill the eternal from the transitory". Or, as Baudelaire might also have said, distinguish the "general beauty" from the "particular beauty" of his epoch. Baudelaire described this paradoxical process as one in which:

...all the materials with which the memory has loaded itself are put in order, ranged and harmonized and undergo that forced idealization which is the result of a childlike perceptiveness that is to say, a perceptiveness acute and magical by reason of its innocence.⁹⁵

The nature of this idealization, which orders and harmonizes, far from being determined by an accord with a venerable tradition -- by a classical canon -- issues from within the artist, from an "innocence" which Baudelaire elsewhere likened to "an inevitable, synthetic, childlike barbarousness...which comes from a need to see things broadly and to consider them above all in their total effect."⁹⁶ Baudelaire imputed such naivete not just to the child but to the convalescent, whose delicate constitution allows him to experience things as if for the first time because illness or trauma has eliminated the possibility of commonplace recognition. During the convalescent's retreat,

he is also able to create order and harmony, as if retroactively, from a prior immersion in sensory conditions which Baudelaire metaphorically described as the scene of mob violence, while this moment of creative incubation he associated with childhood.

To achieve the aesthetic distillation and avoid chaotic or slavish imitation, the painter of modern life must withdraw from those experiences in the teeming urban environment which nonetheless served as his or her principal subject matter. Removed from the contingencies of the modern city, inside a protected zone, the artist could avoid "the physical presence of the model and its multiplicity of details [which] disconcerts and as it were paralyses their principal faculty."⁹⁷ Only through such a "reduction" to the more stable conditions of the studio can the artist more effectively consolidate his or her creative resources and then, in re-presenting the encounter with the model, better manage, order and harmonize the motivating sensory assault. By combining this self-protective retreat from contingency with speed of execution, Baudelaire solved the problem of how to maintain the freshness or "naivete" and the fundamental order which he so highly prized; at least, for the time being. A contradiction marks this Baudelairean prescription for aesthetic production: the modern conditions one seeks to record threaten one's capacity for aesthetic

production. This contradiction can be understood as one of the historical and logical preconditions for the development of that more wholly separate realm of unencumbered perceptual play that would signal the modernist project of abstraction in art.

Yet what conditions might have led Baudelaire to prescribe working from memory for artists, thereby taking a first step away from a social experience they seek to record? To suggest a kind of sensory overload would be -- by itself -- to resurrect one of the central clichés of modernity. Notable in Baudelaire's multivalent prose are the traces of broader social, economic and phenomenological conditions that were imposing themselves upon city dwellers during the 1850's and 60's. In Walter Benjamin's essay, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire," he attempted to historicize the problem of Baudelaire's conflicted and alienated relationship to his reader ("Hypocrite lecteur, mon semblable mon frère!"), and thus to shed light on the problematic status of the lyric poet in the "era of high capitalism." Only in the rarest instances, he wrote, "is lyric poetry in rapport with the experience of its readers." He suggested that the problem -- the incapacity of contemporary readers to meet the challenges of lyric poetry -- "may be due to a change in the structure of their experience."⁹⁸

Benjamin also found that structural change embodied in the later attempts of philosophers like Henri Bergson to "lay hold of 'true' experience, as opposed to the kind that manifests itself in the standardized, denatured life of the civilized masses."⁹⁹ In Bergson's popular tracts memory is decisive to the representation of "the philosophical pattern of existence." Experience is not a matter of facts "firmly anchored in memory" but, rather, entails the "convergence in memory of accumulated and frequently unconscious data."¹⁰⁰ True experience thus weds the collective to the private. For Benjamin, the term "collective," when applied to this discussion of experience and memory, is interchangeable with "tradition." It may also be useful to consider that in Baudelaire's lexicon the use of the terms "eternal" and "transitory" are closely related, if not interchangeable, with Benjamin's "collective/tradition" and "private," respectively.¹⁰¹

Benjamin introduces the figure of Marcel Proust into the second section of his essay. Proust had "actually put Bergson's theory of experience to the test." As such, A la Recherche du temps perdu is in part an attempt to "produce experience synthetically, as Bergson imagines it, under today's conditions, for there is less and less hope that it will come into being naturally."¹⁰² Indeed, Proust diverges

from Bergson, rejecting the notion that the vita contemplativa is, as Benjamin put it, "a matter of free choice". Proust refers to "mémoire involontaire" where Bergson had referred to "mémoire pure".¹⁰³ No matter how hard Proust's narrator tried to recall his early years at Combray he could not do so with satisfactory results. His willful attempts to remember satisfactorily were futile. Only through the intercession of the "petite madeleine" did the past he searched for become available. Far from the attitude of voluntary (or instrumental) memory, which Baudelaire found contemptible, Proust wrote that the past is "somewhere beyond the reach of the intellect, unmistakably present in some material object (or in the sensation which such an object arouses in us), though we have no idea which one it is. As for that object, it depends entirely on chance whether we come upon it before we die".¹⁰⁴ Walter Benjamin, however, inquired if people had always been so entirely dependent upon chance "to form an image of our experience."

It is by no means inevitable to be dependent on chance in this matter. Man's inner concerns do not have their issueless private character by nature. They do so only when he is increasingly unable to assimilate the data of the world around him by way of experience.¹⁰⁵

It is at this point in his discussion that Benjamin turns to his succinct analysis of the newspaper, commenting on how the latter had contributed to the loss of an "older narration" in favor of "information." This replacement of

the "older narration by information, of information by sensation, reflects the increasing atrophy of experience." Information, Benjamin concludes, "does not enter tradition."¹⁰⁶ In a dialectical sense the term "mémoire involontaire" bears the traces of "the situation which gave rise to it." Benjamin (and in this he is comparable to Schiller in The Aesthetic Education of Man) imagines an earlier time when the fragmentation of experience had not yet manifested itself in the irreconcilability of conscious experience with true or involuntary memory; had not, furthermore, split memory into the antagonistic categories whose increasingly rigid differentiation into an instrumental, conscious manifestation and an unconscious (aesthetic) one that might be resistant to instrumental colonization. In the process he also illuminates the conditions through which Baudelaire's "great tradition" had been irremediably lost.

...it ["mémoire involontaire"] is part of the inventory of the individual who is isolated in many ways. Where there is experience in the strict sense of the word, certain contents of the individual past combine with material of the collective past. The rituals with their ceremonies, their festivals (quite possibly nowhere recalled in Proust's work), kept producing the amalgamation of these two elements of memory over and over again. They triggered recollection at certain times and remained handles of memory for a lifetime. In this way, voluntary and involuntary recollection lose their mutual exclusiveness.¹⁰⁷

It was with the progressive isolation of the human being in the "inhospitable blinding age of big-scale industrialism" that the collective -- and tradition with it -- was effectively severed from individual experience and that such experience was exposed to processes that led to its privatization.¹⁰⁸

The third aspect of Benjamin's attempt historically to analyze the fragmentation of experience and of memory coincides with the third section of his essay where he turns to Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle in order more closely to examine the psychic dynamics involved in these conditions. Several aspects of Freud's remarks interested Benjamin. First, he notes Freud's basic hypothesis that "becoming conscious and leaving behind a memory trace are processes incompatible with each other within one and the same system." Consequently, memory is "often most powerful and enduring when the incident which left them [memory fragments] behind was one that never entered consciousness."¹⁰⁹ Second, Benjamin notes how, according to Freud, the system of becoming conscious acts, not passively to receive stimuli, but actively to protect the organism from "energies at work in the external world...which tend...towards destruction."¹¹⁰ After someone suffers the effects of such energies or shocks they tend to "manage" them by reenacting the traumatic experience in dreams which

function "to master the stimulus retroactively by developing the anxiety whose omission was the cause of the traumatic neurosis."¹¹¹ Subsequently, Benjamin quotes a remarkable passage by Paul Valéry about precisely these issues, a passage which, with Benjamin's assistance, makes it possible to grasp that the Baudelairean aesthetic of memory is indeed a precondition for perceptual training in general, and for Hoyt Sherman's flash lab in particular.

The impressions and sense perceptions of man actually belong in the category of surprises; they are evidence of an insufficiency in man....Recollection [is]...an elemental phenomenon which aims at giving us the time for organizing the reception of stimuli which we initially lacked.¹¹²

To this Benjamin adds, "The acceptance of shocks is facilitated by training in coping with stimuli, and, if need be, dreams as well as recollection may be enlisted."¹¹³ According to this interpretation, drawing from memory -- like the dreaming of the traumatized (or the retrospective reflections of the Baudelairean convalescent) -- is a way of responding to the shocks that issue from the social conditions which adhered to the industrialized expansion of capitalism, most noticeably in great urban centers.

It is characteristic of modernist aesthetic experience to master the temporal continuum and the disordered sensory array, two symbolically resonant categories, among others,

that are perceived as antagonistic to such aesthetic pleasures and to the survival of the "centered" subject whose relationship to such aesthetic experience is one of mutual dependence. As fear keeps the individual alert to the possibility of shock, thus warding off trauma, so a form of "training" which Benjamin understands as being contingent upon the ubiquity of psychic shock in the modern city erects a wall of consciousness against such threats to subjective well being.

Moving through this traffic involves the individual in a series of shocks and collisions. At dangerous crossings, nervous impulses flow through him in rapid succession, like the energy from a battery....Whereas Poe's passers-by cast glances in all directions which still appear to be aimless, today's pedestrians are obliged to do so in order to keep abreast of traffic signals. Thus technology has subjected the human sensorium to a complex kind of training.¹¹⁴

For the modern artist -- and others -- this informal training would eventually be codified. It emerged in pedagogical form at end of the period Ernest Mandel has identified as the second technological revolution, when men extended the limits of existing technologies to produce the shocks of a second world war.¹¹⁵

It is noteworthy that the only artist among Lecoq de Boisbaudran's students to be identified with the modernist

vanguard, Auguste Rodin, would later describe drawing in a way which differs significantly from Lecoq's method of teaching. It seems that Rodin, unlike Fantin-Latour, Legros, Tissot and the other students whose works showed signs of benefitting from mnemonic practice, had eliminated memory from his drawing altogether. Taking its place is an immediate sense of contact with the object in a time that is stilled. According to Anthony Ludovici, Rodin described his drawing process as follows:

I have, as it were, to incorporate the lines of the human body, and they must become part of myself, deeply seated in my instincts. I must become permeated with the secrets of all its contours, all the masses that it presents to the eye. I must feel them at the end of my fingers. All this must flow naturally from my eye to my hand....Now look! What is this drawing? Not once in describing the shape of that mass did I shift my eyes from the model. Why? Because I wanted to be sure that nothing evaded my grasp of it. Not a thought about the technical problem of representing it on paper could be allowed to arrest the flow of my feelings about it, from my eye to my hand. The moment I drop my eyes that flow stops. That is why my drawings are only my way of testing myself. They are my way of proving to myself how far this incorporation of the subtle secrets of the human form has taken place within me. I try to see the figure as mass, as volume. It is this voluminousness that I try to understand...My object is to test to what extent my hands already feel what my eyes see.¹¹⁶

In his desire for an essential knowledge of the model, Rodin cannot avert his gaze from it to the paper on which he draws. This would break the possessive state of communion and constant surveillance by which the artist comes to know

and possess the model. Rodin describes the act of seeing and drawing as one in which he remains oblivious to the technical aspect of rendering the image on paper, and creates the impression that while drawing he functions effectively in the absence of conscious thought: of thought articulated and objectified in language. Rodin, like Hoyt Sherman a half-century later, sensed that to permit such conscious or "indicative" thought to enter into in the process of what the latter would term "seeing-and-drawing" would dilute or impede the desired "flow" of pure affect upon which so much of the drawing's value depends. Rodin's process is informed by the projection of (male) desire; possession of the object, a seemingly unmediated correspondence with, and knowledge of, the model facilitates the desired sensation of stability, and fullness of being. More than superfluous, the employment of voluntary or "instrumental" memory would be disadvantageous to such a goal. Rodin's drawing assumes its distinctive character with the inevitability of spontaneous organic growth: the life blood of this organism flows from the light-sensitive eyes to the obedient hand to the page on which the image becomes.

Rodin's description marks a departure from the dicta of Baudelairean memory drawing, and a half-way point between it and the artificial conditions of the "flash lab." Memory drawing presupposed that an essential knowledge of the

object becomes available when the artist retreats from a contingency which is understood to undermine such efforts. The carefully controlled environment of the flash lab isolates the subject and arrests both contingency and time, guaranteeing that instant of undivided experience, and contrives a virtually simultaneous perception and response to produce the desired (aesthetic) experience. Such experience can then promote belief in, and a sensation of, the coherent, masterful and expressive subject without which the production of modern humanist art would not be possible.

Rodin's historical moment and his method were not those of the mid-nineteenth century artist who, on the cusp of modernism, resorted to the protection and emotional reverberations of the mnemonic retreat. Nor were they those of the mid-twentieth-century individual whom institutions of higher learning provided with a protected zone in which to train the subject, whether for the creation of art objects, or for the extension of subjective indivisibility and control into everyday activities. Rodin's time and method were closer to those of Paul Cézanne. He also scrutinized his experience of objects in a mutable environment and achieved, if only for brief moments -- "sensations" in time -- the affective plenitude and communion with the object that Rodin similarly desired and achieved by preventing his eye from leaving the model. The materialization of these

moments, crystalizing into highly charged sensations which the artist configures into dense, harmonic compositions, could then offer the spectator that sensation of a tranquil, sensual amplitude and in this way fulfill its function as temporary shelter for the sovereign subject. Perceptual training, reinvented by Hoyt Sherman as a means of preparing the (art) student so that he or she can continue to produce aesthetic experience, accords well with Freud's mapping of a traumatic terrain. It emerged, however, at a historical juncture as an attempt scientifically and technologically to supplement the effectiveness of the now vigilant artist. Confronting the efflorescence of a consumer culture in which experience -- whether urban or rural -- was itself retreating into representation, the postwar artist turned to newer methods for maintaining a functional relationship to the affective unities of the great cultural past that science and technology could do little to restore.

Chapter Five

Art for the Millions

In the second chapter of this dissertation I presented an extreme instance of late modernism in American art instruction. Using data and techniques from the most instrumental aspects of experimental psychology, and theories derived from Gestalt, Hoyt Sherman conceived a foundation-level drawing course which wedded aesthetic, scientific and industrial structures so seamlessly that he could recommend his course as preliminary training for virtually all walks of life. Even before Sherman opened his first flash lab in 1942, he had concluded that the perceptual and organizational powers required for a career in art were equally useful for other vocations. This conviction, itself symptomatic of the late-modern period, depended upon the idea that unified perception enhances experience, and that through training such perception and experience could be fused to create a new, literally aestheticized sense of reality.

In this chapter I will explore some of the historical preconditions for that "aestheticization," and for what Peter Brger has called the postwar "false sublation" of art and life. Whether or not one agrees with the entirety of Brger's claim, there should be little doubt that modernist

high art and historical avant-gardist techniques have been broadly assimilated within American consumer culture.¹ Yet the historical processes which led to this absorption came into view well before the 1960s. In order to identify those processes, it is necessary to turn to the economic and cultural conditions that obtained in the United States before World War II. Those conditions set in motion an initial transformation of art -- once the concern of a privileged minority -- into something that masses of Americans could find approachable, desirable and, eventually, consumable. This chapter will therefore begin with a discussion of federal policies on art during the 1930s. From there I will outline parallel developments within private and/or commercial art patronage which contributed, albeit at a different level, to the dissemination of a visual culture in this country. By describing the impact both of these developments -- of public policies and commercial developments -- on American art teaching before, during and after the war, the position of Hoyt Sherman's course, relative to the broad spectrum of practices which constitute late modern art teaching, will be clarified.

There were a number of ways in which the continuing generalization of visual culture throughout American life during and after the war was detectable. In a summary of

such changes in the perception of art in America I will argue that the political, economic and cultural processes of transformation begun during the 1930s ultimately facilitated the assimilation of art to the spectacular conditions of postwar consumer culture. I will then conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of Pop Art. For in the art of Roy Lichtenstein, James Rosenquist and Andy Warhol one finds the logical artistic culmination of that process of transformation. So clearly do their varied and contradictory oeuvres refer to, and depend upon, that change that it becomes possible to speak meaningfully of their social construction as late modern artists. While the differences between their art accorded with their different artistic educations, so the similarities between them recall the broad conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures which was the precondition for, and in some cases even the character of, late modern art instruction in America.

American art and its public were transformed between 1935 and 1945. Contrary to a popular misconception, the first American challenge to elitist conceptions of art production, distribution, reception and education does not date from the period between the middle of the 1950s and the early '60s. The first time the idea of art-for-art's sake

was contested, and the first concerted effort to increase the size and social diversity of the audience for art in the U.S. had little, if anything, to do with avant-gardism, neo- or otherwise. It originated in 1935 when the Roosevelt Administration set in motion the activities of the Federal Art Project of the Works Progress Administration (FAP/WPA). As conceived by Holger Cahill, this national art agenda was based upon the model of John Dewey's philosophy of progressive education, reflexive democracy, and aesthetic experience.²

Cahill was appointed National Director of the FAP upon its inception in 1935, and he retained this post until its termination in 1943. He described the goals of the FAP and the rationale behind it in two written statements: first, the essay he wrote to accompany the Museum of Modern Art's exhibition, New Horizons in American Art (1936) and, second, a lecture he delivered on the occasion of Dewey's eightieth birthday in 1939.³ In both statements he outlined the same concepts which served as the basis for the nationwide plan to foster a new and democratic American art.

It is well known that the WPA/FAP made it government business to commission thousands of public sculptures and murals, and to commission and distribute even greater quantities of posters, art reproductions, prints and

paintings among schools, post offices, hospitals, prisons or wherever large groups of Americans could see them. Less familiar is the fact that the Project instituted educational programs nationwide to construct a vast and socially diversified public for art. From Harlem to Spokane, over 130 Community Art Centers and "experimental galleries" were established across the country. There, art was taught to young and old, black and white, whether for recreational, educational, vocational or therapeutic purposes. At these centers and regional museums, scores of federally sponsored exhibitions were put on display. In this way the FAP attempted to stimulate the growth of a national visual culture, while providing work for skilled and unskilled men and women. The government also commissioned the production of lantern slides by the tens of thousands, dioramas, models, map drawings, diagrams and other museological and pedagogical aids. Depression era projects like the Index of American Design and The Music Project reawakened Americans to local cultural traditions.⁴

These projects were united in their attempt to integrate aesthetic experience into the social fabric of American life in a manner that was consistent with Dewey's writings, among them, his newly published Art as Experience (1934). They were intended to create a "sweeping renaissance of democratic interest in American art which runs through

every economic level of our society, from the richest to the poorest."⁵ Most of the Project imagery chronicled what Cahill called a "usable" American past; or it recorded the present in urban and rural settings. The dominance of American Scene styles and historical themes are conventionally understood as a gauge of popular sentiment, cultural provincialism or aesthetic timidity. But they can also be understood to embody the idea that art must try to join in the collective life of communities. Dewey had identified a good part of the value of art with its capacity to serve as an "extension of the power of rites and ceremonies to unite men, through a shared celebration, to all incidents and scenes of life."⁶ Cahill invoked this argument when he reported enthusiastically that the Project was hiring artists and designers in some very small and remote communities.

...the young artist has tended for perhaps the first time within the modern period to attack the problems of art at home, in his own setting, among familiar surroundings, in the midst of a social life which he is likely to know well. This situation -- part of it enforced by the Depression -- has meant at least a beginning toward a naturalization of art in all our communities, an outcome which must be achieved if our art is to be anything more than an effervescence along the Atlantic seaboard...⁷

While the domination of Project art by social realist and regionalist styles may denote the ultimate failure of a naively populist approach to the problem of shaping a

regional sense of identity while forging national cohesion, artists did not have to be practitioners of those styles to consider their work consistent with the goals of the FAP. Among the membership of the American Abstract Artists (AAA) were many who, supported by the Project, rejected the notion that abstraction, in and of itself, constituted an elite or opaque art practice. Barbara Rose has noted that:

...many [members] had been involved with the cause of public art on the W.P.A. and they saw the museums as the means for educating the public to a new understanding of modern art. Believing their work was, if not a utopian solution to the social and political problems of mankind, at least a significant contribution to a democratic culture, they did not want their art supported by a small coterie of wealthy collectors. Instead they wished to educate a large public to understand the meaning of modern art, and they thought this was the job of the museums.⁸

During this period artists were encouraged to "keep(s) alive our ability to experience the common world in its fullness."⁹ For this and other reasons Cahill's wanted to counter the commonplace neglect, or destruction, of local traditions in American art and craft, and their historical dislocation from contemporary experience. He held industrial processes of production accountable for the degradation of popular taste, and stressed the importance to the Project of uniting the fine and applied arts.¹⁰ This was one of the aims that differentiated the FAP from its predecessor, the Public Works of Art Project.¹¹ Art must in a "genuine sense have use," and should be "interwoven with the very stuff and

texture of human experience, intensifying that experience, making it more profound, rich, clear, and coherent." And this was supposed to happen in the context of an "unfolding experience of the American community."¹² That is, it must be useful in the same broadly humanitarian, process-oriented sense that Dewey had intended, while it directed itself to instruction in the public settings that the Project favored. In order to illustrate the idea of collective aesthetic experience, Cahill invoked medieval history and the ritual customs of the Pueblo Indians.¹³

Understanding that such a cultural integration would never come about unless the hierarchical distinction between fine and applied arts could be eliminated, Cahill argued that one must break down "the artificial barrier which exists between...forms of art expression..." This was an "objective desirable in itself...a means of drawing together major aesthetic forces in this country."¹⁴ In some ways the FAP did manage to undermine the hierarchical disposition of art media, elevating in importance implicitly popular techniques and explicitly populist themes and styles. And everyone involved -- whether easel painter, muralist, graphic designer, or photographer -- was paid according to the same scale.¹⁵ Yet owing to the economic character of the Great Depression, and to the limits of the Project's own resources, designers and craftsmen applied their skills to

the production of posters or educational aids, not to consumer goods. The greatest exception to the modesty of the designers' products may have been the extraordinary undertakings carried out in conjunction with the National Forest Service, such as the construction and decoration of the Timberline Lodge at Mount Hood, Oregon, which the Federal Writers' Project documented (fig. 53).¹⁶

Cahill also held American patterns of art collecting responsible for the erosion of local traditions in art and design. He indicted post-Civil War collectors for buying "aesthetic fragments torn from their social background, but trailing clouds of aristocratic glory." In this way they promoted the "dislocation of art...from its social context." With the rise of such collectors, "the first really serious breach between the American artist and his public had occurred."¹⁷ In 1936, and again in 1939, Cahill repeated his challenge to the notion of art-for-art's sake, by criticizing the concept of the individual masterpiece: "a nineteenth-century phenomenon, a collector's idea [which] has little relation to an art movement."¹⁸ Consistent with this view, he structured the Project to respond to the needs of those artists who had fallen through the cracks of the commercial gallery and museum system. It is not, he wrote, "the solitary genius but a sound general art

movement...which maintains art as a vital functioning part of any cultural scheme."¹⁹

The purpose of the New Deal challenge to art-for-art's sake was inseparable from the broader goals of providing federal support for destitute artists, designers and craftsmen, and of disseminating nationally a democratically conceived visual culture. However, while the logical foundation for the New Deal critique of aesthetic elitism can be related to John Dewey's philosophy, so can the countervailing tendency among postwar Americans to venerate the art object. Dewey's Art as Experience is peppered with references to the fact that the work of fine art and the processes that produce it are rare and valuable manifestations of meaning and fulfillment, all the more remarkable for their achievement in the midst of an inhumane structured industrial society. Surely this message also was communicated through the educational programs of the FAP. One of the latter's greatest successes may well have been the conferral of a sense of cultural entitlement and reverence for art to a generation of middle class and soon-to-be middle class Americans which came of age during and after World War II. After the war they turned to art and culture with such enthusiasm, in such numbers, and with enough loose cash on hand to contribute substantially to the cultural preconditions for the

radically anti-domestic, abstract and expressionist art of the later 1940s.²⁰

This is not to say that the generalization of visual culture which accompanied the war's end was the product of WPA/FAP policies alone; other historical factors contributed to this situation. Significant developments in the private, rather than public sector coincided with the era of the WPA/FAP. What has been called the "romance of commerce and culture" is commonly understood as a postwar phenomenon, if not explicitly the legacy of the '60s art boom. Yet it has been traced to the 1930s, when a number of entrepreneurs set about the process of projecting a more stable, positive image of business than the one which the grim realities of the Depression was impressing upon the minds of Americans.²¹

One American entrepreneur, who entered into an emblematic relationship with the practitioners and advocates of that explicitly European high modernist aesthetic, was Walter Paepcke. His familiarity with the administrators, patrons, and aesthetic philosophy of the Museum of Modern Art in New York enabled him to pursue his commercial goals while endowing his company with the dignified, humanistic aura of European modernism. Contemporary with the first activities of the FAP, Paepcke turned his Chicago-based

Container Corporation of America (CCA) into one of the most significant prefigurations of American corporate modernism.

Significantly, this patron of high modernist art and design had no sympathy for Roosevelt's New Deal policies, believing it a "threat to both business and the nation."²² Neither was it likely that he shared any enthusiasm for the Deweyan philosophy, as became evident in his later association with midwestern promoters of American "humanism" like Robert M. Hutchins (President of the University of Chicago, 1929-1945) and Mortimer Adler (a former student of Dewey's who became one of the latter's more vocal critics). Authors of the "Great Books" program of the early 1940s, Hutchins and Adler were determined to "elevate the common run of mankind to demanding standards of culture and morality." Those standards were consistent with the postwar "revival of traditional humanism" to which they and their supporters were committed.²³ The fact that this humanist revival was conceived in a "popular" manner should not conceal the authoritarian aspect of determining cultural and moral standards for everyone. Thus it may not be unreasonable to suggest that the Great Books program found its logical culmination in the 1945 formation of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution.²⁴

His company bedeviled by a standing deficit of three million dollars in 1933, Walter Paepcke adopted a two-tiered approach to transform this bleak fiscal picture. First, he slashed his overhead and the rate at which his deficit was mounting by negotiating a more economical lease for his plant and offices, and by laying off workers. Only individuals who accepted a lower pay scale were rehired, including one "previously laid-off employee (who) promised to work for less than anyone else."²⁵ Second, he engaged in what Barron's in 1937 called a "packaging revolution." With the guidance of his wife, Elizabeth, and the encouragement of, among others, A. Conger Goodyear (first President of the Museum of Modern Art), he developed a comprehensive new design image for his company. In 1935 he hired Egbert Jacobson to head the new project. Jacobson formerly worked for the public relations firms, J. Walter Thompson and N.W. Ayer and, when Paepcke hired him, was President of the Art Director's Club of Chicago. The Container Corporation of America became the "first company to engage modern artists in a systematic, enduring campaign of institutional advertising and of corporate identification with modern art."²⁶ Among others, Moholy-Nagy, Herbert Bayer, Man Ray, Fernand Leger, Jean Hlton, Willem de Kooning, Richard Lindner and Herbert Matter would design ads for Paepcke's company (figs 54-56). The first ad campaign underscored the important contribution that American corporations were

making to the war effort (fig. 57), and included designs by Man Ray, Herbert Matter, Gyorgy Kepes and Jean Hlton. After the war, the interdependence of freedom, democracy, corporate well-being and humanist culture became the focal point of campaigns devoted to the United Nations, United States and "Great Ideas" (figs. 58-59).²⁷

Before the war corporations also saw the potential for improving the sales of their products by turning to artists and industrial designers for sleek product and packaging designs and imaginative promotional schemes.²⁸ Beginning late in the 1920s "machine age" designers had proved their ability to stimulate consumerism through innovative, fanciful designs. The consumer-oriented machine age aesthetic was, in many cases, only slightly more consistent with the material processes and structural character of mass-produced consumer goods production than was the illusionism of more traditionally historicist forms. Reveling in their play upon futuristic codes and fantasies, these American designers, typified by Norman Bel Geddes and his colleagues, had more in common with the aeronautic vernacular styles of later Detroit automotive design than with the morally freighted constructivist logic of European high modernists.²⁹

Nevertheless, it was to practitioners of industrial design that American companies turned during the Depression to lure consumers back to the marketplace. The emergence of industrial design as an important profession -- one which required proper academic training -- had a profound effect upon university art departments. This virtually new field contributed significantly to an instrumentally motivated erosion of the boundaries between aesthetic and industrial structures within late modern art and design teaching. In 1935 the Department of Painting and Design within the College of Fine Arts at Carnegie Tech introduced a B.F.A. degree with a specialty in industrial design: the first such program in the United States. Five years before, the Westinghouse Electric Company of East Pittsburgh had hired Donald Dohner, a graphic artist on the Carnegie faculty, to "redesign and improve any manufactured article and develop new ones within the whole company."³⁰ Had this not happened, Dohner and his colleague, the artist and design instructor, Alexander Kostellow, would not have conceived of the new course of instruction when they did; nor as they did. The industrial design curriculum prepared its graduates to understand the material requirements of mass production, to anticipate the desires of consumers, and to employ the logic of aesthetic structure. Arthur Pulos has noted that "it was at Carnegie Tech that the unique strain of American industrial design philosophy (combining aesthetic principles

with empirical exploration and practical experience), which has permeated industrial design education in the United States, was identified."³¹ In a paper he wrote to commemorate the introduction of the new program, Robert Lepper, Andy Warhol's most important teacher at Carnegie Tech, used the term "artist-designer" to describe the new breed the faculty hoped to produce.³²

Lepper had graduated from Carnegie Tech in 1927, became an instructor in the Department of Painting and Design in 1930 when he taught a first year design course, and was appointed an assistant professor in 1937. Among the courses he would teach were Bases of Design ("...analysis of the elements of visual perception, their properties and potentials"), Pictorial Analysis ("tracing the evolution of drawing and design from prehistoric times"), Industrial Design ("...the design of articles for multiple production"), and his own distinctive contribution to the curriculum, Pictorial Design.³³ Lepper may have graduated in 1927 with a degree in illustration, but his predisposition as an art and design instructor was deeply affected by his presence as an instructor in the department during the early 1930s, when Dohner and Kostellow evolved the industrial design program.

In notes taken while attending one of Kostellow's classes in May 1932, Lepper outlined ideas which would later resurface as the basis for his own course in Pictorial Design. Among these ideas, he described life in terms of a "maintenance of order -- a balance of forces." The individual, a "living organism," is engaged in a "continual process of adjusting forces to balance." It is therefore crucial "to maintain (and) obtain freedom of action within individual limitations...and attempt to reduce, to eliminate...forces which interfere with Freedom of Action (sic)." Kostellow understood those forces to consist of the "personal" or internal ones: physical and emotional conditions; and "impersonal" or external ones: economic and political conditions.³⁴

Lepper's two-part course in Pictorial Design was oriented to the needs of juniors and seniors in commercial, not industrial design. Andy Warhol took it in 1947-48. It shared many of the pedagogical features of industrial design courses, differing principally by omitting instruction in industrial processes of production. Pictorial Design trained students to be keenly aware of what Lepper called the "social flux"; that is, of their ever changing relationship to the component parts of the community in which they lived. The course consisted of seven problems: 1) Study the

elements of Oakland, the community in which Carnegie Tech is situated.

With the general viewpoint of a cultural anthropologist, the analyzer will take into account people, shelter, exchange of goods and services, means of communication, ceremonial observances, the nature of governmental activity and public services, and community spectacle (ie. topography, weather, light, movement of people in groups).³⁵

2) Undertake a general investigation of the construction of a dwelling unit, "the most significant single object in the social flux." 3) Using your imagination, picture the furnishings of the living room within that dwelling. 4) While engaged in the last problem, read several selected short stories with the intention of "achieving...those understandings of human relations which will assist in the solution of the problems of the course." 5) Engage in "significant retrospection," remembering one's own growth "in every sense of the word," with the purpose of "deepening understanding as to human behavior in its origins and expressions." 6) Study dress and general appearance as revealing of personality. 7) Using the knowledge acquired in the first six steps of the course (the entire junior year), prepare a pictorial interpretation of a long novel chosen by the instructor. (For Warhol's class the novel was Robert Penn Warren's, All the King's Men.)

Equipped with the social and personal insights which this course provided, and with the pictorial skills which students had acquired previously in (foundation-level) courses, Lepper hoped the graduate would create products which would effect stability within the "social organism." It is appropriate in a course of instruction for individuals who would go on to work in advertising and promotional design that its stated goal is to achieve a sense of stability within the social environment. The promise of such stability can be read in terms of the structure of human desire -- a condition of perpetual want -- which consumerism promises to satisfy, albeit episodically, through individual acts of consumption.

It is a function of Lepper's historical situation that he also understood the role of the art instructor (and the designer) in the less explicitly commercial and more socially engaged terms of facilitating stability in the midst of a rapidly changing environment. This was evident in the contents of a paper he wrote towards the end of World War II in which he anticipated that rapid changes in materials and patterns of production and consumption would alter the texture of individual and social experience during the postwar era. Such changes, he cautioned, would present "enormous problems of readjustment."³⁶ Lepper felt that artists should be educated to move beyond their function as

"sensory animal(s)" or compliant providers of what people want, to "collaborate in the conception of an idea" prior to production.³⁷ Throughout his paper, he used the term "artist," despite the fact that Lepper was clearly and consistently referring to the situation of individuals who are commercially employed as designers. It was almost a decade earlier that he had combined these two categories more tentatively, employing the conjunction, "artist-designer." Lepper's later use of the term "artist" to refer to an individual who worked as a designer signals a shift that took place in the perception of the designer, in the qualitative relation between what he or she does and what an artist does, and that shift was even discernable in the choice of terms that might be used to describe the work of the commercial designer. This transformation was itself due, in part, to the growing inclination on university campuses, from the mid 1930s through the late 1940s, to train artists with the skills of designers, while educating designers to conceive of their profession in terms hitherto reserved for the work of artists. Partly it was a function of a broader American appreciation of the theories developed by European pioneers in high modernist design: the former Bauhaus masters who had moved to this country during the late 1930s.

Industrial design grew and became more prestigious throughout the 1940s and spawned a variety of institutional

and pedagogical manifestations which also effected the education of artists.³⁸ University art departments -- always eager to increase enrollment -- competed for students. This was especially apparent after the war, when returning veterans -- future Pop artists, armed with federal funds, among them -- turned to careers in art in unprecedented numbers; to careers, I emphasize, not to colorful lives of bohemian indigence. This generation, progeny of Depression, wanted credentials and flexible skills in order to ensure gainful employment. Administrators and faculty members in university art departments therefore refashioned curricula with an emphasis on "the kinds of artistic thought and activity which have the widest range of applications...encouraging adaptability to many kinds of related work," as the Carnegie Tech Bulletin put it.³⁹

Art and design instructors, who came of age during the 1930s and identified themselves as pragmatic modernists, might come from backgrounds in art and design, as did Lepper, or from engineering, art and design, as in Hoyt Sherman's case. Nevertheless, these zealous young modernists coincided at the level of their individual response to the challenge of increased enrollment, and to the demand for more adaptable forms of practical training. Both codified the principles of what they considered a universal aesthetic into all-purpose foundation courses that all students, no

matter what their career plans, were required to take.⁴⁰ To attain greater efficiency and authority both for introductory and more advanced courses, they turned to science. In Chapter II I revealed the special appeal of Gestalt psychology for those who, like Sherman, modernized introductory courses in drawing and pictorial structure. On the other hand, sociology, anthropology and psychoanalysis informed Lepper's two-part course in Pictorial Design. In such ways science and technology, the ethos of an aggressive productivity, and a romantic belief in art's conciliatory power combined to inform late modern instruction within university art departments.

The extent to which one can speak of a correlation of the artist and designer's training was furthered by the emergence of "organic" curriculum planning, a concept that acquired special prestige during the 1940s. According to this theory, individual instructors subordinated the goals of their courses to the requirements of the greater pedagogical "whole." As part of the drive to reform the curriculum along organic lines, the College of Fine Arts at Carnegie Tech implemented a "Fine Arts Academic Program" in 1942 which required students in all its divisions (painting and design, industrial design and art education) to take new courses. These included: Thought and Expression (a replacement for freshman English), The Arts and

Civilization, and Individual and Social Psychology (this last was described as: "Human personality from the standpoint of the native, social and cultural factors that influence its development"). The academic program was intended, in the words of Dean Keeble: "to exploit the capacities...and correct the limitations of the typical art student...to provide a complement to his particular kind of professional training...to widen the horizon of our young artists, to reduce their prejudices and multiply their enthusiasms, to link intellectual and practical interests with their creative endeavors and, finally, to integrate them with society and equip them to take an effective part in the difficult world which this generation must face."⁴¹ By responding in this way to the threat of too technical an arts education, organic curriculum planning advanced the existing tendency to erode some of the boundaries between the education of the artist and the designer; in doing so, it also participated in a century-old tradition of liberal educational reform. But emerging during the war in Europe, this plan to supplement the specialist's training with courses in science and the humanities must be considered in relation to the growing perception among university administrators, educators, intellectuals and more than a few businessmen that since this continent alone would survive the war intact, it was incumbent upon Americans to rescue Western culture. This they planned to secure by advancing a

popularly conceived postwar humanism.⁴² Moreover, organic curriculum planning made possible the assertion that universities could educate a better breed of American artist: a new humanist.⁴³

In much of this, one senses the influence of the Bauhaus: of pedagogical theories developed by Bauhaus masters who had published their major tracts during the 1920s and emigrated to the United States during the 1930s. Among these, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy may have been the most important to the history of American art, design and their instruction. The New Vision (1926; first published in English in 1930, and reprinted in 1938 and 1946) abounds in ideas that were considered throughout the 1930s and '40s by American professors of art and design.

As a practitioner of Bauhaus theory, Moholy-Nagy was outlining in essentially constructivist terms a new mode of production in which traditional dichotomies were transcended by being informed both by aesthetic and industrial structures. Extending the synthetic vision to the pedagogical field, Moholy described good education as an organic balance of sensual stimulation, intellectual, emotional and practical experience. Similarly, he was prone to using a variation of the biological metaphor we encountered in Alexander Kostellow and Robert Lepper's

design courses.⁴⁴ In an oft-quoted phrase, Moholy asserted - as had Hoyt Sherman and many another late modern instructor -- that "everyone is talented."⁴⁵ He envisioned properly trained artist-designers as masters of their increasingly fragmented living and working conditions whose powers of synthesis would extend beyond the reach of traditional artistic skills to embrace a diversity of material and conceptual elements.

At the level of pedagogical theory, though clearly not of concrete visual culture, Moholy-Nagy and many of his fellow Bauhaus instructors shared many ideas with John Dewey. Indeed, The New Vision cites the American philosopher as someone who should be credited with being among the "forerunners of the present educational practice."⁴⁶ The fact that he, Albers, Itten and other Bauhauslers shared so many ideas about education and the social integration of aesthetics with Dewey is a striking manifestation of the diversity and internationalism of high modernist pedagogical theory.

Moholy-Nagy's tract anticipated the themes and goals, though not quite the strategies, of innovative late modern pedagogies of art in this country. I hesitate to include "strategies" in this list because, while Bauhaus ideas were clearly influential in this country, the methods used by

American instructors and the considerations of American designers were rather different from those of the European model. Lepper and Sherman, for example, suppressed the ecological aspect of Bauhaus methodology, emphasized its aesthetic and instrumental potential. There are motivating concepts implicit in such American pedagogies which clearly can be referred back to Bauhaus theory, but the methods these Americans devised have no European precedent.

By the later 1940s the view that the designer's training was an aesthetic one was widely accepted among designers and educators; and it was generally understood that "manufacture would be the medium through which the designer sought expression." But American educators and designers found the European model too time consuming and painstaking. The course which Moholy outlined in The New Vision placed so much emphasis on stimulating the senses of foundation-level students, and was too abstract and idealistic in its goals to suit the requirements of the vast, competitive, and wasteful American marketplace.⁴⁷

High modernist art teaching, as exemplified by the first waves of Bauhaus pedagogies, aimed to transform art, design and their instruction within an immediate context of material scarcity and social upheaval. The New Vision, product of the Dessau Bauhaus, possesses two kinds of

rhetoric: utopian and pragmatic. The late modernist pedagogies which emerged on American university campuses delineated an altogether more instrumental and tentative combination of aesthetic and industrial economies. This, notwithstanding the fact that practitioners of late modern art and design instruction like Lepper and Sherman were hardly indifferent to the allure of utopian modernist rhetoric. The syntheses first envisioned by Bauhaus masters were ultimately not at home in American circumstances. So distinct were the latter from those which obtained in Europe one and two decades before that Moholy-Nagy was compelled to reconsider and adjust his goals and methods.

Moholy's two books, The New Vision and Vision in Motion (1947), so alike in certain ways, are separated by considerably more than their dates of publication. As a restatement of his Bauhaus design philosophy for an American audience, the later book, paradoxically, includes a more extreme measure of rhetoric than its predecessor. Thus it opens onto a virtual catechism, the messianic tone of which Hoyt Sherman would surely have appreciated:

Vision in Motion is simultaneous grasp.
 Simultaneous grasp is creative performance --
 seeing, feeling and thinking in relation and not
 as a series of isolated phenomena. It
 instantaneously integrates and transmutes single
 elements into a coherent whole....Vision in Motion
 is a synonym for simultaneity and space-time; a
 means to comprehend the new dimension. Vision in
 Motion is seeing while moving.⁴⁸

History and the very different circumstances of a new setting separate Moholy's two books from each other. Between the Bauhaus concept of a design "standard" -- one which presides over, and is itself the product of, a painstaking, ecologically minded investigation -- and an American economy which is fueled by what Moholy-Nagy called "forced obsolescence," a contradiction emerges with unusual clarity, one which was merely implicit in Bauhaus theory. In Vision in Motion Moholy offered some commentary on this distinctly American concept.

...design in this country is basically different from that of Europe. A country like the United States, rich in resources, raw materials and human ingenuity can afford to be wasteful. Thus the economy in the United States has incorporated into its structure the frequent change of models and quick turn-over, by declaring older models obsolete long before their technical usefulness has ceased....The theory and practice of forced obsolescence leads -- in the long run-- to cultural and moral disintegration because it destroys the feeling for quality and security of judgment. Continuity of culture results from a primary concern for quality rather than for novelty."⁴⁹

Needless to say, there was resistance to these ideas from American designers and businessmen; this, notwithstanding the support which Moholy-Nagy received from the administrators of the Museum of Modern Art in New York and the lasting generosity of entrepreneurs like Walter Paepcke in Chicago.⁵⁰ Although in 1944 Moholy could join Alexander

Kostellow and Donald Dohner to head an education commission to draw up a model program in design education for the American Designers Institute, disharmony between them was bound to surface. By then Dohner had become a partner with J. Gordon Lippencott in the design firm of Dohner and Lippencott; together they also taught, along with Kostellow, at Pratt Institute. In 1945 Lippencott published an article in the College Art Journal in which he criticized the industrial design philosophy of the Museum of Modern Art. The basis of his disagreement was the concept that Moholy labeled "forced obsolescence," a concept which some American educators and designers were perfectly willing to defend.

Usually when an article is good enough, esthetically, to meet the exacting requirements of the museum, it is so far over the consumer's head that it does not sell. I insist that designs that do not sell are not good examples of industrial design, since the primary function of the industrial designer is to create the product that has consumer appeal.⁵¹

If Josef Albers was less compelled to alter his theory and practice in the United States, that was because he functioned, as both artist and teacher, within the narrower, more literally exclusive and abstract conditions of high aesthetic production and reception. Indeed, Albers and Hans Hofmann -- long a critic of the Bauhaus's utopian plan for a synthesis of art and design -- were resolute in their pursuit of abstraction and aesthetic autonomy. This can be understood in relation to the danger to art which they

perceived as instrumentalism (economic or political), commercial logic and populism encroached upon it's institutional and discursive terrain.

The neglect of Hofmann's and Albers's teaching in this dissertation should in no way be construed as a suggestion of their unimportance or marginality. On the contrary. I am more concerned with illuminating an aspect of American art instruction which has itself remained less familiar, owing to its transitoriness, its regionalism, and/or its all too apparent marginality within conventional art historical accounts which remain responsive to the elaborately orchestrated achievements of postwar American fine art. The persistence of aestheticism in postwar art is impossible to overlook. Retelling its history can bring about no fuller an understanding of the postwar "false sublation" of art and life. Indeed, retelling that history might well leave one puzzled by the fact that any such a development could have come about at all.

Despite differences in their art and pedagogical approaches, Albers and Hofmann coincided in establishing the dominant aestheticist strain within American postwar fine art teaching. Thus, as I will later show, even on a major midwestern university campus an individual who had studied closely with Hofmann taught painting as an autonomous,

materially based search for the metaphysical "real" in the midst of cultural and economic realities which militated against such aesthetic purity. The clarity with which Albers and Hofmann each understood the fundamentals of modernist pictorial dynamics and conveyed them to their students combined with their prestige as renowned figures from the high modernist past to secure for their students a sense of cultural continuity. This combined with the rise of the New York School to international preeminence after the war to ensure the centrality of their practices within late modern art teaching from the 1950s on.

Notwithstanding the influence of Bauhaus and other European masters on late modern art instruction, such teaching did not simply result from emulating the lessons pioneered by such immigrants. Schools like Black Mountain College and the New Bauhaus in Chicago became well springs of high modernist pedagogical theory in this country. But late modern art teaching responded to a complex of conditions that were endemic to the United States throughout the 1930s and '40s. This resulted both in a professionalization -- and rationalization -- of pedagogical strategies, and in a countervailing tendency towards the establishment and preservation of a humanistic visual culture.

Thusfar in this chapter I have described transformations which took place in the base of support for American art and in the character of art instruction as a function of two major historical dislocations: the Great Depression and the immanence of World War II. Extensive changes in the American perception of art continued throughout the war and into the postwar era. These are easily discernable at four institutional levels, including: the museum, art history, patterns of collecting, and the representation of art in the mass media.

A significant change in the public image of the art museum began during the New Deal and continued through the wartime mobilization. Regarded during the 1920s as somber repositories for great American collections like those that were bequeathed during that decade, the museum became a forum for the exhibitions that were organized and distributed under FAP auspices during the Depression. During the 1940s museums really emerged as institutions for public instruction, stages for leisure-time social encounters, or for patriotic, sometimes stirring diversions. Just as the activities of the WPA/FAP were winding down, the museums attempted to demonstrate and rally support for the war effort with exhibits ranging from the Museum of Modern Art's

ambitious "Road to Victory" (1942) and "Airways to Peace" (1943) to the more conventional "Artists for Victory" shows at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. These shows contributed to the unalterable transformation of the demographics of American museum attendance in the U.S., while they helped to shift the social perception of the museum from the periphery to something nearer the center of middle-class attention.⁵²

Although, among the charters of American museums, statements of educational purpose are a commonplace, in 1944 this goal emerged as a prominent topic for discussion among professionals in the field. That year the College Art Journal echoed what had become a far-reaching concern: "The Future of the Art Museum as an Educational Institution." Its entire May issue was devoted to discussing the potential for public instruction in museums. Significantly, the only article that did not correspond to this thematic agenda was nevertheless germane to the position which held that it was desirable to expand public awareness of art through its efficient instruction. Written by Elizabeth Okerbloom, it was entitled, "Hoyt Sherman's Experimental Work in the Field of Visual Form."⁵³

The economic and political supremacy of the United States in the postwar era brought an imperial dimension to the activities of museums, just as it did to museological

discourse. Among the signs of a new emphasis on the international stature of American museums, the 1945-46 Art News Annual was entirely devoted to the "Metropolitan Metamorphosis: the Shape of the Museum to Come," in anticipation of the museum's postwar plans for a ten million dollar reorganization and renovation of its collections and facilities. In his introduction to this issue, Francis Henry Taylor noted that President Truman, in a speech to Congress, had advocated the development of atomic energy for commercial and industrial purposes. History, according to Taylor, foretells that the peaceful application of atomic energy will yield greater national productivity and shorter working hours.

While no one can look into the future definitely, one can dream of the time when all the people of the world will have more and more time available for leisure and culture. It follows then that the educational instruction of this country alone can provide that abundant life without which leisure can never become a reality -- an abundance based upon the development of those resources within the human being which please the eye and the ear and stimulate the imagination, at the same time satisfying the thirst for knowledge of the past and prescience of the future.⁵⁴

According to Taylor's plan, the Metropolitan Museum, then celebrating its seventy-fifth year "of service to New York and the nation," would take advantage of the additional leisure time that would result from the productive surpluses of the third technological revolution to "build a new humanism." The museum collections "whose spectacular growth

and present extent" were featured throughout the lavish magazine in color illustrations, would serve as the cradle of this renewed post-war humanism. As Taylor envisioned it, the reorganized museum was to be an "organic synthesis of five separate museums". Each of the five major areas of the collection would occupy a separate zone in orbit around a center of gravity that would be the Great Hall. Henceforth the museum would separate itself from its traditional function of "a collecting agency" in order to secure an image of itself as "a true people's museum, free and informal."⁵⁵

According to another article, entitled, "U.S. Museums: 1945 and Future," museums were seen to "stand at a crossroads." Less and less, are they "imposing repositories, the pet endowment scheme of a few men of wealth."

Increasingly they must answer to the needs of entire regions whose qualitative horizons have been vastly widened by the travels of their war veterans among their sister institutions abroad."⁵⁶

This may have been a polite warning to museums that they had better grow and improve their collections and facilities if they were to hold their own against the great European institutions which were now the standard against which thousands of G.I.s would now judge their own. The editors of Art News also disclosed the results of a quantitative survey

which they conducted of thirty-one museums across the country, noting that most of them had postwar plans to refurbish and, in fourteen cases, to expand their existing buildings. One unidentified museum, as if in anticipation of the postwar suburban revolution in private housing, was reported to contemplate "opening five branch museums better to service its widely scattered population." The article then offered some compelling advice to the museum curators and administrators:

If our department stores tend to overdo it, our museums apparently give little thought to new systems of lighting or experiments with non-reflecting glass, new display cases, movable walls, new surfaces against which to hang pictures, or any of the mechanical contrivances which, developed during the war to enhance often inferior goods, might benefit exhibition methods or reduce "museum fatigue." Since lighting in most museums is either obsolete or inadequate, it is surprising that allocation of money for experiments in that direction has not been stressed. Factories, libraries, and the widely advertised kitchens of the future are designed today with such factors in mind, Are museums, dedicated to the best possible display of visual objects, in a position to disregard them?⁵⁷

Techniques derived from merchandising were offered for consideration by those who foresaw the potential of more diverting, more spectacular, art museums to assist in the national effort to recast humanist culture in American terms. In a related development, Bern Porter of the University of California at Berkeley seized upon the techniques which the modernist visionary, Frederick Kiesler,

developed to eliminate the mediating function of the frame and facilitate, in Kiesler's own words, "the immediate reality in one living universe." Inspired by Kiesler's famous "projecting" installation (1943) at Peggy Guggenheim's gallery, Art of this Century, Porter speculated in the pages of the College Art Journal about the possibilities such a system offered for advertising and display art, interior decoration, or even as "fresh avenues for painters of non-objective and abstract art."⁵⁸ In this way "immediate reality," which had always been implicit in modern art's metaphysical potential, was appropriated as a fresh concept for commercial sales and promotion.

The College Art Journal, always a barometer of the latest shifts in the art-historical climate, also chronicled the effort of some within the College Art Association to revise the course offerings in university art history programs. In May 1943 Robert Goldwater published the findings of his quantitative survey investigating "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the United States." This quantitative approach was itself characteristic of a tendency among largely German-trained art historians in the United States to emphasize the empirical, indeed, scientific foundation of their discipline.⁵⁹ Goldwater's survey was not entirely quantitative. In its qualitative aspect it reflected its author's desire to see more courses offered in

modern and American art history. One of the facts to emerge from Goldwater's data, based upon a survey of the field between 1900 and 1940, was that between 1937 and 1940, instruction in those two areas had increased dramatically. Topics in the history of American art, in photographic and film history were relatively new areas of investigation for the members of the C.A.A.. In May 1945, The College Art Journal renewed the call for increased study of American art. In doing so, it preserved one important aspect of the federal art agenda just after the latter's demise, while recasting it into the more confident terms of the postwar age: to recover and make use of American cultural forms and traditions. Thus, Alfred Barr Jr.'s preface began: "This Number of the College Art Journal is propaganda. It is intended to persuade the scholars in American universities ...to interest themselves more deeply in studying the history of the arts in the United States."⁶⁰ Barr noted the recently published contributions of, among others, Beaumont Newhall, Frank Jewett Mather and James Thrall Soby, and exhorted the reader to join with them in their worthy, even patriotic endeavour.⁶¹

The matter of a more numerous, if not necessarily more sophisticated, clientele for art became another aspect of the attempt to transform the base of support for American art during the first half of the 1940s. In 1940 and 1941 the

government sponsored "Buy American Art Week," an attempt to encourage people to buy paintings, drawings, and prints from the immense accumulation of art that the various sections of the Federal Art Project produced. Works by some 32,000 artists participated in 1,600 exhibitions across the country in this attempt to garner private support for American works of art before the FAP's activities were phased out. Serge Guilbaut has noted that it was marked by an aesthetic conservatism, not to say rank amateurism, with styles ranging from Social Realism and American Scene painting to the eclectic, domesticated abstractions of the AAA. As such, the art on view typified what then, prior to the emergence of "internationalism" as the byword for American art and politics, served as the national conception of "modern art."⁶²

The continued expansion of the private base of support for modern art extended to other emblematically American developments. In 1942, shortly before Peggy Guggenheim opened Art of This Century, thereby portending the arrival of a more ambitious, independent American art, Macy's made its foray into marketing contemporary art by inviting Samuel Kootz, the art dealer and public relations man, to mount a show of new American painting. What the store desired was not work that would rehash the anecdotal Depression aesthetic, but a formally more innovative, modernist and

decidedly American art. The store wanted the kind of art that Kootz had only just lamented, in a famous letter to The New York Times, did not yet exist in the United States. Following the occupation of France by the Nazis, Kootz called for the elimination, once and for all, of the Depression aesthetic. He urged American artists to seize the opportunity which the war had made available to them to assume the leading role in international visual cultural.⁶³ Guilbaut has argued that the importance of this event was not to be found in the art which Kootz showed -- works by Avery, Davis, Gorky, Gottlieb, Graham and Rothko, among others. Rather, it consists in the fact that Macy's would be so responsive to the furor caused by Kootz's letter. Such attentiveness was symptomatic of how widespread the interest in modern American painting was becoming. In short, art had acquired "advertising potential."⁶⁴ Certainly Kootz's exhibition attested to the already considerable effects of the decade-old popularization of modern art in America.

Two years later, in 1944, Aline Loucheim affirmed that the reprivatization of American art had succeeded the more publicly oriented art of the WPA/FAP in an article, published in Art News, entitled, "Who Buys What in the Picture Boom?". A promotional piece written with a "period" sociological slant, Loucheim divided her essay into various sections. Their contents suggest that the logic underlying

collecting patterns before the discovery of Abstract Expressionism were not so very different from the ones which accompanied the expansion of the art market during the 1960s.⁶⁵ Loucheim observed that the new collectors were middle class, or newly middle class, and were spending money saved during the war primarily on the cheaper, more plentiful works of American artists. She attributed the boom in part to a "long process of familiarity and education" which she associated with the activities of the WPA.

The far-reaching educational activities of museums, the use of art in advertising, art in magazines (whether good or bad), sponsorship of art by industries like IBM, Encyclopedia Britannica, and Pepsi-Cola, the circulation of prints and color-reproductions (the Met gets several hundred requests a week for its 15 cent color reproductions advertised in subways) have created an active interest in art. With the exception of two conservative galleries who decried it as "taking the edge off the prestige value of art" all dealers applauded the beneficial effects of W.P.A. They explained it brought living art into people's consciousness and destroyed forever the sanctified, hushed-voice atmosphere of the generation of old master dealers and mausoleum aspects of museums.⁶⁶

Loucheim claimed that many people who bought art were doing so for investment purposes. Following a section of her article entitled, "Investment or Speculation?", she noted that "very expensive pictures" -- at that time paintings by Renoir, nineteenth-century French artists, Picasso, Miro, Marin, Kuhn and Max Weber -- "are in the majority of cases 'inflation hedges'."⁶⁷ Neither was this an entirely isolated

observation on the part of an interested publication. In January 1943, the College Art Journal published Eugenia Lea Whitridge's "Trends in the Selling of Art," which anticipated Loucheim's emphasis on the increase in buying for investment purposes.

Whitridge also noted the perception among larger numbers of Americans that art "is no longer thought of as a special ornament of the elite, a mark of culture and a source of prestige." She too understood that the popular conception of art as a source of enjoyment was a function of "the government's program of the thirties to develop art in our cultural waste places."⁶⁸ Thus, it may not be entirely accurate to assert, as Guilbault does, that the "disruption caused by the war opened a breach in the citadels of power through which the middle class found its way."⁶⁹ The defenses of that citadel in America had been eroded already, prepared for this breach by the Roosevelt administration's federal art policies from the mid-1930s. At that time, as Henry Schaefer-Simmern, an influential art educator of the 1940s has put it, the intention was to "preserve human integrity in the face of degradation."⁷⁰ What the war did accomplish, however, was the employment of masses of people who had little option, in the face of wartime rationing and scant consumer production, but to save money. After the war, they could spend some of their savings on those original

artworks which they had been taught to regard an indispensable part of their lives, and which now they were being told was a desirable asset in any well appointed domestic interior.

Mass-circulation news and fashion magazines sometimes disseminated the perception that art had become everyone's prerogative. In some cases they inadvertently demonstrated the threat to the cultural well being of the nation which would be posed if that prerogative were the magazine's publisher, Henry Luce. Life ran an article in 1944 concerning department stores as outlets for buying art. Entitled, "Department Stores Popularize Art," Life offered its readers pointers on the "correct" and "incorrect" ways to hang "original" oil paintings. Luce's magazine was no purveyor of advanced aesthetic taste. To judge from the accompanying illustrations (fig. 60), it was a backwater of trivializing modern cliches, or of illustration art. One page (fig. 61) provides ample evidence of the editorial taste for latter-day regionalist landscapes, harbor scenes and ballet dancers. Only toward the end of the decade would Life alert Americans to the antics of its native vanguard when, in 1949, the magazine published its article on the sensational work of Jackson Pollock ("Jackson Pollock: is he the greatest living painter in the United States?").⁷¹ By that time Luce had closed ranks with the other advocates of

American post-war "humanism," and could tolerate the presence of such art since it testified to the vitality of American freedom and democracy during the Cold War.⁷²

In 1946, the editors of Art News anticipated the resurgence of elitism in art by describing patterns of collecting in a somewhat less democratizing manner. Beginning in March 1946, and extending over the next five issues of the magazine, Rosamund Frost ran a series of articles under the heading, "Today's Collectors." In these profiles she added to the investment theory of art patronage the image of the chic patrician rebel or the popular celebrity as contemporary collector.⁷³ In her treatment of Roy Neuberger's fast-paced American art collecting, entitled, "Broker Buys American," she underscored the patriotic aspect of such acquisitiveness while relating the sheer fun of looking for, buying and living with American art. Frost described the Neuberger's first purchase -- bought with naivete, kept out of sentimentality. She told of closets brimming with artworks the couple had no room to unpack, much less to hang, and noted that portions of their collection were constantly shuttling back and forth to museums and art galleries all over.⁷⁴

Fashion magazines were well ahead of mass-circulation publications like Life. As a purveyor of advanced patterns

of consumption, Harper's Bazaar disseminated a familiarity with more sophisticated, up-to-date art practices. During the 1940s, Harper's Bazaar regularly ran ads designed by Dali and photographs like the ones by Hoyningen-Huene showing models posing in interiors with paintings by Leger and Mondrian (fig. 62-63). The same issue of this magazine featured James Johnson Sweeney's article, "Five American Painters," where he introduced the work of Jackson Pollock (The She Wolf was illustrated), Matta, Gorky, Avery, and Morris Graves.⁷⁵

One year later, in 1945, readers of Art News could find evidence of why some artists were turning to the creation of art as undomesticated as The She Wolf. According to the magazine's editors, Americans had grown so accustomed to the style of Mondrian's abstract paintings that a dress manufacturer had seen fit to introduce a new design based upon the just deceased master's works. Accompanying the banner, "Mondrian Makes the Mode," was a photograph of a model wearing such a dress (fig. 64) and the following text.

One of the surprises of the year 1945 has been to witness the sudden popularization of the purest, the most austere abstractionist of our day...The man in the street now accepts this great radical as a matter of course because his paintings are suggested by nearly every phase of modern life.⁷⁶

Only one year later, in February 1946, Clement Greenberg noted with alarm how the presence of the new class of art

advocates -- those weaned on New Deal art policies -- were "surging toward culture under the pressure of anxiety, high taxes, and a shrinking industrial frontier." These individuals:

...would demand cultural goods that are up to date and yet not too hard to consume....This state of affairs constitutes a much greater threat to high art than Kitsch itself....The future of art and literature will brighten in this country only when a new cultural elite appears with enough consciousness to counterbalance the pressure of the new mass market.⁷⁷

This is a topic to which Greenberg returned in 1947 when he wrote his essay, "The Present Prospects of American Painting and Sculpture." In it he warned of the effects on art and culture of using the latter as instruments of education in a society dominated by a (now) vast and prosperous middle class. While crediting unprecedented American accomplishment in industry and education, he anticipated the threat this situation posed to the survival of modernist "high culture." Since Greenberg so perceptively described the effects of the transformation of American art that I have been outlining, it seems worthwhile to quote him at some length.

Art has become another way of educating the new middle class that springs up in industrial America in the wake of every important war and whose cash demands enforce a general levelling out of culture that, in raising the lowest standards of consumption, brings the highest down to meet them. For education always means a certain number of concessions.

In any case the very improvement of general middle-brow taste constitutes in itself a danger. Where high art used to remain untempted, simply because it had no chance whatsoever of complying with the market demand, today the new mass cultural market created by industrialism is seducing writers and artists into rationalizing and packaging for mass distribution even the most pretentious products.

Taken on other terms, however, the American effort at mass culture -- not, let me emphasize, mass education, which has already been accomplished -- is an unparalleled venture, one not to be sneered at. Culture means cultivation. Only the enormous productivity of an American industrialism could have led any society to think it possible to cultivate the masses. Given our ethos...as made possible by our productivity, it was to be expected that sooner or later the American "common man" would aspire to self-cultivation as something that belonged inevitably to a high standard of living as personal hygiene. In any event, the bitter status struggle that goes on in a thoroughly democratic country would of itself have served by now to put self-cultivation on the order of the day -- once it became clear to the commonality, as it has by now, that cultivation not only makes one's life more interesting but -- even more important in a society that is becoming more and more closed -- defines social position.

By then it had already dawned on Greenberg that the intellectual elite would find its cultural nourishment in art produced by the bohemians of downtown Manhattan like Jackson Pollock and David Smith. Pollock had had his third one-person exhibit in April 1946 at Peggy Guggenheim's gallery and showed work that prompted Greenberg to compare its "violence, exasperation and stridency" to Faulkner and Melville.⁷⁸ The signs of extreme alienation, lack of any obvious European precedent and the monumental scale which

such art offered would combat the easy domestication that Greenberg considered such a menace to serious art. The scale and ambition of this art -- even its intended communicative potential -- recalled the ambitions of the public art which was the elusive goal of the FAP. But these qualities now coexisted with an imagery and material logic which responded negatively to the dominant conditions of a private art marketplace. Meanwhile, outside New York, Pop artists were enrolled in university art departments. There they were being prepared for a very different kind of life in art within circumstances that confirmed many of Clement Greenberg's worst fears.

Picture an art gallery exhibit, where visiting artists threaten to destroy the art, where the spectators approach the brink of anarchy, so outraged are they by the paintings of comic strip panels and ads on view. This would be to imagine John Rublowsky's account of Roy Lichtenstein's first Pop exhibit (Castelli Gallery, February 10 and March 3, 1962) in his book, Pop Art. In that picturesque, early chronicle of the new art, Rublowsky combined facts, apocrypha, and suitably heterogeneous photographic documentation to yield a period artifact informed by a taste

for only the most spectacular aspects of the avant-garde scenario.

The exhibition created a furor. There had not been so much excitement in the art world since the Fauvists caused riots in Paris half a century ago. Many artists were outraged and denounced Lichtenstein and the gallery while threatening to do physical damage to the paintings....The furor was, however, proof of the validity of Lichtenstein's vision. This kind of excitement could be generated only by significant work.⁷⁹

Evoking shades of a tumultuous vanguard, Rublowsky promoted the impression of the latter's continuing capacity to disturb. That such a disturbance then functioned to prove the significance of Lichtenstein's "vision" suggests that the notion of avant-garde cultural transgression, now turned on its head, had assumed a more problematic, indeed supportive relationship to systems of cultural legitimation.

Roughly two years earlier, late in 1962, Henry Geldzahler had offered quite a different view of Pop Art, its reception and of the avant-garde. In a symposium on Pop at the Museum of Modern Art he described the audience and the institutional support systems for contemporary art in such a way as to suggest that avant-gardism, as he understood it, was well on its way to extinction. By "avant-gardism" he meant art so antagonistic to the standardized pleasures of consumer culture, and to the reified canonical norms of high culture that it defies acceptance. Geldzahler

observed that the contemporary art audience had grown accustomed to (though by no means did it always like) the anti-populist rigor and anti-domestic scale of New York School art. For these spectators, the "shock" which had accompanied so many first encounters with new art forms, from Courbet's Realism on, had become one aspect of contemporary aesthetic experience to be enjoyed among others; so much so that contemporary art dealers recognized its value as a marketing tool.

There is now a community of collectors, critics, art dealers and museum people, a rather large community, that has been educated and rehearsed to the point that there is no longer any shock in art. The American artist has an audience, and there exists a machinery, dealers, critics, museums, collectors, to keep things moving and keep people on their toes. Yet there persists a nostalgia for the good old days when the artist was alienated, misunderstood, unpatronized. The new situation is different. People do buy art. In this sense too there is no longer, or at least not at the moment, such a thing as an avant-garde. Avant-garde must be defined in terms of audience, and here we have an audience more than ready to stay with the artist. One even gets the idea that shock has become so ingrained that the dealer, critic and collector want and expect it.⁸⁰

Geldzahler was a member of Pop's extended family, a key curatorial player and an avatar of the emerging, eclectic late modernist orthodoxy. As such, he was in a position to know of what he spoke. Like virtually every other show by a major Pop artist, Lichtenstein's first exhibit virtually sold out at prices ranging from approximately \$400 to \$1350 with, as further incentive, a ten percent reduction for

noteworthy or promising collectors.⁸¹ The artist had consigned at least thirty-one paintings to Leo Castelli between November 1961 and February 24 1962. Of these, twenty-eight were sold before the show's end on March 4, while at least five sold before the exhibit even opened.⁸² This success story may not seem so surprising in light of Jasper Johns's and Robert Rauschenberg's conquests of the previous decade. On the other hand, one should not underestimate how shocking Pop Art like Lichtenstein's or Warhol's must have looked to its first observers.

The speed with which Pop found a loyal following among curators and collectors may attest to the shrewdness of Geldzahler's remarks. But it also signifies the ultimate success of the aesthetic education of the American middle-class public; a long-term process which began during the mid-1930s, but which was only clinched by the cultural, economic and political emergence of the United States to international dominance after the war. Thus there may be a parallel between the fate of Bauhaus art and design principles when they were assimilated to American economic, political and cultural conditions during the 1930s and '40s and the fate of avant-gardist procedures during the 1950s and '60s. The earlier incorporation led to the transformation of those principles into the instrumentalist terms of a late, eventually corporate modernism. Similarly,

the dissemination of avant-gardist aesthetic procedures, from the mid-1950s on, led to the transmutation of the latter into the paradoxical form of an avant-garde culture that was avidly patronized by the upper-middle-class and middle-class art audience.

Henry Geldzahler's intimation that some contemporary art dealers regarded avant-garde shock as a valuable marketing tool found support in the comments of the new art's most conspicuous collectors. Surely their vulgarity never exceeded the insurance broker, Leon Kraushar's, when he was featured, along with Robert and Ethel Scull and Harry Abrams in the pages of a mass circulation magazine.

All that other stuff it's old, it's old, it's antique. Renoir? I hate Renoir. Czanne? Bedroom pictures. It's all the same. It's the same with the cubists, the abstract expressionists, all of them. Decoration. There's no satire, there's no today, there's no fun. That other art is for the old ladies, all those people who go to auctions. It's nothing, it's dead. Pop is the art of today, and tomorrow, and all the future. These pictures are like IBM stock, don't forget that, and this is the time to buy, because pop is never going to die. I'm not planning to sell my IBM stock either. They say op killed pop. They're all wrong. They'll never kill it, they'll just be caught with their pants down, just like all those others who got stuck with those lousy 12th rate abstract expressionists. There isn't any art except right here. I got rid of all those second-raters. Somebody else can have them.⁸³

With Leon Kraushar, we cross another threshold in the transformation of the base for art in America. His attitude

embodies a new set of terms which defined the relation between American art and its supporters during the boom years of the mid-'60s. The departure from (art) business as usual which such cupidity and jingoism exposes cannot adequately be described in terms of a postwar American cultural "hegemony," nor a national obsession with youth. Beyond the arrival of new faces and new money in American art collecting, it signals the further assimilation of art to the conditions of daily life.

Pop corresponded with an unprecedented depth of involvement in the internal machinations of the art market among the collectors it attracted. The fate of artists, dealers, and collectors were entwined as never before. (Thus the collector Robert Scull was also an underwriter of Richard Bellamy's Green Gallery.) The selling of Pop and its reportage in the international press proved the argument, implicit in Warhol's art, correct: if there were significant differences between the art business and all others, they were becoming more difficult to detect and maintain. To what extent Pop itself can be considered responsible for this situation seems moot, at best; a wrongheaded question at worst. There were forces at work long before Pop Art that paved the way to the effects so often causally associated with it.

At the MOMA symposium on Pop Art Henry Geldzahler described this art, provocatively, as a "new American regionalism." According to him, Pop was the product of a situation in which mechanical reproduction and the mass media had "saturated" American and European life with images to the point where our "primary visual data are for the most part secondhand."⁸⁴ This is a perceptive point, as far as it goes. It may even have helped stimulate Leo Steinberg, a more skeptical participant on the panel, to move towards the theory of "postmodern" art which he would articulate five years later in terms of the "flatbed picture plane." In his essay, "Other Criteria," Steinberg identified postmodern art with a picture surface that is "no longer an analogue of a visual experience of nature but of operational processes."⁸⁵ Hilton Kramer, never a fan, also had something compelling to say at the symposium.

Pop art does not tell us what it feels like to be living through the present moment of civilization it is merely part of the evidence of that civilization. Its social effect is simply to reconcile us to a world of commodities, banalities and vulgarities, which is to say, an effect indistinguishable from advertising art. (italics added)⁸⁶

This too is a perceptive observation, one which helps to elucidate Donald Judd's more enigmatic comment, dating from his review of Lichtenstein's 1962 exhibition, concerning the fact that with his representations of comics and advertisements the "usual definitions" that separate high

cultural forms of pictorial expression from low ones are no longer necessary.⁸⁷

Kramer may have lapsed into wishful thinking, however, when he declared that Pop says nothing about what it felt like to live at that time and place. His assertion depends, of course, upon whether or not one shares Kramer's perception of the decade in question. At that time he limited his expressions of consternation regarding the '60s to matters of exclusively cultural, if not purely stylistic, concern. Consequently, he described Pop, with its promiscuous cultural purview, its seemingly insatiable taste for visual puns and irony, as the middle-brow answer, par excellence, to 1960s abstraction. Kramer was little fonder of '60s abstraction, whose "poverty of incident" and absence of imagination he deplored. In his view, second generation post-painterly abstraction was responsible for the success of Pop; for the fact that these artists turned to the lurid attractions of mass culture as a way out of an aesthetic deadlock.⁸⁸ For a more telling glimpse of how Kramer felt about the 1960s, one must wait two decades until, as a prominent spokesman for American neoconservatism, he welcomed the return of expressionism to art.

With its drug culture and dropout mentality, its social radicalism and sexual revolutionism, its opposition to bourgeois order and its embrace of apocalyptic and irrational visions of the future, the whole ethos of the sixties especially in what

came to be called its counter-culture would seem to have offered extremely fertile ground for the growth of an expressionist movement. But it was not to be. Instead, as we know, this hottest of decades was adamant in favoring the coolest of art styles. The expressionist impulse was reserved for life, not art.⁸⁹

Kramer's vision of an apocalyptic 1960s allows no moments of lucidity; only a process of wanton cultural degradation.

He would have found little or no merit, for example, in the cultural, social, and political analyses that surfaced within the different context of the European New Left. The historical and theoretical investigations and the cultural interventions of the Situationist philosopher Guy Debord -- to name only the one who is most immediately pertinent to analyzing the economic and sociological preconditions for Pop Art -- would constitute for Kramer an especially "irrational vision of the future." Debord's aphoristic tract, The Society of the Spectacle, published five years after Pop's emergence in the United States, provides a set of terms in which one can describe in precisely what ways such art actually said a great deal about how it "felt" to live at that time. His analysis also makes it possible to identify the sense in which, and the extent to which, aesthetic and commonplace experience converged in postwar America.⁹⁰

The encyclopedic array of images that greeted the visitor to Lichtenstein, Warhol and Rosenquist's early Pop works represented the many aspects of a life that was increasingly circumscribed by consensus, colonized by the logic of commodification, and stylized in accord with the exigencies of mass production and sales. While Henry Geldzahler could account for the Pop image of art and everyday experience as simultaneously flattened because of mass-media image "saturation," Debord addressed the broader social function -- as well as the effect -- of the mass media and considered under what conditions this could have come about.

As a reformulation of the Marxist analysis of social relations inhering in advanced capitalist economies, Debord focused on Marx's concept of the commodity fetish. According to Marx, in a system of undifferentiated wage labor, the locus of social relations is displaced from the site of production to the system of exchange. In that system of exchange the social character of human labor appears to producers as "an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour." Debord was especially concerned with the idea that the fetishistic component of the commodity increases as the socially differentiated character of the labor that produces it effectively decreases.⁹¹ Consequently, he identified the "spectacle" with the mass

media in only a limited sense. He understood the spectacle to be the goal, the "justification" and the means of social reproduction in economies where, as Ernest Mandel has stated, "all branches of the economy are fully industrialized for the first time."⁹²

In contrast with the notion of Pop as a new landscape, Debord's text offers a different perspective on the historical meaning of such art. In fully industrialized economies the structural logic -- not merely the image -- of commodification infiltrates art and life.⁹³ Spectacular production, distribution and consumption is removed from the historical circumstances in which commodity production once responded to human need. Since Marx defined the commodity fetish as a consequence of exchange, and not use value, it follows that in a highly developed consumer culture, fetishization will flourish. That said, it is apparent that the individual work of art -- as a product devoid of use value -- will occupy an increasingly privileged position; and among all works of art, those which embody the most extravagant signs of humanity in all its fallibility -- the works of Vincent Van Gogh -- will become the most highly prized.⁹⁴

The burden of creating "need" in such a consumer culture, which is dictated by the expansive requirements of

capital, falls upon advertising and the mass media. Advertising executives must devise novel methods to direct desire toward the temporary satisfactions of consumerism. One conciliatory effect of Pop Art can be considered in relation to one such marketing fad. At the beginning of this dissertation I argued that Pop Art foiled "instrumental memory," despite -- or rather, because -- of the fact that it initially summons such commonplace recollection with instantly recognizable images and representational codes, with things the mind presumes already to know. Pop Art invalidates this kind of recognition by privileging the direct perception of the art object. (This ontological cure clearly does not work as well, if at all, when these works are seen in reproduction.) Significantly, these artists devised this strategy after the period during the 1940s and '50s when advertisers explored the possibility of stimulating consumerism through "subliminal" suggestion; that is, through the attempted colonization of "involuntary" memory.⁹⁵ In this and other more effective ways, the mass media, as principle conveyors of promotion, became the most effective means of guaranteeing the continuous growth of capital through the creation of ever more goods and services. It is this effect of the image-making apparatus which led Guy Debord to observe: "The spectacle is capital to such a degree of accumulation that it becomes an image."⁹⁶

According to these conditions, the logic of the commodity insinuates itself into the fabric of daily life to the point where assumptions concerning the character of "normal" living -- from cradle to grave -- are prescribed within the fictional narratives and skewed histories of mass culture. The latter contribute to the construction of consensus and, by determining what will be construed as "common sense," help to define the limits of personal and political possibility. In many ways, Debord's tract parallels Herbert Marcuse's nearly contemporaneous attempt in One Dimensional Man to describe the self-generating and self-preserving effects of such highly developed systems of production, distribution and reproduction.

Today this private space has been invaded and whittled down by technological reality. Mass production and mass distribution claim the entire individual, and industrial psychology has long since ceased to be confined to the factory....The result is, not adjustment but mimesis: and immediate identification of the individual with his society and, through it, with the society as a whole....The productive apparatus and the goods and services which it produces "sell" or impose the social system as a whole. The means of mass transportation and communication, the commodities of lodging, food, and clothing, the irresistible output of the entertainment and information industry carry with them prescribed attitudes and habits, certain intellectual and emotional reactions which bind the consumers more or less pleasantly to the producers and, through the latter, to the whole. The products indoctrinate and manipulate; they promote a false consciousness which is immune against its falsehood. And as these beneficial products become available to more individuals in more social classes, the

indoctrination they carry ceases to be publicity; it becomes a way of life. It is a good way of life -- much better than before -- and as a good way of life, it militates against qualitative change.⁹⁷

Marcuse's account of life as a virtually closed circuit in which the productive "base" dooms complaisant individuals to "false consciousness" is typical of the false consciousness of the Frankfurt School theorist who, as a heterosexual white male, never considered the potential for matters of race and gender to mobilize large groups of people who then act upon that base. In this sense, as in his relentlessly dark view of mass culture, the Frankfurt School Marxist actually closes ranks with his neoconservative colleague, Hilton Kramer.

The opening statement of Debord's tract describes a withering of life to a specter of its former self and, as such, details the experiential preconditions for the most basic characteristic of American Pop Art.

The entire life of societies in which modern conditions of production reign announces itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has moved away into representation.⁹⁸

By representing only representations to describe contemporary life, Pop Art literally envisioned this displacement of being by representation, this

aestheticization of life in a fetishistic spectacle of global dimensions.

Pop Art could respond insightfully to the consequences of the social, economic and cultural processes which effected this new degree of equivalence within art and everyday experience after the war. The strength of early Pop Art by Lichtenstein, Rosenquist and Warhol was largely a function of the economy and forcefulness with which it could communicate these facts. The remainder of this chapter will consist of a discussion of works by these three artists that will show how they presented these facts and, more significantly, how they variously "managed" the latter, thereby preserving in their art a vestige of the conciliatory effect of modernism in art. Their ability to do so depends upon a Pop formula, one which recalls the confluence of aesthetic and industrial structures that informed their artistic educations: Pop artists aestheticize commodities while they commodify aesthetics.

A photograph of the Castelli Gallery (fig. 65) in 1962 shows three Lichtenstein paintings on the east wall and one on the north wall which seemed to retrieve for art traditional genres, long ago consigned to "kitsch" and consumerism. On the east wall a lurid yellow and red painting, Turkey (1961), was flanked on the left by Washing

Machine (1961), a painting where the outline of a housewife's disembodied right arm -- one instrument of good housekeeping among others -- holds a detergent box inverted over the stylized waves of the appliance in action. To Turkey's right, the grotesquely enlarged face of the all-American housewife grins at the spectator from inside the gleaming refrigerator she stoops to clean (The Refrigerator, 1962). On the north wall Lichtenstein's The Kiss spotlights the pulp palliative. A young woman embraces her man in uniform, their eyes closed, their bodies a tight column which fills all but a tiny square at upper right in which the pilot's plane is visible. The postwar creed of redemption through good housekeeping was further evoked at the time by Spray (1962), Sponge (1962), Rotobroil (1961) and the diptychs, Step on Can with Leg (1962) and Like New (1962).

After Donald Judd noted in his review of Lichtenstein's show that such paintings could be compositionally quite "expert" in a traditional sort of way, he pointed out what had been well known, but suppressed, by modernists from Picasso to de Kooning: The style of comic strip artists and of high modernists -- and here Fernand Leger served as Judd's example -- possessed more than a passing resemblance to one another.⁹⁹ Lichtenstein's works attested to the fact that comic-strip panels, and even

advertisements, could be full of compelling pictorial inventions whose relationships to modernist art and to referents in real life could then be explored.

In a 1963 interview Lichtenstein expressed an admiration for the representational economy and forcefulness of the commercial artists. They had evolved an abbreviated notational system for drawing and coloration, a system which stripped an image to the barest "visual cues": size, brightness, proximity, etc. Lichtenstein also admired the fact that the range of descriptive and expressive effects used by the comic strip artist and commercial designer was the product of the explicitly economic requirements of commercial printing. In this way the Pop artist proposed an equation between commercial and aesthetic definitions of "economy."¹⁰⁰

Lichtenstein's willingness to commodify aesthetics depended upon the fact that in "found" imagery he could locate an abundance of non-cubist pictorial "hits" and near misses. After the initial selection was made, the acts of cropping, drawing, transposition and enlargement helped him to refine, or aestheticize, the original (copy). The "intense unity" he imposed upon these popular sources was far more compatible with them than was the European high modernist style to which he had subjected American

nineteenth-century imagery during the 1940s and 1950s.¹⁰¹ Lichtenstein's rule of thumb in selecting an image was to find one that required as little modification as possible. This was the basis for his oft-quoted remark that the closer his work was to the original "the more threatening and critical the content".¹⁰² While aptly characterizing the most radical feature of his early art, this comment also describes a striking historical insight: to maintain the distinctions between fine and commercial art in the late 1950s and early 1960s required a sharp eye and a very imposing, simultaneously arbitrary and exclusive critical and institutional apparatus. One month after he described this critical aspect of his early Pop practice so concisely, Lichtenstein tempered his comments in another interview. Admitting that his art represented images that were consistent with the most "threatening characteristics of our culture," he insisted he was never "really advocating stupidity, international teen-agerism, and terrorism." Rather, he was more interested in producing the significant unities of an art that was open to the printed world around him.¹⁰³

By then, in 1963, he had mastered his simulation of the Ben Day dot, and had perfected his method of production. He could make virtually any image elegant and, increasingly, he chose only elegant images to make again. In the pictorial

effects that were revealed to him by enlarging Ben Day dots, Lichtenstein had found all the characteristics of texture he then desired of painting as well as a flexible, vivid range of color. At first he had stippled with brushes to achieve the look of the half-tone screen. But by late in 1962, he was using standardized industrially manufactured screens that added greater refinement, and textural and conceptual range to his work. Using this method with one color -- say, Lichtenstein's medium red -- produced an aerated tint; a pale rose, that could denote flesh. Applying the same color flatly produced a very different, more saturated color. In this way Lichtenstein adopted the commercial artist's economic method of making five colors perform as if they were ten.¹⁰⁴

There were other features of commercial imagery that supported the artist's contention that he could find strong, forceful and compelling images among the products of cheap mechanical printing and design-by-committee. Another criterion for selection that dates from Lichtenstein's first Pop show was that the image might perform as both popular icon and as high cultural cipher. Golf Ball performed in just this way. It became the cipher through which Diane Waldman and others were gratified to recognize Mondrian's "plus minus paintings" of 1915, or Kenneth Noland's "targets" of 1959.¹⁰⁵ In Varoom (1963, fig. 66),

Lichtenstein's attraction to the instant of narrative climax and to the paradox of representing the unrepresentable led him to an abiding involvement with the image of an explosion and, through it, to an even more enduring preoccupation with the iconography and ideology of Expressionism.¹⁰⁶ In these and other ways, Lichtenstein exploited the unstable relationship between pictorial signifier and signified which obtains when one represents mass cultural imagery in high cultural contexts as directly as this artist then did.

A second installation photograph from the 1962 exhibition (fig. 67) shows several examples of the kinds of choices Lichtenstein made, and shows both how close the commercial image came to approximating aesthetic experience and how much, or how little, Lichtenstein did to re-form such commercial images. The west wall of the gallery featured Engagement Ring (1962. fig. 68), where a woman frets over whether or not the reticent fellow behind her might have brought with him the ring that would seal their common marital fate. Lichtenstein was undoubtedly drawn to this image less because of the mock-anxiety of its narrative than because it achieved its pitch of emotional intensity through rudimentary graphic means. The vertiginous space is created using little more than the discrepancy between the size of the two figures. The woman's face looms in the foreground, the warm pink of her skin achieved by imitating

the effect of the half-tone dot screen in red. This is juxtaposed with the hot, saturated red of the interior's rear wall, as well as that of her parted lips and polished finger nails. This distribution of red incidents locks her into the matrix of the picture's surface, reiterated by the black grid of the window panes which visually unites the rear plane with the objects in the middle and foreground, all to remarkably claustrophobic effect. Similarly, the diminutive, "distant" suitor is dressed in an unmodeled white suit that joins with the pure white of the speech balloon overhead to create a strong vertical mass. This causes his figure to rise in perception, closer to his outsized date, from background to picture surface. The bright yellow scallops and swirls of the woman's hair occupy the entire upper left portion of the painting and, framing her face, descend the painting's center as a rhythmic yellow column whose bladeliike curves are echoed in the man's shoulders. In the upper third of the picture's right edge, this yellow, and those shapes, are repeated in the comic book artists' shorthand for a lampshade, cropped on the right where it lies just short of the rear wall.

We know, however, that Lichtenstein did more to Engagement Ring than merely enlarge it. Judging from a comparison with the comic book source (fig. 69), he recropped the panel, taking a sizable slice off the right

edge and a smaller one off the top. Making this decision while transferring the panel onto a monumental canvas turned the figure of the woman into an even more menacing presence. Lichtenstein also elongated the figures and extended the grid horizontally to the right behind them, thereby transforming it into a far stronger unifying element in the painting. On the whole, he adjusted the compositional and coloristic elements of the comic book original to correspond with its isolation in an entirely different context: one in which formal coherence and stability, and a high mock-emotional pitch displace narrative contingency to redefine aesthetic value.

All of which is to say, Roy Lichtenstein selected pulp images because he saw formal and/or thematic potential in them. But in the process of monumentalizing these bits of ephemera he subjected them to the rigors of the "unified (and unifying) perception" he had learned years ago at Ohio State. There too he had first realized that making art could consist in the re-formation of a preexisting image. Lichtenstein's Pop gesture was persuasive. It is well known that the effects of his formal adjustments were all but invisible to many visitors to his first exhibition. So completely had he concealed the "art" in his paintings, so distracting was their apparently complete possession by the

commercial code, that "experts" claimed to be unable find the art in his work.¹⁰⁷

Unlike Lichtenstein's paintings, James Rosenquist's could never function as challenging aesthetic eye tests. Finding the art in Rosenquist's collage-like paintings has never been so difficult. Yet to claim that Rosenquist emerged, full grown, as a Pop artist after years of working as a commercial sign painter would be only slightly to oversimplify the conventional account of his development. The manual skills and many of the constituent elements of Rosenquist's Pop Art do derive from his employment as a commercial artist. These would include the commercial mode of rendering imagery, his mastery of scale and his vernacular understanding of color ("dirty bacon tan...tea shirt yellow... Man-Tan suntan orange...").¹⁰⁸

Rosenquist likes to tell picturesque tales. In two such anecdotes he traced to his commercial art work the play of perceptual dislocation -- an oscillation between recognition and perception, between representation and abstraction -- upon which the central effect of Pop Art depends. Thus the disjunctions of Early in the Morning (1963, fig. 70) have been referred back to his experience as a young man when he was employed during the summer to paint the skin of a giant globe -- a storage tank -- beside a railway line that

extended in both directions to the distant horizon. He worked in the hot summer sun, so close to the metal expanse that only intermittently could he be conscious of things happening in the desolate landscape around him. Lonesome, he saw a little boy running down the railroad tracks towards him. But so immense were the distances involved that it seemed to take forever before the boy approached -- with every intention of continuing on past him without even stopping. In the other story we find the artist perched high above Times Square. He is painting a billboard so vast that he can determine neither the relative progress nor the accuracy of his work without going to the building across the street for a look. So large is the billboard, and so close is Rosenquist to its surface, that he cannot recognize the image he is representing. In such situations recognition is sheared away from perception, and representations are transmuted -- if only for the duration of that extreme perceptual proximity -- into abstractions.¹⁰⁹

Less easy to understand in terms of Rosenquist's employment as a sign painter is how he came to exploit his perceptual epiphany the way he did: to make fine art in which he brings together popular representations in such a way that they also read as refined abstractions. Rosenquist takes pleasure, as he has said, in "seeing abstractions everywhere, looking at a landscape and seeing

abstraction."¹¹⁰ Consider a painting like The Lines were Etched Deeply in Her Face (1961, fig. 71). The discrepancies in scale between the representational fragments facilitate a kind of cognitive slippage, in which these representational shards alternately read as abstract. It all depends upon where, exactly, the eye rests at any given instant. Similarly, abstraction results from the placement of objects in unfamiliar positions, like the isolated checker which is poised diagonally and receding into space. Space? The "ground" which I have just described as (abstract) space is itself comprised of another representation -- a "figure" -- a close-up of a woman's face. The combined effect of all these devices is to guarantee that the viewer will experience episodes of "pure perception." As noted in Chapter Two in the discussion of Hoyt Sherman's method of teaching drawing, such perception -- perception as if prior to language -- is a sure sign of the metaphysical purpose of such late modern art.

Like virtually all Pop Art, the conciliatory effect of Rosenquist's painting is predicated upon his compulsion to entice, and then repudiate, commonplace (instrumental) recollection. This repudiation depends upon the artist's determination to combine eminently recognizable fragments in such a way that perception is privileged over recollection. The fact that Rosenquist's paintings often promote reverie in

no way contradicts this assertion since, by revery, I understand the meanderings of unconscious (aesthetic) memory. In Rosenquist's works the "gestalt" are even more utterly dependent upon abstraction and "pure perception" because the representational fragments are so often so resistant to more conventional forms of metaphorical closure.

It is extremely unlikely that Rosenquist would have arrived at such a paradoxical aesthetic formula based solely upon his experience as a sign painter. In fact, Rosenquist's predisposition as a fine artist recalls his three years of study (1952-1954) in painting and drawing with Cameron Booth at the University of Minnesota. It is not hard to see in Rosenquist's compositions the many signs of lessons learned well in pictorial dynamics, in the tensile optical character of the picture plane. Cameron Booth was just the man to instill such knowledge in the young American, and to convince him that it is important to establish a modernist base of pictorial value in his art. Booth had studied in Paris with the cubist painter and theorist, Andr Lhote in 1927, But then, more significantly, he moved to Munich where for two years he studied with the master theorist of "push-pull," Hans Hofmann. The influence of Hofmann's teachings remained indelible in Booth's method. Thus Rosenquist recalls Booth teaching art by using Hofmann drawings.

Hofmann's influence is also powerfully felt in Rosenquist's pictorial syntax: in the way he disposes the representational fragments which constitute his pictorial vocabulary, interlocking them in order to create the greatest possible plastic tension between surface and depth. At a somewhat more philosophical level, it was Hofmann's aesthetic perspective -- as interpreted by Cameron Booth -- which informed Rosenquist's tendency to impose upon mass cultural imagery a mode of pictorial organization which is invariably related to organic life. During the summers of 1952-54, while away from his studies with Booth, Rosenquist was employed as a sign painter for the General Outdoor Advertising Company. Both of these experiences bracket his work as a Pop artist.¹¹¹

No such opposing pair of early influences brackets Andy Warhol's Pop Art. But then nothing about that work would make one search for a pictorial metaphysician in Warhol's past. Warhol's first Pop show consisted of 32 small paintings of cans of Campbell's soup (fig. 72). A more concise and balanced realization of the Pop formula according to which commodities are aestheticized while aesthetics are commodified would be hard to imagine. This cycle of paintings found its motif and its extent in a highly visible line of products: 32 flavors; 32 paintings.

The reduction of the painting to the status of commodity is underscored by a deadpan seriality in which every painting resembles every other. So numbing is the effect of that seriality that only the most dedicated connoisseur of condensed soup would have cared that each label proclaims a different identity for the "contents" of each painted can. The fact that the paintings were first exhibited side by side on a spotlit shelf that circumnavigated the gallery seemed to presume that someone would notice and care about such differences. On the other hand, the sequential viewing set up by this installation was as evocative of an assembly line as of anything else.

Of course there was one such connoisseur of condensed soup; one person who actually cared about and appreciated the nuances of labels and flavors: Warhol himself. Consequently, it is especially beneficial to consider these works from the other side of the Pop equation: the gesture which enabled Warhol to equate paintings with mass-produced banalities also made it possible for him to pay homage to a brilliantly designed and promoted line of products which, in effect, he immortalized with his cycle of hand-rendered paintings. That Warhol considered Campbell's Soup "brilliantly designed" can be deduced from the fact that he claimed to eat the stuff every day; consumption being, as J. Gordon Lippencott argued, the ultimate criterion of

greatness in American design.¹¹² That Warhol enjoyed the thought of glorifying commercial design can be deduced from the fact that he represented each can so emblematically, its label splayed as flatly as possible against the pure white ground, as if the artist wanted to be sure that he nor anyone else would miss any nuance of its design. Indeed, it would be safe to say that the referent in these works is commercial art, and not soup at all.

There is a rather direct reason to believe that Warhol's production of these works was informed, in part, by a desire to elevate the commercial designer's work. Warhol's first Pop exhibition took place at the Ferus Gallery in Los Angeles, not in New York at all. It is no coincidence that the sell-out shows of virtually every other artist associated with Pop preceded Warhol's own Pop debut, whether in New York or Los Angeles. For New York's most prestigious contemporary art dealers the idea of showing art by someone who actually had been trained, and achieved fame as a prize-winning commercial artist was just too big a pill to swallow. Until these dealers grasped the enormous potential of the Pop phenomenon, Warhol's entry into the institutional framework of the New York neoavant-garde had to wait. Only after that realization could his unique background be understood as a precondition for the emergence of the most "radical" Pop Art.

Indeed, Warhol's New York Pop debut was something of a fluke. Had Eleanor Ward not unexpectedly found herself during the summer of 1962 with no show for November, Warhol would not, in Calvin Tompkins's words, have "got in just under the wire."¹¹³ The exhibition provided Warhol with the opportunity he had worked for over a year. He seized it as only someone with his experience could. Wanting to make his presence felt in a big way, he filled the Stable Gallery (fig. 73) with every kind of image he had elaborated up to that time except one -- and for good reason: the comics already belonged to Lichtenstein.

Continuing the logic of his Los Angeles show, the walls were hung with paintings of "products" and designs Warhol admired: more Cambell's Soup Cans, Coca-Cola, Marilyn, Troy Donahue, Elvis and the dollar bill. By this time he had turned to silkscreen as his primary method of production, and serialization surfaced as his principal compositional mode and expressive device. Warhol's off-register use of the silkscreen technique and his garish pastel colors variously heightened the perceptual and emotional pitch of his imagery. Of Warhol's art it can truly be said that aestheticization depended exclusively upon industrial, rather than fine art structures; with one very important

exception: the institutional framework which secured the identity of fine art as such.

There were other motifs as well: a Dance Diagram was exhibited -- to add insult to injury -- on the floor, and work from the series, Do It Yourself, made its first appearance. As send-ups of a thoroughly democratized culture, these works would have provided the original proponents of the concept that "everyone is talented" with definitive proof of their pyrrhic victory. With Warhol's paintings of commodities and dollar bills he decisively proved Robert Lepper, his teacher at Carnegie Tech, wrong. The "most significant object in the social organism" was not, as Lepper had asserted in his pictorial design course, the "individual dwelling." Otherwise, with his love of industrial structures and his willingness to exalt the accomplishments of commercial designers, while demystifying fine art (up to a point), Warhol's Pop strategy pushed the very same aspects of the late modern art and design instruction he had experienced to their logical, and historically inevitable, extreme.

A year later, Warhol installed a show of boxes at the Stable Gallery (fig. 74). Of these (Kellogg's Cornflakes boxes, Heinz boxes, Del Monte boxes, Mott's Apple Juice boxes and Campbell's Soup boxes), the wooden facsimiles of

Brillo boxes are by far the best known. This time he treated the gallery like a stock room of a supermarket. Still he glorified commercial design while foregrounding the commodity status of the work of art. But in this case his installation produced what may well be the ultimate late modern conundrum. Indeed, I can think of no better way to end this chapter than with a brief consideration of this puzzling condensation in which virtually all of the constituent terms of late modern art instruction come into play.

It was only a fortuitous coincidence that the Brillo box was designed by James Harvey, an artist who would rather have been known for the latterday abstract expressionist canvases he showed at the Graham Gallery. Warhol was delighted when he learned about the identity of the man who was responsible for the Brillo design. After learning about an irate press release the Graham Gallery had sent out concerning Warhol's show, Warhol contacted Harvey and offered to trade him a Brillo Box of his own for one of Harvey's "originals" -- signed, of course. Life is tough, but tougher for some than others. It seems that poor Harvey died before the two men could consummate their trade. Somehow I cannot help envisioning a dispirited abstract artist, a true believer -- a veritable Gulley Jimson -- whose big, rugged heart just gives way after hanging up the

telephone on Warhol.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, not for one moment do I doubt Warhol's sincerity. He really admired Harvey's design and was clearly amused by the crazy inversion he had performed by selecting the commercial work of a fine artist to send up as the latest fine art by a (former commercial) artist like himself. But for Harvey it would be hard to imagine a crueller fate than to learn so late in life that his greatest claim on eternity, his most lasting contribution to art, would be another artist's representation of his design for a box of soap pads.

In such ways Warhol's "fake" cardboard boxes with product designs emblazoned on them still wreak havoc with the terms still used by many to distinguish art from nonart. As for Warhol's installation of these boxes, it derives from the supermarket, via the contemporary practices of the New York avant-garde. I am thinking of the environments produced for/by "Happenings"; or, more specifically, Claes Oldenberg's work in New York since 1960, especially The Store (1961-2) which he opened on East Second Street. But with Warhol one cannot be secure in the stability of allusions like these. Never, for example, has it been noted that his installation also refers to commercial art; not in the obvious sense of the designs emblazoned on those boxes, but of a concept for his installation. That concept was

suggested to him, at the very least subliminally, by an advertisement.

Notwithstanding Lucy Lippard's observation that Pop artists were interested in only the most banal commercial art,¹¹⁵ the ad in question is a particularly "arty" and sophisticated one for CBS Radio Network (fig. 75). It shows cardboard boxes piled high, though tastefully, into a rather shallow white interior. The boxes, their labels clearly visible, conceal all but a small portion of the rear wall at upper right where the caption, "Busy Market..." appears. In 1954 this ad was reproduced in Art News in an article announcing, "The Biggest U.S. Show of Editorial and Advertising Art...in New York." Reproduced in the same article was a cover of Interiors designed by Warhol (fig. 76). If that were not sufficient to prove the ad's presence, if not persistence, in his memory, the same issue of the magazine published Barbara Guest's review of a drawing exhibition at the Loft Gallery in which Warhol and two others showed their works.¹¹⁶ My point here is not that this was the "source" for Warhol's installation. I hope that the weight of the argument in this chapter will suffice to prove that what matters far more is that such an advertisement has found its double in Warhol's second Stable Gallery show.

There is a point at which the mind revolts against trying to keep separate the many elements that figure in an exhibition like Warhol's at the Stable Gallery. The conflation of aesthetic and industrial structures in art like this suggests that the differences -- not to say contradictions -- between these terms have been resolved. But then, modern art has always been the stage on which such resolutions have been imagined; and that, finally, is all that usually happens: an imaginary resolution. But that is not quite the case in this instance, where it seems a transposition in the applicability of certain terms has taken place. The aesthetic terminology which was conventionally associated with art now applies to a product of commercial design, while the terms commonly associated with the latter now describe conditions obtaining in an art gallery. Lurking behind this play of terminology, which seems to have gotten so tangled in the contradictory art of the 1960s, is the memory of a time when historical calamities, the persistence of a romantic desire for subjective rehabilitation through aesthetic education and the requirements of capital expansion combined to erode the boundaries between art, industry, commerce and culture. No longer was the "good life" envisioned by this confluence predicated upon the utopian visions of an earlier generation; not by any stretch of the imagination. This time it was comprised of a more limited, pragmatic and

instrumental realization of art as experience, one in which consumerism would play the dominant role.

Conclusion

When John Dewey described how art might be reunited with everyday experience in Art as Experience, he had in mind something profoundly different from the commodification of experience in spectacular culture. Nor did he want art to reconcile people to life as it was lived in the U.S. during the Great Depression. In the last chapter of his book, Dewey insisted that the reconciliation he envisioned could, under certain conditions, restore to art something of its ancient role as a stimulus of social cohesion and a conveyor of meaning.

If social customs are more than uniform external modes of action, it is because they are saturated with story and transmitted meaning. The rites of mourning expressed more than grief; the war and harvest dance were more than a gathering of energy for tasks to be performed; magic was more than a way of commanding forces of nature to do the bidding of man; feasts were more than a satisfaction of hunger. Each of these communal modes of activity united the practical, the social, and the educative in an integrated whole having esthetic form.¹

Lamenting the loss from Western culture of such social coherence and aesthetic integration, Dewey -- like Ruskin -- believed that industrial progress corresponded with social and cultural disruption. While the meaningful organic harmonies of aesthetic experience become anachronistic as industrialization progressed, Dewey cautioned that this

correspondence could not be understood causally in terms of mechanization alone. Nor was that reality to be redressed with increased quantities of leisure time. Echoing Ruskin's logic again, he observed that increasing time for recreation would only retain "the old dualistic division between labor and leisure." The cause of the problem lay elsewhere; the aesthetic reconciliation he had postulated for thirteen chapters required a fundamental transformation in the structure of Western societies.

There must be forces at work that affect the mechanical means of production that are extraneous to the operation of machinery itself. These forces are found, of course, in the economic system of production for private gain.²

Dewey's plan for a more meaningful and humane life required nothing less than the rejection of the central component within capitalist social organization. He charged that the "psychological conditions resulting from private control of the labor of other men for the sake of private gain...suppress and limit esthetic quality in the experience that accompanies processes of production."³

What is true is that art itself is not secure under modern conditions until the mass of men and women who do the useful work of the world have the opportunity to be free in conducting the processes of production and are richly endowed in capacity for enjoying the fruits of collective work. That the material for art should be drawn from all sources whatever and that the products of art should be accessible to all is a demand by the side of which the personal political intent of the artist is insignificant.⁴

The "society of the spectacle" seems at times the dark antithesis of Dewey's formula for an aesthetic of experience. Experience can only be said to have achieved its aesthetic dimension insofar as it has been supplanted by spectral representations of itself. While Dewey articulated his metaphysics of experience to prepare for the time when art would be integrated within a radically restructured society, the integrations that did take place have been of a profoundly different kind. Working men and women gained no effective measure of control over the processes of production. No revitalization of a public art, such as that which Dewey's self-critical concept of democracy required, has occurred. Most art remains resolutely private, while the mass media have effectively displaced the concept of political dialogue with its one-way system for transmitting into our homes representations of the limits of choice.

Larger numbers of people did, of course, develop a greater appreciation for conventional -- and unconventional -- forms of aesthetic experience. The increased cohesion of social groups, meaning and fulfillment that Dewey hoped would coincide with such heightened sensitivity to aesthetic processes has largely been experienced outside the elaborately sanctioned institutions of mainstream culture. That culture continues to proffer a "humanism" so debased as

to contribute to the plausibility and appeal of aesthetic theories that are predicated upon a positive absence of meaning.⁵ As for the efficient methods for teaching visual structure and perceptual unity that were inspired, in part, by Deweyan goals, perhaps the ultimate measure of their success is to be found in the growth of spectacular culture itself. Fine art, embraced by this system, occupies its privileged place within the industry of arts and leisure.

Before and just after the war, art instructors who were weaned on the combined promises of Deweyan educational goals and European high modernist methods shared in the conviction that it was necessary and possible to train a generation of highly skilled and cultured artists and designers. Courses in the humanities and the history of art were offered to students seeking degrees in art as a means of producing such cultured individuals. During the mid-'50s a renewed commitment to a hierarchical system of aesthetic value within art instruction surfaced. This was partly a function of the international success of Abstract Expressionism; partly because of the persuasiveness of the critical apparatus which supported it so effectively. In the different cultural climate that followed this triumph, art history courses functioned in art schools in a slightly different way. Now they helped to ensure belief in the historical inevitability, rightness and singularity of

increasingly narrow, specialized high aesthetic practices. The formalist teleology which dominated art history during the 1950s and early '60s merely helped to reinforce this belief in the independence and distinction of late modernist procedures.

During this period of retrenchment there were no significant innovations in the techniques used to teach foundation courses, the basics of drawing, painting and sculpture. Having achieved a degree of technical and theoretical perfection before the war, methods of teaching visual structure became more codified and widely disseminated throughout the 1950s. Evolved over the previous century, modern art instruction had become historical. During the 1960s one of the few new developments in American art teaching was a greater willingness among some art instructors to acquaint students with historical and neo-avant-gardist techniques, and sometimes even with the logic of such vanguard strategies. The international success of art by Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg and the Pop artists had trickled down through conservative institutional structures to produce this tolerant effect. By then, during turbulent years of the second half of the 1960s, the artists associated with Minimalism and Process Art defined practices that broke with the largely Greenbergian, high modernist precedent by indicating the contingency of aesthetic

experience. This conflicted with the approach of most art instruction which pursued the effect of artistic "presence" to support the principle of aesthetic autonomy. It was in the context of this contentious climate that one influential minimalist, Dan Flavin, challenged modern art instruction in a lecture he delivered at several American art schools in 1967. Entitled, "...on an American artist's education...", this text (published early in 1968) was a call for the end of modern art instruction as it was practiced at that time.⁶

Flavin argued for the need to displace the traditional aestheticism, the artistic clichés and eclectic self-indulgence he found on campuses around the country. His lecture reads in many ways like a depleted Constructivist manifesto concerning art, design and their instruction. Flavin characterized contemporary art schools as jamborees of aesthetic options: a system of "formal indoctrination in art historical media... augmented by humanities."⁷ Despite the fact that art schools and university art departments offered an encyclopaedic array of aesthetic choices, he detected debilitating limitations. Flavin described that limit in terms of the prejudices of often embittered, failed artists who depended on tenured teaching jobs for their modicum of professional respect and their livelihoods. Accredited art schools and university art departments were "tradition burdened" places where in-fighting and intra-

mural politics imposed a crippling conformity upon students. Among the forces that kept students and teachers in line -- and which defined the horizons of acceptable practice -- none was more debilitating in Flavin's view than art historical "indoctrination" in the "traditional fine art media." Art history was the "ultimate censorship."⁸

Past styles in painting and sculpture and recent "new media" (including performance) might comingle at art schools which admitted a superficial tolerance for deviation from the "art historical media." But this took place in a broader context in which the most time-worn, expressionist ideology of creative work was maintained. Thus, when Flavin offers a formula for better art teaching, he begins by dismissing the "romance of days of belabored feeling, of precious, pious, compulsively grimy studio-bound labor by haphazardly informed neurotic 'loners,' often verging on mental illness, relying desperately on intuitive good sense...". Insisting that this cliché of the modern artist should become a thing of the past, Flavin proposes the image of "a public man, trusting his own intelligence, confirming his own informed ideas."⁹

In another departure from the conditions in which he found contemporary American art instruction, Flavin considered it sheer foolishness to attempt always to

increase the number of professional artists; this had only doomed scores of young people to a destiny as "peripherally remaindered persons." There was simply no need for more artists "than for those who deem themselves capable and sense the potent possibility of sustaining thought which should develop thereafter."¹⁰ Flavin intended to transform the art department, retaining for it a largely advisory study status "under the direction of circumspect artists and scholars." Students would choose the media they want to learn, how, and in what combinations they want to use them. Significantly, he dismissed the discrete categorization of practices like painting on canvas and sculpture in stone as antiquated burdens, but was more cautious about declaring precisely when students should be authorized to choose their form of technical training. He concluded, ambivalently, that it should be "from the inception of his own conspicuous conscious concern."¹¹

That Flavin looked forward to a time when traditional studio practices would no longer be privileged in art schools was also apparent in other comments. Artists "of independent prospect" should have at their disposal the entirety of the university's disciplinary structure. There should be a continuous program of visiting lecturers, chosen by a peer panel reflecting various perspectives and prejudices. As a further safeguard against entrenched

aesthetic prejudices, the "most meagre credentials should be acceptable."¹² Flavin also stipulated that a continuous schedule of exhibitions would be featured in flexible exhibition spaces. The most important feature of such schedules and spaces would be their meticulous differentiation from the character of the interdependent museum and gallery systems. Such an educational setting, where the "imposition of educational tyranny by art historical media indoctrination could be decisively diminished," would produce a new kind of art school and a new kind of artist.

So much information would be made available everywhere for so many people. Exclusive enclaves of artistic production and consumption could be efficiently disrupted. Relieved of serious monetary inhibitions by the system of collegiate and university stipends, many artists could finally free their efforts from the economy, from the odious implications that most art is merely commodity for speculative disposal by the commercial art "cartel," and its coordinated adjunct economic social "scenes" which artists often sense as compromising of their intentions and ideas and restricting of their lives.¹³

The kind of art instruction which Flavin describes departed not only from modernist precedents in art instruction, but also in certain ways from the Constructivist paradigm that his text seems to trail. Flavin's formula looks forward to cultural practices which depend upon an initial period of interdisciplinary experimentation before they can flourish. Such

experimentation, combined with the elimination of the boundaries between painting, sculpture, architecture and other practices effectively distance his plan from contemporary modern art instruction. Insofar as Flavin does not mention how his "public man" might participate within a broader arena of cultural or social change, or effect transformations at the level of innovative design -- fundamental Constructivist principles during the second and third decades of this century -- his educational plan describes a constriction of the historical avant-gardist agenda. As a contestation of existing forms of aesthetic training and practice, there could be no question of defining the practices which might result from incorporating his ideas. But the buoyancy and belief in progress that marked the period of historical avant-gardism, whether explicitly (in the case of Productivism and Constructivism) or implicitly (in the case of Dada and Surrealism), is notably absent from his remarks. That Flavin described his ideal academic community as a plausible alternative to the art marketplace for the new artist -- thereby specifying the academic community as a suitable domain for this "public man" -- and again underscores the historical evisceration of the Constructivist paradigm.

With the benefit of hindsight one might observe that the critical interrogation of representation which emerged

in art during the late-1970s, while the product of an interaction between recent developments in art (Pop, Conceptual, and Minimal Art) with continental literary and feminist theory, was also indicative of the fact that a few art schools had grown closer to the educational system which Flavin outlined. They would diverge from the latter to the extent that Flavin's image of the new artist -- still tenaciously male -- remained entrenched within the mythified sexual economies of the American modernist vanguard and of the political Left during the postwar era.¹⁴ In this sense too, his comments fell short of Constructivist historical ambitions. Yet, notwithstanding its semblance to a depleted Constructivist pedagogy, his plan remains far more compelling and altogether less cynical than some other, more flagrant attempts at historical restitution which have informed art instruction during the subsequent two decades.

The vast majority of art schools and university art departments depend upon variations on the central themes and strategies of a half-century of modern art instruction. Others aspire to the condition of elaborate vocational schools that turn out young masters of the marketplace. Where the pictorial language of modernism has been deemed obsolete, as it has among so many corporate and private patrons since the emergence of postmodern revivalism, this has led to a delirious spiralling of technical and

intellectual options. Some schools have responded to the demands of this marketplace and to the more broadly articulated conservative yearning for "traditional" values by turning even further back, to the pre-modern pedagogies of the Acadmie des Beaux-Arts.¹⁵ Notwithstanding the efforts of such institutions and their sponsors, there is no way to retrieve the confluence of historical and cultural factors that made of such figure drawing something more than the willful and fragmenary graft onto a panoply of anachronistic aesthetic options that its revival is likely to accomplish. (The combination of conservative technical training, cultural barriers to be breached, insight and technical brilliance that produced the work of Gerhard Richter is not likely to recur very often.)

The sense of limitless possibility which was inherent in art teaching during a century of modernist and avant-garde experimentation has become disengaged from its historical, sometimes utopian, social goals. Now a sense of limitless capacity persists, for the most part, to fuel the production of cultural pastiches devoid of textual and material gravity. Belief in progress also fuels mass cultural pastimes. In the midst of a widespread skepticism and disillusionment, new technologies promise the restoration of remote cultural traditions for the edification and amusement of millions. During the past two

years museum conservators have been spotlighted for their ability to satisfy the widespread hunger for spectacular acts of cultural restitution. Reporters maintain that these experts have mobilized the resources of science and technology and, through isotope-enhanced investigations of the old masters' crumbling or merely discolored surfaces, have established privileged access to the true past.¹⁶ Closer to home, high modernist art and design acquires new meanings as it takes on the patina of age. Similarly distanced from the social contexts and belief systems that prompted its development, neither can the modern pedagogical tradition mean what it once did. Just as historians try to bring it into always fuller view, it simultaneously fades and becomes something other; something lost, if better remembered.

TEACHING THE LATE MODERN ARTIST:
FROM MNEMONICS TO
THE TECHNOLOGY OF GESTALT

by

S. DAVID DEITCHER

VOLUME II

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in
Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1989

Notes

Introduction

1. I have adopted Peter Bürger's use of the term "historic avant-garde" to denote that art which challenges modernist aestheticism, an "art-for-art's sake that is "unassociated with the life praxis of men." According to Bürger, historical avant-gardists -- Dadaists, Russian Constructivists and Productivists and Surrealists furnish him with his examples -- can be distinguished from such modernists to the extent that they attempt to organize "a new life praxis from a basis in art." It is Bürger's differentiation between the terms "modernist" and "avant-garde," so often used synonymously, that I am adopting. See Peter Bürger, Theory of the Avant-Garde, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 49.
2. I use the word "alteration" in the Hegelian sense of qualitative change.

Alteration is not the same as becoming. It is a more concrete, fuller category. Becoming is the passage of being and nothing into each other, as when a thing begins to exist or ceases to exist. Alteration is the passage of one something into another something (not into nothing) as when a leaf changes colour or a man grows old. Becoming is creation or annihilation. Alteration is change of quality.

See: W.T. Stace, The Philosophy of Hegel (New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1955), p. 145.

3. Aside from unpublished interviews with this author dating from 1983, in his first interviews as a Pop artist, Lichtenstein acknowledges Sherman's importance to his aesthetic formation. For example:

G. Swenson: Where did your ideas about art begin?

Lichtenstein: The ideas of Professor Hoyt Sherman on perception were my earliest important influence and still affect my ideas of visual unity.

See: Gene Swenson, "What is Pop Art?" Art News, vol. 62, no. 7, November 1963; reprinted in John Coplans, ed. Roy Lichtenstein (New York, Praeger, 1972), p. 53.

4. Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York, Vintage Books, 1979), part III, section 1, entitled, "Docile Bodies," p. 135ff.
5. The theme of continuity emerges in Boime's first chapter where he notes the historical concordance between the academic categories: élève, agrée, académicien and the similarly hierarchical triad dating from the guild tradition and the origin of the corporations: apprentice, journeyman, master. Similarly, he linked the hierarchically charged separation of technical training from theoretical knowledge in the age of the corporation with the split, early in the nineteenth century, between the privileged and largely honorary membership of the "class of fine arts" in the Institut and the more technically oriented Ecole. In a more revealing historical leap, he also linked the conflict between ruling powers (François I, on the one hand, and Napoléon III, on the other) and the established body that controlled the arts (the corporations, the Académie) over a third party (Italian artists; independent French artists). Albert Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century (second edition, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1986), p. 2ff.
6. Ibid., p. 65.
7. See preface to the 1986 edition, ibid., p. viiff.
8. At first I was a lone voice in the wilderness of avant-garde neglect....The fruitful results encouraged others to do more research in French official archives, to examine the institution of the Salon and the records of state commissions. The book thus made a significant contribution to the methodology of social art history that is now dominant among the younger generation of art historians."

Ibid., p. ix.
9. Albert Boime, "The Teaching Reforms and the Origins of Modernism in France," Art Quarterly, n.s., I, 1977, pp. 1-39; hereafter: "Reforms."

10. Ibid., p. 19.
11. Michel Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge, trans. A.M. Smith (New York, Pantheon Books, 1972), p. 9.
12. Ibid., p. 10.
13. Ibid., p. 12.
14. Ibid., p. 203.
15. Ibid., p. 6.
16. See, for example, Ibid., p. 10.
17. Ibid., p. 21.
18. Ibid., p. 207.
19. Ibid., p. 44.
20. Ibid., p. 117.
21. ...it is on the basis of such a contradiction that discourse emerges, and it is in order both to translate it and to overcome it that discourse begins to speak; it is in order to escape that contradiction, whereas contradiction is ceaselessly reborn through discourse, that discourse endlessly pursues itself and endlessly begins again; it is because contradiction is always anterior to the discourse, and because it can never therefore entirely escape it, that discourse changes, undergoes transformation, and escapes of itself from its own continuity.

Ibid., p. 151. For a discussion of the changing relationship between utilitarian and aesthetic interests in Europe and its impact upon universal expositions in the nineteenth century see Patricia Mainardi, Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867 (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1987), esp. pp. 7-47.
22. See, for example: H.C. Barnard, A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944 (London, University of London Press, 1949); S.J. Curtis, History of Education in Great Britain (London, University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1949; seventh ed., 1967).
23. Ruskin quoted in Raymond Williams, Culture and Society

1780-1950 (New York, Harper & Row, 1959; first paperback edition, 1966), p. 142. Williams adds: "Value rests properly only in the fitness of such labour or commodity as a means to 'the joyful and right exertion of perfect life in man'."

24. Ernest Mandel, Late Capitalism, trans. Joris De Bres (London, Verso, 1978), esp. "'Long Waves' in the History of Capitalism," pp. 108-46.
25. Raymond Williams investigated how the use of words like "industry," "art," "culture," "atomistic" and others was altered during the late eighteenth century and nineteenth centuries, eventually taking on their modern sense. He emphasized that these developments in language were the product of individuals struggling in experience to make sense of a multitude of factors which contributed to the confusing new reality.

...it was also, quite evidently, a response to the new political and social developments, to Democracy. Again, in relation to this, it is a complex and radical response to the new problems of social class. Further, while these responses define bearings on a given external area that was surveyed, there is also, in the formation of the meanings of culture, an evident reference back to an area of personal and apparently private experience, which was notably to affect the meaning and practice of art.

Williams' book is a valuable study of the rise of the progressive liberal tradition of social reform in relation to which the limits and goals of general education, from the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, are defined and redefined. As a particularly sensitive "history of ideas," it is a provocative book to read while keeping Michel Foucault's very different and only slightly later project in mind. See Williams, op. cit., p. xvi.

26. See part II, "The Interregnum," ibid., pp. 162-198.
27. Arthur Wesley Dow, Composition (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, Page and Co., 1913), p. 4.
28. A.W. Dow, "Art Teaching in the Nation's Service," National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, vol. 55, 1917, p. 92.

29. For example, the use of photomontage by Heartfield and other avant-gardists implicitly criticized the modernist's retreat from the instrumental logic of everyday life to the resources of "aesthetic," or involuntary memory insofar as photomontage constructs what might be called "historical" memory. On the relationship between Duchamp's readymades and drawing instruction in French general education from the 1880's, see: Molly Nesbit, "Ready-Made Originals: The Duchamp Model," October 37, Summer, 1986, p. 53ff.
30. See John Gage, "The Psychological Background to Early Modern Colour: Kandinsky, Delaunay and Mondrian," and Lucy Adelman, Michael Compton, "Mathematics in Early Abstract Art," in Michael Compton, ed., Towards a New Art: Essays on the Background to Abstract Art (London, Tate Gallery, 1980), pp. 22-40, 64-89.
31. On the growth of consumer culture during the 1920's, see: Stuart Ewen, Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1976).
32. Raymond Williams refers to the tradition of culture as a "court of appeals," a repository of ethical and moral values and forms of experience that were endangered by the material and social results of twentieth-century industrialization. I.A. Richards considered art as a form of play that might prepare the individual to respond more effectively to the changing conditions of such twentieth-century Western life. See Williams, op. cit., pp. xvi, 249ff.
33. Pamphlet published for the first public exhibition of Bauhaus student works based on practices in Johannes Itten's preliminary course of 1922-3; cited in Hans Wingler, The Bauhaus, trans. Wolfgang Habs, Basil Gilbert (Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1969), p. 54.
34. Early on, Gropius sought to extend the limits of the Bauhaus transformation of art and everyday life, especially when thinking about the experience of the Russian avant-garde:

Thus the basis upon which our work is built cannot be broad enough. Today this basis is too small rather than too large. This is made clear by reports of Russian experiments, similar to ours, which have incorporated music, literature, and science as coming from

one source...".

Walter Gropius, "The Viability of the Bauhaus Idea," notes of February 3, 1922, in memo to the Bauhaus masters. Ibid., p. 51. On Russian Constructivism and Productivism, see: Christina Loder, Russian Constructivism (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1983).

35. Josef Albers, "Creative Education," (1928) cited in Wingler, op. cit., pp. 142-3.

36. It was the tragedy of the Bauhaus, that, at the beginning of its existence, it confused the concepts of the fine and applied arts.

Hans Hofmann invoked the concept of "plastic empathy," which refers to the earliest period of abstraction; he supplements it with his notion of "surreality" to define the metaphysical "real" that would keep fine art separate from the applied arts. See: Hans Hofmann, Search for the Real and Other Essays, Sara Weeks, Bartlett H. Hays Jr., eds., (Cambridge, MIT Press, 1983), p. 47.

37. For a discussion of this concept, see Bürger, op. cit., p. 54ff. Also see Terry Eagleton, "Capitalism, Modernism and Postmodernism," Against the Grain (London, Verso, 1986), pp. 131-149.

Chapter One

1. Elaine de Kooning, "Franz Kline: Painter of his Own Life," Art News, vol. 61, November 1962, p. 68. Reprinted from exhibition catalogue, Franz Kline (Washington, D.C., Gallery of Modern Art, 1962).
2. Harold Rosenberg, "The American Action Painters," reprinted in The Tradition of the New (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1982), p. 32.
3. This story has been retold by, among others, Albert Boime and Irving Sandler. Sandler notes that Kline would have arrived at his mature style had he never used the projector. "It is likely that Kline would have ventured into gesture painting had he never used the Bell-Opticon, for his subjects were becoming increasingly shorthand, their contours transformed into abstract marks, in what seemed to be a desire for greater directness, immediacy, and drama." Irving Sandler, The Triumph of American Painting (New York, Harper & Row, 1970), p. 249. Harry F. Gaugh has also downplayed the significance of this practice, arguing for prefigurations of the monumental "abstract" paintings in the earlier easel paintings. Prior to relating the incident, he notes the increased size of Kline's works: ie. Rocker, (1947, 36" x 20 1/2"), or an untitled abstraction (1947, 27 1/2" x 21 1/2"). Observing in the latter "a great deal of black", he continues:

While important to Kline, this event must be seen in the context of those trends, well under way, to move toward a totally abstract mode and to enlarge the size of his paintings (figurative and abstract). It can only have affirmed his ideas along these lines....If the Bell-Opticon introduced Kline to anything new it was to the enlargement technique which apparently did not occur in his abstraction prior to those paintings of 1949-50 that made up his first one-man show. These were carefully "blown up" by Kline from small sketches; an example is Clock Face. Working freehand, he enlarged on canvas the configuration first drawn in the sketch. He would make use of this technique throughout his lifetime as an artist. One of his last, and largest paintings, Riverbed of 1961,

was originally a few strokes of the brush on a piece of paper roughly 10 x 11 inches.

Gaugh goes no further to discuss how such a technique might contribute to the meaning of work like Kline's. See Harry F. Gaugh, The Art of Franz Kline, 1930-1950: Figurative to Mature Abstraction (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1972), pp. 293-4. Albert Boime has discussed Kline's use of the opaque projector in an essay where he also describes the artist's early involvement with comic strips and his affection for movies. All these events are considered anticipations of Pop Art and Photorealism.

The process of magnification had a double meaning for Kline: it monumentalized his work and simultaneously legitimated it in his eyes through its analogy with the movies and the movies' primitive ancestor -- the comic strip. Kline's magnification thus foreshadows Lichtenstein's and the photorealists' more mechanical amplification of images.

While a compelling statement, the emphasis upon Kline's capacity to "foreshadow" the art of the subsequent decade does little to mitigate the image of the Abstract Expressionist as Promethian creator. Rather, Boime's essay attempts to smooth over any apparent disjunction in Kline's development -- and, indirectly, in the development of late modern art history -- when such artists move from producing domesticated genre scenes to mural-scaled abstractions. See Albert Boime, "Franz Kline and the Figurative Tradition, in Franz Kline: The Early Work as Signals (exh. cat., Binghamton, State University of New York, 1977), p. 17.

For an example of the increased receptivity of critics after the emergence of Pop to the importance of mass cultural interests among Abstract Expressionists, see Thomas B. Hess's essay in, Willem de Kooning (exh. cat., New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1968), esp. p. 76ff. Hess notes de Kooning's complaint that nobody had ever noticed how funny the "Women" really were. Hess then proceeds to claim works like Attic (1949) and Gotham News (1955-6) and Woman (1950) as "direct influence[s]" on Pop artists. Lichtenstein would fulfill Hess's claim fourteen years later in a series of paintings after de Kooning's "Women."

4. Brian O'Doherty, "Doubtful but Definite Triumph of the Banal," The New York Times, October 27, 1963, Section 2, p. 21.
5. Erle Loran, "Cézanne and Lichtenstein: Problems of Transformation," Artforum, vol. 2, September 1963, pp. 34-35; "Pop Artists or Copycats?" Art News vol. 62., September 1963, pp. 48-9, 61.
6. O'Doherty, op. cit.
7. Loran, Art News, p. 49. Lichtenstein remembers that the Leo Castelli Gallery was approached by the publishers of Loran's book. Reprinted in 1963, it would have been in preparation at the time the controversy broke out. Unpublished interview with this author dated June 27, 1983.
8. Loran, Artforum, p. 35.
9. Ibid.
10. Gene Swenson, "What is Pop Art?" (Interviews with Eight Painters, Part I), Art News, vol. 62, no. 7, November 1963; reprinted in John Coplans, ed., Roy Lichtenstein (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1972), p. 53.
11. Max Kozloff, "Art," The Nation, vol. 197, November 2, 1963, p. 284.
12. Ibid., p. 285. Peter Bürger uses the term "neo-avant-garde" to account for those forms of art which, after World War II, reiterate historical avant-gardist procedures, the criticality of which, he claims, have been foreclosed as a result of the institutionalization of the avant-garde. In the final chapter of this dissertation, I examine processes that facilitated the absorption of art into life by the postwar consumer culture. See Bürger, op. cit., p. 58.
13. Kozloff, op. cit., p. 285.
14. Ibid.
15. Andy Warhol quoted in Swenson, "What is Pop Art?," reprinted in John Russell, Suzi Gablik, eds., Pop Art Redefined (London, Thames and Hudson, 1969), p. 117.
16. Roland Barthes, "That Old Thing, Art..." in The Responsibility of Forms, trans. Richard Howard (New York, Hill and Wang, 1985), p. 205. In 1968 Barthes discussed more extensively the "revolution in language"

which he recalls in this essay. See "The Death of the Author," in Stephen Heath, ed. trans., Image-Music-Text: Roland Barthes (New York, Hill and Wang, 1977), p. 142ff.

17. Walter Benjamin quoted in Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, "Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art," Artforum, vol. XXI, no. 1, September 1982, p. 46.
18. Roland Barthes, op. cit., p. 198.
19. On the concept of distinction as used here, see Pierre Bourdieu, Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1984).
20. Warhol quoted in Bruce Glaser, "Oldenburg, Lichtenstein, Warhol: A Discussion," reprinted in Coplans, op. cit., p. 65.
21. Donald Judd, "Roy Lichtenstein," Arts Magazine, April 1962, p. 52. Reprinted in Kaspar Koenig, ed. Donald Judd: Complete Writings 1959-1975 (Halifax, The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1975), pp. 48-9.
22. Glaser, op. cit., p. 62.
23. Warhol's work is usually described as if it were the fulfillment of his frequently quoted observation that "everybody should be a machine." Yet there is a considerable difference between a Warhol image (or object) and the thing it represents, and that difference is aesthetic. The difference between Warhol's aesthetic (trans)formations and Lichtenstein's is that the latter's are more consistent with the conventional modernist understanding of "fundamental structure." Warhol's art can be considered "anti-aesthetic" insofar as his repertory of expressive devices -- his deliberately off-register silkscreen method, garish use of color, and use of seriality to displace more traditional methods of composition -- were all distillations from advertising and other forms of commercial design.
24. Art's enormous prestige, despite the historical erosion of its representational and sensual complexities, has been noted by Thomas Crow:

If indeed advanced painting and sculpture have been as emptied and

debilitated as we have been led to believe, then it would follow that they must possess immense reserves of strength, of residual capacity to command interest, in order to sustain the enormous growth of the last decade. Or, if art had lost certain kinds of power, it has been given others and in larger measure. We may in fact be living in an era in which art has been empowered as never before.

See: Thomas Crow "The Return of Hank Heron," Endgame (exh. cat., Boston, The Institute of Contemporary Art, 1986), p. 18.

25. Erle Loran, Cézanne's Composition (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1943; reprint. 1963), p. 3.
26. Clement Greenberg, "Art," The Nation, February 23, 1946; Greenberg addresses this issue at length in "The Present Prospects of American Painting and Sculpture," Horizon, nos. 93-4, October 1947, p. 22. Both reprinted in John O'Brian, ed., Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1986), vol. 2, pp. 57-58; p. 160ff.
27. Clement Greenberg, "Cézanne's Composition by Earle (sic) Loran," The Nation, December 29, 1945; reprinted, ibid., p. 47.

Chapter Two

1. Hoyt Sherman, Drawing by Seeing (New York, Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, 1947), p. 4.
2. Hoyt Sherman, Curriculum Vitae, 1977, located in Sherman's studio in Columbus, in July 1984, p. 3.
3. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 18.
4. Sherman cites Emmert's Law to account for this. "Emmert in 1880 discovered that the size of the afterimage of a stimulus was determined by the distance that you assume that it lies [from you]." David Ecker, Stanley S. Madeja, Pioneers in Perception: A Study of Aesthetic Perception, (conversations with Rudolf Arnheim, James L. Gibson, Nelson Goodman, Henry Schaefer-Simmern, and Hoyt Sherman; St. Louis, Mo., Cemrel, Inc., 1979), p. 247. David Ecker is Professor of Fine Art at New York University and remains an enthusiastic supporter of Sherman's art theories. Cemrel, Inc. was a nonprofit private corporation supported in part as an educational laboratory by funds from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington D.C.. pp. 253, 258.
5. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 18.
6. "I became acquainted with Gestalt theory and figure-ground about 1939 and knew that that (sic) ground was a critical factor over the figure, aesthetically. The ground always influences the figure, that was Helmholtz' demonstration; so I used the other cues of Wertheimer -- proximity, closure, continuation, etc." Ecker and Madeja, op. cit., pp. 259, 267.
7. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 19.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 18.
10. Ibid.
11. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 24.
12. Sherman, Perceptualism: the Artist's Vision (Columbus, Ohio State University, 1944), pp. 16-17.
13. Ibid., p. 45.

14. Jacques Derrida, "Speech and Phenomena: Introduction to the Problem of Signs in Husserl's Phenomenology," in Speech and Phenomena and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs, trans. David B. Allison (Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1973), p. 31.
15. Ibid., p. 53.
16. In his fourth chapter Derrida quotes from Husserl's Logical Investigations where he isolates the phrase which he continues to find valuable in his analysis. The initial quote is as follows: "In a monologue words can perform no function of indicating the existence (Dasein) of mental acts, since such indication would there be quite purposeless (ganz zwecklos ware). For the acts in question are themselves experienced by us at that very moment (im selben Augenblick)." Ibid., p. 49.
17. Unless otherwise noted, biographical data derives from a series of conversations with Rachel Sherman, Hoyt's widow, which took place in Columbus Ohio on September 10-11, 1984.
18. Sherman was born into a Southern Methodist family in Lafayette, Alabama on November 7, 1903. His father worked in a general store and in a cotton gin mill. Alice Sherman, the boy's mother, conducted kindergarten in a one room school house. After his father died when Hoyt was 12, he began part time work as a draughtsman for the U.S. Cast Iron Pipe and Foundry Company. Although one hesitates to make too much of Sherman's past as, say, art director for the Ohio State Fair (1927-28), this job was only the first of many which suggest the broad range of activities to which he applied himself while promoting the modernist message throughout the American midwest from the late 1920s, but with increasing enthusiasm during the subsequent two decades. Even his more modest activities can offer insights into his understanding of an American application of modernist design principles. For example, in October 1929, he designed the cover of The Ohio State University Monthly (fig. 26a), taking the opportunity to deploy indigenous influences which nonetheless corresponded well with his modernist outlook. His design, in use (with changing colors) at Ohio State until June 1933, is dominated by a bold typeface which reveals the engineer's taste for a still youthful American "Machine Age" aesthetic. Here it takes on an American Indian flavor through his elaboration of such typography into chevron, triangle

and diamond-shaped elements, as well as his termination of the lettering with a Navaho-derived figure. Sherman laid out the title of the periodical in four horizontal bands across the upper third of the cover, while he situated its date in an architectonic box at lower right. These two sections he joined with a vertical column of boxed vignettes which repeat a single stylized leaf design. Together this yields a streamlined variation of the sophisticated midwestern arts and crafts styles like those developed from the turn of the century by such Ohio-based decorative arts concerns as the Rookwood Company. The use of the vignettes, and apparently of a woodblock or linocut technique, also recalls those with which Arthur Wesley Dow adorned the pages of his pedagogical tract, Composition.

From the late 1920's Sherman took on various commercial design jobs -- from designing a Timken Steel and Tube Co. exhibit in the Chrysler Building at the Chicago World's Fair ("Century of Progress," 1933-34) to designing his efficient modern home and studio in Columbus in 1939. In 1950 he became one of a distinguished group of consulting editors (including Marcel Duchamp, Nelly van Doesburg, Siegfried Giedion, and Gyorgy Kepes, among others) on Harry Holtzman's short-lived journal, Transformation. In 1954, as Sherman's pedagogical program at Ohio State declined in prominence -- ultimately resulting in the dismantling of the flash lab in the late 1950s, he was hired to analyze "billboard communication" for the Coca-Cola Company of Atlanta, Georgia. In 1955 he was called upon to participate in a conference at the University of Georgia organized by the "Business Art Institute" entitled, "making people SEE", a title which Sherman used as the title of his own lecture. In 1960 Sherman's commercial application of his aesthetic principles culminated in his conception and design of an elaborate promotional brochure for the E.F. Hauserman Co., manufacturers of a movable wall system (in use at the Seagram's Building). In designing this stylish brochure, Sherman enlisted the history of art and design -- marshalling figures from Bramante to Gropius, Wright to Mies, Maillart to Leger, and design traditions ranging from Gothic to de Stijl in order to establish that tone of enlightened commerce which epitomized by the Museum of Modern Art's design collection, could serve as a high-minded pedigree for promoting sales.

19. Ecker and Madeja, op. cit., p. 250.

20. Ohio State had been offering fine arts degrees since as early as 1905. In 1929 O.S.U. offered one of a few Ph.D.'s in painting to Bertha Koch. Shortly thereafter, this policy of awarding Ph.D.s in painting was discontinued due to objections from various official quarters, including the College Art Association. Roy Lichtenstein said in a conversation with this author in 1984 that one reason he had considered O.S.U. in the first place was because it offered advanced degrees in Fine Art. See Ross A. Norris, The Cultured Mind The Skillful Hand: Art and Art Education at the Ohio State University, 1874-1944 (bound manuscript, Ohio State University Archive, ERIC document no. ED 175779).
21. Sherman, Perceptualism, p. 1.
22. "I have leaned heavily, and naively probably, on John Dewey's Art in Experience [sic], (1934). I've never forgotten it." Ecker and Madeja, op. cit., p. 309.
23. Thomas M. Alexander, John Dewey's Theory of Art, Experience and Nature: the Horizons of Feeling (Albany, State University of New York Press, 1987).
24. Frederick M. Logan, The Growth of Art in American Schools (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1955), p. 113.
25. Alexander, op. cit., p. 57ff.
26. Ibid., p. 19.
27. Ibid., pp. 128-9.
28. Ibid., p. 128.
29. Ibid., p. 126.
30. Ibid., p. 133.
31. Ecker and Madeja, op. cit., p. 289.
32. Ibid., p. 283; Hoyt Sherman, Cézanne and Visual Form (Columbus, Ohio University, 1952), pp. 10-11.
33. Köhler quoted by in Kurt Koffka, Principles of Gestalt Psychology (New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1935), p.62. Although it was Wertheimer who first postulated the theory of isomorphism, Köhler elaborated upon it. For example, he stated that isomorphism is:

...the thesis that our experiences and
the processes which underlie these

experiences have the same structure....From our point of view, there is only one way in which such facts of experienced determination can be represented in the brain: we have to make use of what the scientist calls field physics. In other words, when the self is felt to respond to the characteristics of a certain object, then in the brain the processes underlying the experienced self must be affected by the processes which correspond to the object. More particularly, the specific characteristics of the processes corresponding to the object must somehow be represented in the area in which the processes underlying the self occur, and under the influence of this "field" the processes corresponding to the self must change in one way or another. Conversely, a particular attitude of the self with regard to an object must have a physiological counterpart which extends to the locus where this object is physiologically represented, so that the process corresponding to the object can change under the influence of the self's field.

See Wolfgang Köhler, Gestalt Psychology (New York, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1947), pp. 344-345.

34. Sherman, Cézanne, pp. 10-11.
35. Ibid., pp. 19-20.
36. Ibid., p. 239. On transactionalism, see: Franklin P. Kilpatrick, ed., Human Behavior from the Transactional Point of View (Institute for Associated Research, Department of the Navy, 1952); Hadley Cantril, Understanding Man's Social Behavior, Preliminary Notes (Princeton, N.J., Office of Public Opinion Research, 1947); "Science Contrives Princeton Ordeal," The New York Times, March 14, 1954. Also see Alexander, op. cit., p. 77ff., 107-115. In an unpublished interview with this writer dated June 28, 1983, Roy Lichtenstein essentially agreed with Sherman's overall understanding that the way an individual configures the surface of a painting can be understood, in part, as a function of the structure of the cortical region of the brain. He added that the field pattern is "independent of object

patterns....these patterns would be individual, they wouldn't even be the same by the same artist again.They wouldn't keep repeating the same thing, It would always vary. It's probably something in the cortex that produces it."

37. Alexander, ibid., p. 144.
38. John Dewey, Art as Experience (New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1934), especially chapters 3-6. Dewey's debt to Barnes is evident in his dedication of this book "To Albert C. Barnes in Gratitude". Barnes' The Art in Painting made an especially deep impression on Dewey, its essentially formalist aesthetic economy governing Barnes' understanding of the potential synthesis between the essential properties of painting. As for Barnes' debt to Dewey, its legacy is the Barnes Foundation itself; at least if we are to believe some of the earliest published statements regarding the purposes of the foundation. In an editorial describing the origins and practices of the Barnes Foundation, one learns that its:

...program for education is based upon the fundamental conceptions of 'democracy' and 'education' as they are set forth in the work of modern thinkers, and more particularly in that of John Dewey. Democracy means the sharing of all the interests of a group by every member of the group, and the full and free interaction of all the groups making up society...is conceived as the complete and harmonious development of all the capabilities with which an individual is endowed at birth, a development which requires, not coercion or standardization, but guidance of the interests of every individual towards a form that shall be uniquely characteristic of him."

See: Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol. 1, no. 1, April, 1925, p. 3.

39. Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 103; Alexander, op. cit., p. 231.
40. Dewey quoted in Alexander, ibid., p. 199.
41. Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 40.

42. Dewey quoted in Alexander, op. cit., p. 210.
43. Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 256.
44. Ibid., p. 52.
45. Ibid., p. 119.
46. Sherman, Perceptualism, p. 1.
47. Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 23.
48. Ibid., p. 24.
49. Ibid., p. 25.
50. Dewey quoted in Alexander, op. cit., p. 237.
51. John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York, Macmillan, 1916; reprint., Free Press 1966), pp. 5-6.
52. Dewey quoted in Alexander, op. cit., p. 183.
53. Dewey, Art as Experience, pp. 148-9.
54. Ibid., p. 262.
55. Thus it is not too much to say that the statement of an objective criterion of value in paintings set forth for the first time by Mr. Barnes will make possible in time an adequate psychological, even physiological analysis of aesthetic responses in spectators, so that the appreciation of paintings will no longer be a matter of private, absolute tastes and ipse dixits.

In the same essay, Dewey noted that painting affords "such a deep and abiding experience of the nature of fully harmonized experience as sets a standard or forms a habit for all other experience." See John Dewey, "Affective Thought and Logic in Painting" Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol. 2, no. 2, April 1926, p. 8. In an anonymous article which Barnes himself may have written for the first issue of the Journal of the Barnes Foundation, one reads that his activities:

grew out of a business the success of which was largely due to the application of the principles of democracy and

education.... Shared control and responsibility, an intelligent enlistment of personal interest, and consequent expansion and cultivation of personal abilities led first to success in business and then to success in employing the leisure which increased financial returns made possible. This liberated interest was directed to the study of psychology, of aesthetics, and especially of plastic art.

According to one biographer, Henry Hart, Barnes established what may have been the earliest American precedent for situating modern art in the corporate workplace in the hopes of enhancing the workers' environment -- to say nothing of the corporate image. The desire to enlighten workers to the pleasures of plastic expression, to improve their circumstances through exposure to Barnes' art collection, also extended in a properly Deweyan manner, to encouraging his employees to in-form their tasks with the patterns acquired by studying the aesthetic model. That is, they were to acquire "the kind of habits which give an individual a greater measure of control over the environment. Active habits are the opposite of routinized conduct..." In order to realize these goals, Barnes enlisted Mary Mullen, an administrator of his company who later would teach at The Barnes Foundation, to conduct classes for the workers in psychology and aesthetics at the factory in time "found" after Barnes -- an adept entrepreneur and master of the relatively new art of efficiency -- discovered a method for achieving production goals "in six of the eight hours the employes (sic) then worked each day." See: "The Barnes Foundation: An Experiment in Education," Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol.1, no. 1, pp. 3-4; Henry Hart, Dr. Barnes of Merion, an Appreciation (New York, Farrar, Strauss, 1963), pp. 44, 61.

56. Sherman, curriculum vitae, p. 3.
57. Sherman, Perceptualism, pp. 4-5.
58. Sherman, curriculum vitae, p. 3, Sherman's emphasis.
59. Sherman, Drawing By Seeing, p. 3. For examples of the early uses of the tachistoscope see Robert S. Woodworth, Harold Schlosberg, Experimental Psychology (New York, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1938), esp. chapters 2, 13, 17, 23, 24, and 25.

60. Sherman, Perceptualism, pp. 69-75; Drawing by Seeing, p. 51.
61. Sherman, Perceptualism, p. 5.
62. Since the mid 1930s, Samuel Renshaw, Professor of Psychology at Ohio State University, directed graduate students in a series of studies devised, with the aid of the tachistoscope, to establish the conditions necessary for individuals to read and memorize a row of numbers, letters, etc., with optimal speed and efficiency. Renshaw published a summary of results gleaned from his own research and that of his students in the following: Samuel Renshaw, "The Visual Perception and Reproduction of Forms by Tachistoscopic Methods," Journal of Psychology, vol. 20, October, 1945, pp. 217-32.
63. On the scientific level, the pioneering text was unquestionably Hermann Ebbinghaus, Über das Gedächtnis: Untersuchungen zur experimentelle Psychologie (Berlin, 1885). Raymond Holder Wheeler has pointed out that after it was translated into English in 1913, "a voluminous literature on memory appeared." See Raymond Holder Wheeler, The Science of Psychology (New York, T.Y. Crowell Co. 1929) p. 288. However, the more widespread commerce in mnemonic manuals includes, among many others: A.E. Middleton, Memory Systems, New and Old (1885); M.L. Holbrook, How to Strengthen Memory; or, Natural and Scientific Methods of Never Forgetting (n.d.); E. Pick, Memory and Its Doctors (1887); William L. Evans, Memory Training (1889); D. Kay, Memory: What it is and How to use it (1888); E.H. Hawley, Mnemotechny for the Millions, (1858).
64. This information concerning Kurt Koffka's emmigration comes from Jean Matter Mandler, George Mandler, "The Diaspora of Experimental Psychology: The Gestaltists and Others," in Donald Fleming, Bernard Bailyn, The Intellectual Migration: Europe and American, 1930-1960 (Cambridge, Harvard Univeristy Press, 1969) pp. 374-399.
65. "Could we then claim that psycholgy is particularly fitted for the task of integration...? I think we can, for in psychology we are at the point where the three great provinces of our world intersect, the provinces which we call inanimate nature, life, and mind." Kurt Koffka, Principles of Gestalt Psychology, p. 10.
66. Ibid., p. 10-11.
67. Ibid., p. 19.

68. See especially Chapter II where Koffka compares the unitary model of Gestalt with the atomistic behaviorism favored by American psychologists. In chapter III Koffka introduces -- and criticizes -- the "introspectionists" for their atomistic view of direct experience which he contrasts to the Gestaltist's understanding of a "phenomenological" method: "For us, phenomenology means as naive and full a description of direct experience as possible. In America the word "introspection" is the only one used for what we mean, but this word has also a very different meaning in that it refers to a special kind of such description, namely, the one which analyses direct experience into sensations or attributes, or some other systematic, but not experiential ultimates." Ibid., p. 73.
69. In Gestalt Psychology, Wolfgang Köhler wrote: "One cannot reduce organization to other factors, if these other factors can be understood only in terms of organization. I do not hesitate to repeat that experiences are quite commonly imbued with meanings. But this statement would be misleading if I were not to add, first, that for the most part it is organized experiences to which such meanings attach themselves, and secondly, that the facts of learning which are here involved derive again from the principles of organization." In a subsequent chapter on "Recall," Köhler stated: "Association is necessary for recall, and association presupposes a sufficient degree of unification in the sense of organization.....not only the organization given at the time of association matters, but also the organization at the time of (expected) recall." See W. Köhler, Gestalt Psychology, pp. 278, 289, 291.
70. In Köhler's book, as in Koffka's, he introduces his subject by discussing the failures of both behaviorism and introspectionism to function as viable alternatives in the quest for a science of the mind. Köhler argues that in his extreme quest for epistemological purity the behaviorist attempts to eliminate direct experience from scientific observation altogether. In doing so, he argues, the behaviorist engages in a falsification of the physicist's methodology. Köhler argues effectively that the latter in fact depends at some point upon direct observation, using the example of scientists observing such a device as a galvanometer. Consequently, he demonstrates that Gestalt theory rests upon a ground at least as objective, or reliable for scientific purposes as that of the physicist. Ibid., pp. 3-33.

71. Ibid., p. 18.
72. Kurt Koffka, op. cit., especially his Chapter XIV, "Society and Personality", where he argues: "...we are members of a society, and our behaviour is determined by this fact to a degree which psychologists have only begun to realize." p. 648.
73. See Paul Ricoeur, Freud and Philosophy: an Essay on Interpretation, trans. Denis Savage (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1970), especially his Book III, Chapter 1: "Epistemology: Between Psychology and Phenomenology" in which he initially reviews the various attempts of psychologists, dating from the mid-1950's, to reformulate psychoanalysis into the terms of "scientific psychology" and observes:

Reformulation can only deal with results that are dead, detached from the analytic experience, with definitions isolated from one another, cut off from their origins in interpretation and extracted from academic presentations where they had already fallen to the rank of mere magical phrases....The difference comes at the beginning or never: psychology is an observational science dealing with the facts of behavior; psychoanalysis is an exegetical science dealing with the relationships of meaning between substitute objects and the primordial (and lost) instinctual objects. The two disciplines diverge from the very beginning, at the level of the initial notion of fact, and of inference from facts. (pp. 358-9)

Concerning the understanding of the psychologist versus the psychoanalyst regarding "facts" Ricoeur states:

The object of the analyst's study is the meaning for the subject of the same events the psychologist regards as an observer and sets up as environmental variables....[For the analyst] they do not function as observables, but as signifiers for the history of desire....strictly speaking, there are no "facts" in psychoanalysis for the

analyst does not observe, he interprets.
(pp. 364-365)

Later he argues that the attempt to liken
psychoanalysis to an experimental science:

analytic experience unfolds in the field
of speech and that, within this field,
what comes to light is another language,
dissociated from common language, and
which presents itself to be deciphered
through its meaningful effects --
symptoms, dreams, various formations,
etc. Not to recognize this specific
feature leads one to eliminate as an
anomaly the interrelationship of
hermeneutics and energetics in analytic
theory. One may indeed discover in
psychoanalysis what Rapaport calls the
empirical, gestalt, and organismic
points of view, but at the cost of a
translation that alters the proper
meaning of analytic concepts. (pp.
366-367)

74. Derrida, Speech and Phenomena, pp. 45-46.
75. See Frederick Jameson, The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1981) p. 62.
76. Ibid., p. 221-222.
77. Samuel Renshaw, op. cit., p. 217.
78. Ibid., p. 218.
79. Ibid.
80. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 3.
81. Ibid., p. 27.
82. Renshaw, op. cit., p. 218.
83. Ross A. Norris, op. cit., p. 3.
84. Ibid., p. 33.
85. Norris has argued that because the disbursements for Mason's materials included payments for large amounts of chemicals that could only have been used in

connection with photography, he believes that they were acquired for more than his own personal use. Ibid., pp. 70-82.

86. Edward L. Thorndike, "The Nature, Purposes, and General Methods of Measurements of Educational Products," 17th Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Bloomington, 1918, part II, p. 16. Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957 (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), esp. pp. 180-186. For a history of the this tendency in the U.S. to weave together industrial expansion and higher education into a mutually supporting network see: David F. Noble, America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism (N.Y., Alfred A. Knopf, 1977).
87. According to David Noble, there were three stages in harnessing science to the needs of industry, two of which involved the instrumentalization of the university. First, he notes that at the turn of the century organized research laboratories were established by industry following Edison's classic example. Second, and at roughly the same time, these industries recruited support from research agencies outside industry proper, such as trade associations, research foundations, government bureaus and university science and engineering departments. Third, and most dramatic, during World War I the national coordination, orchestrated through the National Research Council, turned the war mobilization into, among other things, what Noble has referred to as a "testing ground for the rating systems" in order to rate men "according to their individual abilities and identify officer potential". Aside from determining who would fight in the war, and at what degree of mortal risk -- decisions whose racist and classist implications Noble has stressed -- this testing experience proved of considerable value to the administrators of post-war industry. In fact, the prominence of business leaders (and educational administrators) in the war coordination and mobilization organizations like the Committee on Education and Special Training (C.E.S.T.) must be considered in relation to such activities as its promotion of "war-issues courses" in colleges, and national war-issues "educational" rallies to engender support for a war. In the post-war period C.E.S.T. became responsible for disseminating management theories to increase industrial productivity under the auspices of the U.S. Bureau of Education, theories and plans that had been worked out during the war. By 1940, the administrators of C.E.S.T. included executives from

Standard Oil, General Electric, and U.S. Steel. Thus, many of the techniques that were tried out during the mobilization under the auspices of organizations like C.E.S.T. were merely deployed during peacetime to promote personnel management, to increase productivity, and generally to imbue the student with a "practical and commercial viewpoint." See: David Noble, Ibid. espec. Chapters 9 and 10.

88. Karl Marx, quoted by Noble in his introduction, Ibid., p. xxiv.
89. Consider William E. Wickenden. Born in Ohio as the son of a civil engineer, he studied electrical engineering and then taught at the University of Wisconsin and MIT. He then rose the corporate ladder and became Vice President at A.T.&T., and then left corporate life to become President of the Case Institute of Technology (Case Western Reserve) in Cleveland where he remained until his death in 1947. Wickenden is known as a reformer, interested in expanding university curricula along "humanistic social-science lines". As part of his reformist agenda, Wickenden sought closer ties between industrial and educational sectors. Wickenden's A Professional Guide for Junior Engineers, published posthumously in 1949 by the Council for Professional Development, advised his reader to be "like a soldier" who seeks special qualifications for his "arm of service." He must rise within the organization, knowing that his effectiveness in this capacity will depend upon "team-play rather than upon his individualism. He must know how to follow before he is qualified to lead." Wickenden suggested that these young engineers should by all means join unions, not so much because he supported their goals, but rather to "learn to study the psychology, economics, politics, and tactics of unionism from within." See David Noble, op. cit., pp. 48-49. In his commencement address to the General Motors Institute entitled, "Industry and Education Approach Each Other", dated August 23, 1946, Wickenden turned to a selective etymology in order to remind the "graduating class" that "The very word university comes from the latin word for corporation...". See, Cremin, op cit., p. 167.
90. "...the engineer was at the service of capital, and, not surprisingly, its laws were to him as natural as the laws of science." Ibid., p. 34.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., p. 39.

93. Ibid., p. 6. Among the stories concerning the hazards of instrumentalizing the university during this period is the history of the later years of the Princeton Radio Project, which had been headed by Paul Lazarsfeld, Frank Stanton and Hadley Cantril -- the latter two of whom became co-directors of C.B.S. Research, and also became acquainted with, and supportive of Hoyt Sherman's work on perceptual training at Ohio State (see fig. 34a). Supported in large part with funds from The Rockefeller Foundation, trouble came to the Radio Project when Theodor Adorno was invited by Lazarsfeld to do the work which later became Adorno's "The Radio Symphony," and "On Popular Music." John Marshall, a review director for The Rockefeller Foundation, found his work inappropriate and discontinued funding for the music project; that is, for Adorno's work. That Adorno would soon after join Horkheimer in California in order to embark on writing The Dialectic of the Enlightenment -- their critique of precisely that rationalist and instrumentalist thought which partly informed projects like Hoyt Sherman's, is as close to historical coincidence that the refugees from the Frankfurt School for Social Research came to the latter. But perhaps of equal interest for our purposes here is what happened after the Radio Project left Princeton in the fall of 1939, after a break between Cantril and Lazarsfeld. It went on to function under the jurisdiction of Columbia University's Department of Sociology with the title, Bureau of Applied Social Research. During the War, Columbia took greater part in funding and determining projects which at that time pertained to propaganda films. It also pertained to the use of the "Lazarsfeld-Stanton Program Analyser" -- a device invented at Princeton with Rockefeller support which was intended to "relate the musical structure of a song to the emotional reactions of the listener" -- and which was, as Lazarsfeld noted, a "thinly disguised...polygraph." By October 1944, the Office of Applied Social Research, operating under the guidance of the Columbia Council for Research in the Social Sciences, was soliciting and accepting contracts with industry, as was fairly common during wartime. Lazarsfeld noted that in 1968, "50% of Columbia's operating budget comes from contracts". See Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "An Episode in the History of Social Research: a Memoir," in Fleming, Bailyn, op. cit., esp. pp. 322-327.
94. For a survey of how these issues were manifested differently during the 1920s, and in the two subsequent

decades when educational theorists were more intent on linking education to progressive political agendas, see: Cremin, op. cit..

95. Recently, Jacques Derrida addressed the problem of the University's relationship to government-related institutions and programs, and of philosophy's place within them in, "The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of its Pupils," Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal, The New School, vol. 10, no. 1, 1984.
96. Cremin, op. cit. p. 221.
97. Ibid., pp. 195-221. Werrett Wallace Charters had been at The Carnegie Institute of Technology, University of Pittsburg (1923-25) and at the University of Chicago (1925-28) before finally working at Ohio State Univeristy (1928-42). Along with Franklin Bobbitt at the University of Chicago, he was the author of Curriculum Construction (New York, 1923), and was influenced by the scientism of the Committee on the Economy of Time. Bobbitt was known to refer to curriculum planners as "great engineers." Boyd S. Bode joined Ohio State in 1921 after having been a member of the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture. During his twenty-three years at O.S.U. he brought to it the Deweyan ideals which also informed his writing in Educational Freedom and Democracy (New York, 1938).
98. Cremin, ibid., p. 223.
99. Mandel isolates ten economic characteristics of the third technological revolution. Among those which seem pertinent to my claim regarding Sherman's flash-lab technique is Mandel's observation that the accelerated displacement of human labor by mechanization produces a "shift of living labour power still engaged in the process of production from the actual treatment of raw materials to preparatory or supervisory finctions." Mandel notes that the processes of production, preparation and supervision are themselves greatly accelerated within a system where the "compulsion to accelerate technological innovation" dooms existing machinery to a shorter life-span. An individual trained to perceive and perform as acutely and smoothly as Sherman intended would be able to cope with the demands such a system imposes than one who is not. See Mandel, op. cit., pp. 195-198
100. Certainly the most fanciful and the largest

manifestation of this tendency to envision the future as an untrammelled consumer's paradise was the 1939 New York World's Fair where corporate, rather than national pavillions dominated the show, affording an image of American life as the multi-nationals saw it.

101. "Man has, as it were, become a kind of prosthetic God. When he puts on all his auxiliary organs he is truly magnificent; but those organs have not grown on to him and they still give him much trouble at times." Training such as that which the flash lab offered can be seen as a means of helping relieve man of such "trouble," by preparing him for the more demanding conditions of prosthetically supplemented life. See Sigmund Freud, Civilization and its Discontents, trans. James Strachey (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1961), p. 43.
102. See note 16 above.
103. Sherman, Perceptualism, pp. 76-77.
104. Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," in Basic Writings, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977), p.289.
105. Sherman, Drawing by Seeing, p. 41.

Chapter Three

1. The key text is On the Aesthetic Education of Man, where Schiller notes, for example, in his Sixth Letter, that the "progress" of civilization is predicated upon increasing empirical knowledge and elaborating the structure of the State. As a consequence of the increasingly sharp divisions between the various sciences and specialization among the ranks and occupations of mankind, without which such progress, Schiller notes, would have been inconceivable, there evolved parallel splits within experience and the human faculties. Schiller recalls the "polypoid character of the Greek States, in which every individual enjoyed an independent existence but could, when need arose, grow into the whole organism..." Since then, he observes, a "mechanical kind of collective life ensued."

State and Church, laws and customs, were now torn asunder; enjoyment was divorced from labour, the means from the end, the effort from the reward. Everlastingly chained to a single little fragment of the Whole, man himself develops into nothing but a fragment; everlastingly in his ear the monotonous sound of the wheel that he turns, he never develops the harmony of his being, and instead of putting the stamp of humanity upon his own nature, he becomes nothing more than the imprint of his occupation or of his specialized knowledge. But that meagre, fragmentary participation, by which individual members of the State are still linked to the Whole, does not depend upon forms which they spontaneously prescribe for themselves...it is dictated to them with meticulous exactitude by means of a formulary which inhibits all freedom of thought.

At the conclusion of his sixth letter, Schiller turns to the idea of a healing Art which is separate from the divisive (mechanical) arts, noting that, "it must be open to us to restore by means of a higher Art the totality of our nature which the arts themselves have destroyed." See Friedrich Schiller, On the Aesthetic Education of Man, Elizabeth M. Wilkinson, L.A.

- Willoughby, ed. and trans. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 31-43.
2. Stuart Macdonald, The History and Philosophy of Art Education (London, University of London, 1970). p. 67.
 3. On what has been called the "great global boom" and how rail travel, steamships and the telegraph contributed to the fact that "an entirely new economic world was added to the old and integrated into it", see E.J. Hobsbawm, The Age of Capital 1848-1875 (New York, New American Library, 1975), esp. "The Great Boom," pp. 27-47. From its inception roughly in 1850, this period, which Hobsbawm would call "the golden age of capitalist growth...would reach its peak in the boom of 1871-1873." Ernest Mandel also characterized the period between 1848 and 1873 as an expansive one in which the rate of profits tended to rise and in which a massive expansion of the world market followed the "growing industrialization and extension of railway construction in the whole of Europe and North America as a result of the 1848 Revolution." See Mandel, op cit. p. 131. On the universal expositions, see Patricia Mainardi, op. cit..
 4. Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 77, 150.
 5. Nikolaus Pevsner has noted that the rise of "practical" instruction within new or reorganized European art academies can be dated as early as to the mid to late eighteenth century. Then, in virtually every European nation, schools were structured (or restructured) to accomodate classes for craftsmen and artisans in response to what Pevsner perceived as a union of "mercantilism" and emerging Enlightenment attitudes towards education and work; according to this union, it was deemed necessary "in order to make factories and industries flourish, and increase the prosperity of the citizens... to promote the art of drawing as the foundation of all art." He noted that in 1767, Jean-Jacques Bachelier, flower painter and head of porcelain decoration at Sèvres, founded a program for an Ecole Elémentaire du Dessin en faveur des metiers relatifs aux arts, renamed later that year the Ecole Royale Gratuite de Dessin. See Niklaus Pevsner, Academies of Art (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1940), pp. 152-163. William J. Sewell has noted the more gradual transition in France (than in Great Britain) to industrial conditions of production, evident in the more gradual increase in the size of urban relative to rural populations, which itself is emblematic of the slower shift to large-scale mechanized industry. He

notes, however, that dislocations did take place, especially as a product of shifts in the organization of production and distribution of goods, where increased demand gave rise to the system of "confection." According to the latter, entrepreneurs in urban trades turned away from the older practice of "making items to order for their clients and, instead, came to specialize in lower-quality, standardized, ready-to-wear or ready-to-use items that could be produced more efficiently and sold at a lower price. As a result, while artisanal skills in France were not "wiped out by advancing industrialism" they were decidedly "diluted by declining standards of quality and an increasing division of labor." See: William J. Sewell, Jr., Work & Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press), esp. Chapter 7, "Industrial Society," pp. 143-161.

6. Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 67-8. In his "Report to the Board of Trade, on Foreign Schools of Design for Manufacture," William Dyce noted the foundation in France in 1767 of the "Ecole Gratuit de dessin, de mathématiques, de construction, et de sculpture d'ornement, en faveur de métiers relatif aux arts." See The Art-Union, September 1840, pp. 143-144.
7. Quoted in Macdonald, op. cit., p. 153.
8. Ibid., pp. 79, 81-82. The school of design in Lyons, often cited as exemplary among French design schools by visitors like Dyce, was divided into six sections, including, painting, sculpture, architecture, ornament, engraving, and botany. All students -- some of whom were the sons of factory workers selected for special training by the Mayor of Lyons -- completed the same course in drawing and painting in which life classes figured, before they committed themselves to a given career.
9. Ruskin would argue that the government-sponsored schools of art had confused the notion of an artistic skill, by which he understood that which was required to design a beautiful utilitarian object, with the "skill of manufacture", by which he meant the skill needed to reproduce any design a "thousandfold." He felt that these schools had succeeded -- to their own detriment -- in privileging the latter at the expense of the former. See John Ruskin, Elements of Drawing in: The Works of John Ruskin (Library Edition, London, George Allen, 1903-12), vol. XV, p. 12; reprint: New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1971); hereafter cited

as Elements.

10. Walter Smith (1836-1886) would introduce his variation on this system into American education. Here he is quoted in Macdonald, op. cit., p. 256. Years later, George Moore would recall these drawings: "The poor drawing had neither character nor consistency; it looked like nothing under the sun, except a drawing done at Kensington, a flat foolish thing, but very soft and smooth." Quoted in Macdonald, p. 195.
11. Ibid., p. 87.
12. Macdonald has noted that, as run by George Jackson and John Zephaniah Bell, the school at Manchester sought "to break down the barriers between the training of a designer and a fine artist" that is, to teach students according to as French a pedagogical orientation as Dyce's predisposition was German, albeit in an essentially pragmatic British sense. Thus, Jackson could ask members of the Manchester Mechanics Institute why nature should not serve as the "master" since it had for the authors of ancient ornament. And Bell, who was too fine-art oriented and too much the Francophone even for Jackson's taste, had his students practice the stump technique when using chalk. Ibid., p. 86.
13. See: William Dyce, The Introduction to The Drawing Book of the School of Design (London, Chapman and Hall, n.d. [c. 1854]), p. 7ff. Macdonald notes: "Dyce seems to have misinterpreted the German system, which was based on the ideal of realizing the potentialities of every member of the nation so that each would serve the state in his appropriate role, as Hegel and Fichte advised." Ibid., p. 119.
14. Mathew Arnold in Logan, op. cit., p. 116.
15. On the Royal Academy's "Instrument of Foundation" ('promoting the Arts of Design') see Macdonald, op. cit., p. 62ff. On Dyce's defensive view of drawing and design instruction, see pp. 77-79, and Dyce, op. cit..
16. For Redgrave and Burchett's National Course of Instruction for Government Schools of Art, see ibid., Appendix C, pp. 388-391. Cole's administrative accomplishments were extensive to be sure. As Superintendent of Schools of Practical Art from 1852 to 1873 he reorganized all these educational facilities, overseeing the most rapid increase in the number of art institutions in British history, including the first training school for art masters, the first government

art exams, teaching certificates, the initiation of state art education in public day schools, and the first museum of applied art. Dyce's early interest in the German system of Gewerbeschulen and Werkstätten may have led to the idea of a "British Museum of Ornamental Manufactures" since a similar institution existed in Berlin, in part, to supplement the instruction of future designers.

17. On the laborious process of certification see: ibid., p. 161ff. On the student-teachers' ("masters in training") employment from 1852 in the elementary national and parochial "schools for the poor" in London, at each of which they might earn five pounds per year, see pp. 165-66. On the four part first grade examinations, consisting of (1) freehand outline drawing in pencil from flat example of ornament; (2) outline of geometric solid, such as a cube; (3) outline from memory of a common object; (4) problems in practical geometry, see p. 167.
18. Ibid., pp. 141-2.
19. Ibid., p. 159.
20. Ibid., pp. 161, 379. Though noted in the Clarendon and Taunton Commission reports of 1864 and 1868, respectively, drawing would only become a compulsory subject in British elementary schools for boys following the Cross Commission (1888) with the enactment of the Code of 1890. See S.J. Curtis, op cit., p. 156ff
21. Unless otherwise noted, this account of the National Course of Instruction is based on Macdonald's account. In the latter he notes that in addition to Dyce's copy books, the Department of Science and Art had authorized plates of geometry, architectural detail and classical sculpture (the Laocoon, the Farnese Hercules, Myron's Discobolus, etc.) in its collection, and plates deriving as well from books like Giocondo Albertolli's several late-eighteenth-century collections of architectural ornament, L. Gruner's Specimens of Ornamental Art, and Dicksee's Foliage, Fruit and Flowers. Ibid., p. 160ff; 388-391.
22. David Wardle, English Popular Education: 1780-1975 (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. . See also "Introduction" above, pp. 23-24 and the related note #22. For early, and insightful critical responses to the widespread deployment of memorization, see discussion of two Scots, David Stow and James Wood,

in S.J. Curtis, op. cit. pp. 214-220.

23. See Clive Ashwin, Drawing and Education in German-Speaking Europe 1800-1900 (Ann Arbor, Michigan, UMI Research Press, 1981), pp. 132-134. As timeless as it seems, the logic behind drawing from memory as the British conceived of it would benefit from further investigation. During the nineteenth century, elementary instruction for middle class children often depended upon the clergy who relied upon the method of questions and answers which are learned according to the model of the liturgical catechism. During the first third of the nineteenth century, catechistic instructions were codified in book form by individuals like William Pinnock, for example, for study in innumerable areas, including geography, anatomy, history, ichthyology, moral and social duty, and perspective drawing. George Eliot noted the catechistic mode of instruction in The Mill on the Floss. There, in Chapter 11 of "Boy and Girl," Maggie, the ill-fated, exceedingly curious, and largely self-taught protagonist tells the gypsies she has run off to join:

Columbus was a very wonderful man, who found out half the world and they put chains on him and treated him very badly, you know it's in my Catechism of Geography but perhaps it's rather too long to tell before tea....I want my tea so.

See George Eliot, The Mill on the Floss, ed. A.S. Byatt (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1985), p. 174, and 674 n. 31.

24. Macdonald quotes the comments of H. Johnstone, a headmaster in Manchester who, in 1846, understood the copying technique then in use as follows:

...guides to successful imitation were then drawn or modelled as repeated motifs for wallpaper patterns or plaster work. By this copying the Council hoped that pupils would commit to memory a multiplicity of historic motifs, so that they could combine them anew and spawn mongrel designs, the theory being that the more historical ornaments they knew "the greater the number of combinations effected."

Macdonald, op. cit., p. 74.

25. On Cole's institution of the Special Technical Classes, see ibid., pp. 169-171.

Cole, a friend of John Stuart Mill, whose Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government he especially admired, was of the opinion that "a perfect institution, whether a school, museum, or exhibition, should not only be self-supporting, but show a profit." This is entirely consistent with Mill's statement that he looked forward to a time "when the rule that they who do not work shall not eat, will be applied". Such logic may well have informed Cole's decision to institute the system of "payment on results" from 1854-1863 which limited "making payments to school and master on the exam results of the schools for the poor." This tended further to reduce payments to already underpaid and undervalued teachers and diminished the sums provided to the schools. When the State provided the maintenance allowance for art masters in training, it was required that they earn that sum by teaching at these elementary national and parochial schools, the so-called, "schools for the poor." It is furthermore characteristic of Cole's administration that the vast majority of the sums which he allocated went to the construction and embellishment of the museum and residences at South Kensington. In 1863, though an average of 153 pounds was spent on each local school, 56,542 pounds were spent on South Kensington. To economize on the construction of the latter, Cole enlisted the aid not only of his design school staff, but also of local convicts, whose labor on the black and white marble chips laid into the floors of cloisters, halls and roadways led to Cole's pithy appellation, "opus criminale". Ibid., p. 172ff. Payment on results was also at the heart of the "Revised Code" which was enacted in 1862 and applied throughout the British system of general education. See H.C. Barnard, op. cit., p. 130ff.

26. Macdonald identifies the "'45 rebellion" with the resignation of John Rogers Herbert, R.A., who had been holding evening painting and life classes which many of the students at the central school attended. Herbert resigned under the pressures imposed by Charles Heath Wilson, director and headmaster of the central school at Somerset House. Wilson was more antiquarian and just as opposed to attempting original designs for utilitarian purposes as Dyce had been committed to his own narrow perception of the needs of the industrial arts trades. Herbert, a Catholic, papist, and friend of the Pugin family, was Master of figure drawing, and vehemently opposed Wilson's antiquarianism and,

similarly, his "decadent" fixation on Italianate ornament. Macdonald reports that Burchett was "the most prominent rebel student," a notion which is supported by the fact that in 1848, when Herbert was appointed head of ornament, he invited Burchett to join the staff. In the meantime, Herbert's class was discontinued, and thirty-five students suspended, after Parliament shelved the latter's protest. Ibid., pp. 97-98.

27. Richard Burchett, "The Central Training School for Art," in Introductory Address on the Science and Art Department and the South Kensington Museum, no. 4. (London, Chapman & Hall, 1858) p. 8.

28. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

29. Ibid., p. 4-5.

30. Ibid., p. 5.

31. Macdonald has noted:

It was common in Britain at this period to preach about the system of public art education being specially planned for the artisan, whereas the French were inclined too much towards fine art, but in actual fact, there was much humbug in this. As has been shown, France provided free art education for the sons of factory workers, Britain did not. The British artisan even had to pay fees (though these were reduced).

Macdonald, op. cit., p. 176; and see chapter entitled, "Sociological: Art Education for Whom?" p. 143ff.

32. The emblematic text, symptomatic of a situation with far older roots in nineteenth-century British life, is Samuel Smiles's Self Help (1859). Concerning Smiles popular book and its broader meaning and ideological effect in Victorian life, see: K. Fielden, "Samuel Smiles and Self-Help," Victorian Studies, vol. 12, 1968-1969, p. 155ff.; for the relationship between Smiles and Ford Madox Ford's Work (1862-1865), see Albert Boime, "Ford Madox Brown, Thomas Carlyle, and Karl Marx: Meaning and Mystification of Work in the Nineteenth Century," Arts Magazine, vol. 56. no. 1, September 1981, pp. 116-125.

33. Robert Owen, Essays on the Formation of Human Character

(1812) quoted by Macdonald, op. cit., p. 119.

On the relationship between Bentham's statement and its realization in a society steeped in individualist, utilitarian, and Malthusian ideology see Hobsbawm, op. cit., especially his chapters 10 and 13. In the former, Hobsbawm sketches the logic that governed the limits of upward mobility for the poor during this period; the logic, that is, of the "career open to talent." About the self-limiting component among those deemed suitable for education, he writes:

Neither business nor education were high roads open to everybody even among those who were sufficiently emancipated from the grip of custom and tradition to believe that "people like us" would be admitted to them, to know how to operate in an individualist society, or to accept the desirability of "bettering themselves." A toll had to be paid by intending travellers: without some initial resources, however minimal, it was difficult to get started on the highway to success. This admission toll was unquestionably higher for those entering upon the education road than upon the business road, for even in the countries which had acquired a public educational system primary education was in general grossly neglected; and, even where it existed, was confined for political reasons to a minimum of literacy, arithmetic and moral obedience. (p. 227)

In a footnote to chapter 13 (pp. 279-80), Hobsbawm outlines the limits of the utilitarian's concern for the well being of others:

It should not be supposed that "self-interest" necessarily meant an anti-social egoism. Humane and socially-minded utilitarians held that the satisfactions which the individual sought to maximalize included, or might with proper education well include, "benevolence," i.e., the urge to help one's fellow-men. The point was that this was not a moral duty, or an aspect of social existence, but something which made the individual happy. "Interest,"

argued d'Holbach in his Systeme de la Nature (I, p. 268) "is nothing but what each of us considers necessary for his happiness."

34. Dyce had envisioned "a strictly ordered Christian society in which every person should be trained only for that class of society in which he was predestined by God to serve." Macdonald has characterized Dyce's course as a "narrow vocational training for a particular branch of ornament...." Macdonald, op. cit., p. 77.
35. Ibid., p. 177.
36. Ibid., p. 137. Cole had promoted the Penny Post in 1838, and in 1846 the uniform railway gauge. In 1849, the same year he prompted the Select Committee on the Arts and Principles of Design, which transformed the program originated at Somerset House he started to publish the Journal of Design and Manufactures. After administering the Great Exhibition of 1851 and seeing to its surplus of 213,305 pounds, he won the support of many in government. See: Sir Henry Cole, Fifty Years of Public Work (London, G. Bell, 1884).
37. Ibid., p. 176.
38. Ibid., p. 152. One should not draw any hasty conclusions about Potter's sympathy for the exhausted worker from this isolated comment which was excerpted from his address to the 1864 Select Committee on Schools of Art. Consider Potter's supporting role in the first volume of Marx's Capital, specifically in Chapter XXIII, entitled, "Simple Reproduction." There Marx discusses the logic by which capital guarantees that all means of production are "reproduced," on the one hand, by extracting surplus value from workers, while, on the other, paying them subsistence wages for their maintenance; that is, for their own "reproduction." In a letter he wrote to The Times, published on March 24, 1863, Potter's is, in fact, the self-concerned voice of the capitalist. He argues that while the cotton market is depressed (from the shortage of raw material coming from the war-torn American Confederacy), the unemployed laborer who had acquired skills that only an accumulation of experience could supply should not be encouraged or even "allowed" to emigrate to America since that would squander the capitalists' most valuable resource: skilled labor. Rather, they should be housed in the "poor houses" of England until matters improve. Marx quotes Potter,

limiting his own editorial comments to characteristically caustic parenthetical clarifications or mere exclamations:

The question I would put then is this: Is the trade worth retaining? Is it worth while to keep the machinery (he means the living labour machines) in order, and is it not the greatest folly to think of parting with that? I think it is. I allow that the workers are not a property, not the property of Lancashire and the masters; but they are the strength of both; they are the mental and trained power which cannot be replaced for a generation; the mere machinery which they work might much of it be beneficially replaced, nay improved, in a twelvemonth. Encourage or allow (!) the working power to emigrate, and what of the capitalist?...Take away the cream of the workers, and fixed capital will depreciate in a great degree, and the floating will not subject itself to a struggle with the short supply of inferior labour....We are told the workers wish it (emigration). Very natural it is that they should do so....Reduce, compress the cotton trade by taking away its working power and reducing their wages expenditure say one-fifth, or five millions, and what then would happen to the class above, the small shopkeepers; and what of the rents, the cottage rents....Trace out the effects upwards to the small farmer, the better householder, and suggestion more suicidal to all classes of the country than by enfeebling a nation by exporting the best of its manufacturing population and destroying the value of some of its most productive capital and enrichment...

See: Karl Marx, Capital, Volume I (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977), pp. 539-40.

39. Burchett, op. cit., p. 10.
40. This term, as noted by Hobsbawm, "seems to have been used from the middle of the nineteenth century -- at

least to describe certain distinctive upper strata of the working class." Marx and Engels used the term to refer to that component part of the split Chartist movement which, unlike the revolutionary proletariat, sought liberal reform. Thus the term also is used to denote the conservative ideology upheld by the subjects of embourgeoisement. See Eric Hobsbawm, "The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth-Century Britain", in his Labouring Men (London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964), p. 272. Also: Tom Bottomore, A Dictionary of Marxist Thought (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 265.

41. The Museum of Ornamental Manufactures was first located at Marlborough House in 1852, moved to South Kensington, to the Iron Building, in 1856. From there it gradually moved into the building currently housing the Victoria and Albert Museum in the early 1860's. Apparently, from the perspective of students, it fell far short of its promised pedagogical goals. Macdonald documents the fact that the Select Committee on the Schools of Art (1864) was convened in part to deal with the protests of students in the design programs who signed a "memorial" complaining that the library and art collections were "far from affording us that assistance in our studies which is declared to be their primary object." The context in which this protest takes place can be clarified if one keeps in mind that Cole had factored the cost of the museum collection into evaluating the cost of government expenditures for each student in the program. In 1864, Walter Smith, then headmaster at the Leeds school, wrote in the Art Journal, complaining: "Georgious courts arise at South Kensington, Venetian glass and majolica plates are purchased at fancy prices, whilst Provincial Schools of Art in important centres of manufacture are crippled and curtailed....to be made mere elementray drawing classes in order that South Kensington may have a public curiosity shop...." Thus, in 1863 the Department of Science and Art paid 154 pounds to each local school while it paid out 56,542 pounds to South Kensington; including residences in the style of Italian palazzos for Cole and Fowke, chief engineer of the project. See: Macdonald, op. cit., p. 207ff.
42. On the notion that "taste" and "style" are potentially symptomatic of group identification and class -- or pf subcultural solidarity, see: Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe, Paul Willis, eds., Culture, Media, Language (London, Hutchinson, 1980); S. Hall, J. Clark, T. Jefferson, B. Roberts, eds., Resistance Through Rituals (London, Hutchinson, 1976); Dick Hebdige,

Subculture: the Meaning of Style (London, Methuen, 1979).

43. Dickens appears to have been sensitive to the notion that underlying the mid nineteenth-century British attempt to educate the public in matters of taste in consumer goods were complex social issues. In Hard Times, in the chapter entitled "Murdering the Innocents," Mr. Gradgrind runs his model school according to the dominant utilitarian principles of the day. There he attempts to impose upon his students -- including the recalcitrant Sissy Jupe -- the notion that "facts" should determine all decisions in life, including how to wallpaper or carpet a room. In this way a standard of "good taste" which was worked out by the administrators of the Museum of Ornamental Manufactures was imposed children to train them in proper patterns of consumption. Mr. Gradgrind's visiting instructor, Mr. McChoakumchild, describes the new aesthetic in terms that enable Dickens to parody utilitarianism as well.

You must discard the word Fancy altogether. You have nothing to do with it. You are not to have, in any object of use or ornament, what would be a contradiction in fact. You don't walk upon flowers in fact; you cannot be allowed to walk upon flowers in carpets. You don't find that foreign birds and butterflies come and perch upon your crockery; you cannot be permitted to paint foreign birds and butterflies upon your crockery. You never meet with quadrupeds going up and down walls; you must not have quadrupeds represented upon walls. You must see...for all these purposes, combinations and modifications (in primary colours) of mathematical figures which are susceptible of proof and demonstration. This is the new discovery. This is fact. This is taste.

Meanwhile, Dickens used his weekly journal, Household Words (December 4, 1852), to satirize the new aesthetic pronouncements of Owen Jones, as the latter had organized his various acquisitions for the museum at Marlborough House. "A House full of Horrors" describes the response of Mr. Crumpet upon seeing his own possessions on display in the "Chamber of Horrors" -- an ante-room at the top of the stairs in the museum which featured exemplary transgressions against the

- emerging aesthetic. See Charles Dickens, Hard Times (New York, New American Library, 1980), pp. 16-17. See Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 179-180.
44. Dyce quoted from an article in the Edinburgh Review (1819), cited in ibid., p. 77.
 45. Ibid., p. 151. The Reverend Richard St. John Tyrwhitt's Handbook of Pictorial Art was often given as a prize to design students for winning prizes in national drawing competitions.
 46. This is a reference to Karl Marx's Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts which date from 1844. Also relevant to this discussion is John Ruskin's The Stones of Venice, specifically the chapter entitled, "The Nature of Gothic," where he describes the debilitating fragmentation of the worker as a product of a division of labor whose aim is higher profits, and whose method is the increasing "perfection" of the processes of production. See: Ruskin, Works, vol. X, p. 191ff.; on Marx's theorization of alienation, see: Istvan Meszaros, Marx's Theory of Alienation (London, Merlin Press, 1970). For a broader discussion of the emergence of the themes and language one associates with industrialization in nineteenth century discourse, see Raymond Williams, Culture and Society.
 47. Horace Mann, "Schmidt's Guide to Drawing," The Common School Journal, vol. V, no. 16, pp. 241-43. Logan, op. cit., p. 20ff.; Ashwin, op. cit., p. 79ff.
 48. See: Walter Smith, Art Education, Scholastic and Industrial (Boston, Hames R. Osgood & Co., 1872), pp. 33-34.
 49. Ibid., p. 38.
 50. Walter Smith, Report on the Works of Pupils of the French Schools of Design (London, Simkin & Co., 1864), pp. 1, 44.
 51. In his description of the conditions in the State of Massachusetts which gave rise to the passage of Charter 248, Smith referred to the fact that the "progress of manufactures, and the accumulation of wealth by the people required increased skill in the workmen, and the varied opportunities of art education generally." The formation of the Massachusetts Normal School of Art was the product of this debate in that it reflected the determination to train teachers to instruct young students in drawing skills. Smith, op. cit., p. v. On

Smith's invitation to, and presence in Boston, see Diana Korzenik, Drawn To Art: A Nineteenth Century American Dream (Hanover and London, University Press of New England, 1987), esp. pp. 198-204.

52. Ibid., pp. 6-7.
53. Ibid., p. 6.
54. Ibid., p. 17.
55. Ibid., p. 18.
56. Ibid., p. 33.
57. Ibid., p. 42.
58. Ibid., p. 8.
59. Ibid., p. 9.
60. Ibid., p. 47. Hoyt Sherman has written: "Remove the dissected character of art teaching and the normal person can achieve creative work as a natural expression of his everyday self....Outstanding artists have drawn with perceptual unity, but without full awareness of what they were doing. They were interested in the end-product more than they were in the behavioristic processes by which good painting was achieved. Our age, however, always interested in the pragmatic question of how things are done, has forced attention to the process, and thereby has opened up the secret for teaching and understanding. Now the average person has available to him a way of learning which Rembrandt and Cézanne could achieve in their times only because they were talented." (emphasis added) Sherman, Perceptualism, p. 76.
61. Walter Smith, The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions and Original Designs for Public Schools, Drawing Classes, and Schools of Art in America (Boston, J.R. Osgood & Co., 1872), p. 1.
62. Macdonald, op. cit., p. 258.
63. Smith, op. cit., p. 53-4.
64. Macdonald, op. cit., p. 256-258; Smith, Report.
65. Ibid., p. 263ff. Through Robert Catterson-Smith's experience as a student and teacher (1853-19), one can follow the trajectory of a logic that extends from his

own exposure to the practice of memory drawing during the later years at South Kensington to his conception of a novel pedagogical system that anticipated Hoyt Sherman's approach in certain respects and which he referred to as, Drawing from Memory and Mind Picturing (the title of his book on the subject). Catterson-Smith, whose father, Stephen, was a successful Irish portrait painter, and whose mother, Anne Wyke, was a drawing instructor and watercolorist, worked with Edward Burne-Jones and William Morris on the elaborate designs of the Kelmscott Press's editions of Chaucer. Perhaps the practical training he received in the teachers' program at South Kensington prepared him to transcribe and regularize Morris's designs into the firm outlines which were required for the printing process; his credentials certainly helped him to become Director of Art Education in Birmingham. Devised early in the twentieth century, his method of drawing instruction for use in general education differed from even the more romantic French approach. Marion Richardson was one of Catterson-Smith's more successful students; she is credited with being among the first teachers to recognize and to emphasize the aesthetic value of intuitive and imaginative children's drawings in Great Britain. Describing her experience as a Catterson-Smith student, Richardson seems to outline the very threshold of Hoyt Sherman's flash technique:

It was not until I reached a stage senior enough to entitle me to a place in the class taken by the headmaster, Mr. Catterson Smith (sic), that I began to see my way. He won me over as a disciple by teaching us to rely on our visual powers rather than our skill of hand, and never to begin a drawing until we had a clear image of the subject. These subjects many of which I seem to think had a puzzle quality about them -- were generally presented to us as lantern slides, of which he had a most fascinating collection. The slide was shown for a few moments and then withdrawn; we closed our eyes and keeping them closed, quickly outlined the picture. This "shut-eye" drawing was perhaps Mr. Catterson Smith's (sic) greatest contribution to art education. It was a wonderful means of clarifying and impressing the image and of keeping it before us while we set to work with open eyes. Nor was that all, we were

encouraged to use these devices as material for ideas of our own, to look to mental imagery as the source of ideas and let it lead us where it would.

Richardson went on to teach at the Dudley Girl's High School where there was no lantern slide equipment. Finding the British copy-book system not at all to her liking, she evolved a system in which she told her students to close their eyes and she described "word pictures" to them. After hearing these simple descriptions of evocative scenes, they were then asked to draw them imaginatively. In 1920 she took examples of their drawings to the Omega Workshop, having heard that Roger Fry had mounted a children's art show. Her experience there affirmed her own principles of art instruction for children. Fry had been very encouraging. In 1924 she became "Lecturer in Art" at the London Day Training College, and in 1930 she was appointed District Art Inspector of the London County Council. From this post she terminated the nearly century old copy-book practice, and saw to it that imaginative childrens' art became the rule rather than the exception in British and Canadian schools. For Catterson-Smith's analysis of memory drawing and its consequent development into his own work, see: Robert Catterson-Smith, Drawing from Memory and Mind Picturing (London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1921); also Marion Richardson, Art and the Child, intro. Sir Kenneth Clark, (Peoria, Charles A. Bennett Co. Inc., 1946) pp. 12-13.

Among other influential artists and art instructors who were practitioners of memory drawing were William Morris Hunt and Robert Henri. See: William Morris Hunt, Talks on Art, ed. Helen Mary Knowlton (Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1896); and Margery Ryerson, ed. The Art Spirit by Robert Henri: Notes, Articles, Fragments of Letters and Talks to Students, Bearing on the Concept and Technique of Picture Making, the Study of Art Generally, and on Appreciation (New York, J.B. Lippencott Company, 1939).

66. Rodin quoted in Albert Elsen, Rodin (New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1963), p. 163.
67. Mandel, op. cit., esp. chap. 4, "'Long Waves' in the History of Capitalism."
68. Quoting from that portion of Schiller's sixth letter which was cited above in footnote # 1, he continues:

The dead letter takes the place of living understanding, and a good memory is a safer guide than imagination and feeling.

With this last line, one encounters the notion of memory so divorced from imagination and feeling, and so keenly allied with the "dead letter" of the new law of progress that it warrants the term "instrumental memory." The place of memory within Schiller's broader discussion of the fragmentation of human faculties and experiences because of the exigencies of progress begs the question -- which Walter Benjamin would address a century and a half later while reflecting on Baudelaire's poetry -- of whether memory itself had been sheared away from an earlier state of cohesion within individual and collective forms of experience. This issue is examined in depth in the next chapter. See: Schiller, op. cit.; Walter Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire," in Walter Benjamin, Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York, Schocken Books, 1977), pp. 155-200

69. Smith, op. cit., p. 59.
70. Ibid., p. 27.
71. Ibid., p. 26.
72. Ibid., pp. 22, 32.
73. Ibid., p. 32.
74. See: R. G. Collingwood, Ruskin's Philosophy (Chichester, Quenton Nelson, 1971); Robert Hewison, John Ruskin: The Argument of the Eye (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1976), esp. p. 204ff.
75. Quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 320. Smith calls Ruskin, "the greatest art master this century has produced." (p. 318)
76. Burchett, op. cit., p. 4.
77. John Ruskin, Elements, p. 25.
78. See E.T. Cook's introductory comments to this effect in Works, vol. XVI, pp. xix-xxii. Ruskin describes the differences between his teaching at the Working Men's College and in book form in his preface as follows:

The system followed in this work will,

therefore, at first, surprise somewhat sorrowfully those who are familiar with the practice of our class at the Working Men's College; for there, the pupil, having the master at his side to extricate him from such embarrassments as his efforts may lead into, is at once set to draw from a solid object, and soon finds entertainment in his efforts and interest in his difficulties....if he makes the ball look as oval as an egg, the degree of error is simply pointed out to him, and he does better next time, and better still the next....But the solitary student can only find out his own mistakes by help of the traced limit, and can only test the firmness of his hand by an exercise in which nothing but firmness is required; and during which all other considerations (as of softness, complexity, etc.) are entirely excluded.

Both the system adopted at the Working Men's College, and that recommended here, agree, however, in one principle, which I consider the most important and special of all that are involved in my teaching: namely, the attaching its full importance, from the first, to local colour. I believe that the endeavour to separate, in the course of instruction, the observation of light and shade from that of local colour, has always been, and must always be, destructive of the student's power of accurate sight, and that it corrupts his taste as much as it retards his progress.

The importance of this last aspect becomes evident when one considers what such an emphasis upon local color means within the context of drawing: it testifies to a highly developed appreciation for the value of unity within a direct perceptual experience. It therefore extends beyond the linear consonance and compositional placement of a normative aesthetic to an attentiveness to harmonic disposition of lights and darks within subjective observation. See: Ruskin, Elements, pp. 14-15.

79. See: J.F.C. Harrison, A History of the Working Men's

College 1854-1954 (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954) p. xvi.

80. Boime, "Ford Madox Brown," p. 120.
81. Ruskin, Addenda to A Joy For Ever, in Works, vol. XVI, p. 121.
82. Quoted by E.T. Cook in his introduction to Vol. XV of Works, p. xx.
83. Harrison, op. cit., p. xvii.
84. Raymond Williams, op. cit., p. 142ff.
85. Ruskin, Elements, p. 12.
86. Ruskin, The Two Paths, in Works, vol. XVI, p. 338.
87. Ibid., p. 342.
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid., p. 294.
90. See footnote 46 above.
91. In his lecture (October 29, 1858) to an audience at the Cambridge School of Art on the occasion of its inauguration, Ruskin said:

All specific Art-teaching must be given in schools established by each trade for itself: and when our operatives are a little more enlightened on these matters, there will be found, as I have already stated in my lectures on the Political Economy of Art, absolute necessity for the establishment of guilds of trades in an active and practical form, for the purposes of ascertaining the principles of Art proper to their business, and instructing their apprentices in them, as well as making experiments on materials and on newly invented methods of procedure.

See Ruskin, Works, vol. XVI, p. 179.

92. The full passage by Ruskin reads:

A wood-carver needs for his business to learn drawing in quite a different way from a china-painter, and a jeweller from a worker in iron. They must be led to study quite different characters in the natural forms they introduce in their various manufacture.

Ibid., p. 178. See: Hewison, op. cit., p. 134.

93. Ruskin, Works, vol. XVI, p. 287ff.
94. Ibid., p. 287.
95. Hewison, op. cit., p. 131.
96. Ruskin, Elements, p. 82.
97. Ruskin, Works, vol. XVI p. 201.
98. Ruskin quoted in Boime, op. cit., p. 120
99. Ibid.
100. Boime, op. cit.
101. Ruskin, Works, vol. XXXVI, p. 406.
102. Ruskin, Works, vol. XV, p. xxix.
103. Ibid., vol. XXVI, p. 418; Hewison, op. cit., p. 177ff.
104. "The sky is the largest and the most beautiful; watch it at twilight, after the sun is down, and try to consider each pane of glass in the window you look through as a piece of paper coloured blue, or grey, or purple, as it happens to be, and observe how quietly and continuously the gradation extends over the space in the window...." Elements, p. 34.
105. Hewison has argued that Ruskin's methods of instruction, as evidenced in his Elements, and in the program he drew up in 1871 for the Ruskin School of Drawing at Oxford, was as rigorous and potentially gruelling in practice as was the government-sponsored schools of design's. He notes, significantly, that it was not based upon copying the minutae of engravings and casts. Ruskin's drawing class at Oxford was intended to provide any student with that visual acuity and manual dexterity which Ruskin understood to be a crucial goal of general education. As such it was a

model course in which he developed more fully the implications of his own earlier experiments at the Working Men's College and in his Elements. Ruskin's program shared space in the University Galleries building with an "elementary school for artisans." The latter had been consigned to the basement, where it was run according to the principles of the National Course of Instruction of which Ruskin disapproved. Yet the fact that its master, Alexander MacDonal, had been among those who had testified against Cole's administration in the Parliamentary inquiry (1863-4) into the national schools of art may have helped make it possible for Ruskin to name him first Ruskin Master of Drawing. See Hewison, op. cit., p. 172ff.

106. Elements, p. 40.
107. "You will see that all the boughs of the tree are dark against the sky. Consider them as so many dark rivers, to be laid down in a map with absolute accuracy: and, without the least thought about the roundness of the stems, map them all out in flat shade, scrawling them in with pencil, just as you did the limbs of your letters;" ibid., p. 40.
108. Ibid., p. 50.
109. Ruskin, Elements, pp. 17-18, 72. Ruskin frequently cites Leonardo da Vinci's Treatise on Painting in this text.
110. Ibid., p. 18.
111. Ibid., p. 79.
112. Ibid., p. 83.
113. "All deceptive projection is obtained by partial exaggeration of shadow: and whenever you see it, you may be sure the drawing is more or less bad: a thoroughly fine drawing or painting will always show a slight tendency towards flatness." Ibid., p. 66.
114. Ruskin, Elements, pp. 102-103.
115. Ibid., p. 91.
116. Metaphor, which Ruskin frequently uses to enliven the various stages of his course for the reader, emerges as an interesting trope for Ruskin's view that art may be understood to function best when paralleling the natural model; that in the Ruskinian order, truths

derived from nature are consistent with, and can also be learned from, the truths implicit in the internal logic of aesthetic experience. Hence his statement: "You need not be in the least afraid of pushing these analogies too far. They cannot be pushed too far; they are so precise and complete, that the farther you pursue them, the clearer, the more certain, the more useful you will find them." Ibid., p. 118.

117. Ibid., p. 117.
118. Ibid., p. 162.
119. Ibid., p. 163.
120. Ibid., p. 164.
121. Ibid.
122. Ibid., p. 165ff.
123. Ibid., p. 138.
124. Ibid., p. 129
125. Ruskin's full sentence is: "You must try therefore to help what memory you have, by sketching at the utmost possible speed the whole range of the clouds; marking, by any shorthand or symbolic work you can hit upon, the peculiar character of each, as transparent, or fleecy, or linear, or undulatory; giving afterwards such completion to the parts as your recollection will enable you to do." Ibid.; on the purposes of keeping a book of memoranda, see p. 103.
126. Describing his ideal for general education before the National Association for the Promotion of Social Sciences, Ruskin noted that drawing should be one factor within such education for the masses, arguing: "Supposing it determined that this local natural history should be taught, drawing ought to be used to fix the attention, and test, while it aided, the memory." Ruskin, "Education in Art," in Works, vol. XVI, p. 145.
127. Thus, Cook notes in introductory comments: "not only could he not draw anything that was moving, but likewise, nothing that had the power of moving as it fussed and worried him too much to feel that at any moment it might begin to move." Works, vol. XV, p. xxii.

128. On the theme of memory in Baudelaire's criticism, see Michael Fried, "Painting Memories: On the Containment of the Past in Baudelaire and Manet," Critical Inquiry, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 510-542. This issue, and Fried's essay, are discussed at length in my next chapter.
129. Ruskin, Works, vol. XVI, 144-146. On Ruskin's analogy between ordered play and beneficial work, see his essay, "Work," which he delivered on January 24, 1865 before the Working Men's Institute at Camberwell, in Works, vol. XVIII, p. 426ff.
130. For example: "I believe that the masses have a right to claim education from their government; but only so far as they acknowledge the duty of yielding obedience to their government." See: A Joy Forever in Works, vol. XVI, p. 26- 27.

Chapter Four

1. For a survey of the decree and the context in which it and the related teaching reforms took place, see: Albert Boime, "The Teaching Reforms of 1863 and the Origins of Modernism in France," Art Quarterly, n.s. I (1977), pp. 1- 39; hereafter cited as "Reforms."
 2. See the decree in Le Moniteur Universelle, November 15, 1863, esp. articles 9ff; also Boime, "Reforms," p. 24, n. 1.
 3. Ibid., p. 3.
 4. Ibid., pp. 3-4. On the universal expositions, see Mainardi, op. cit.
 5. Boime, "Reforms, pp. 3-5; p. 26, notes 26, 27; p. 29, note 34.
 6. Much experience is necessary, however, to derive any benefit therefrom. The photograph is superior to the tracing; it is the mirror of the object -- certain details, usually overlooked in designs from nature, there assume characteristic importance, and thus introduce the artist into close acquaintance with construction; the lights and shades are there reproduced in their true character, that is, with their exact degree of firmness or softness; a very nice distinction -- without which there can be no projection.
- Delacroix's testimonial was first published in the Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15, 1850; here quoted from: Elizabeth Cavé, Drawing Without a Master: The Cavé Method for Learning to Draw from Memeory (New York, Putnam, 1868), p. 11.
7. Ibid., p. 19.
 8. Ibid., pp. 34-35.
 9. Boime, "Reform," p. 4.
 10. For a response to the Great Exhibition, see Gottfried Semper, "Science, Industry, and Art," in Hans M.

Wingler, Bauhaus, second English edition (Boston, MIT Press, 1969), p. 18. M. le Comte de Laborde, De l'union des arts et de l'industrie. Exposition universelle de 1851. Travaux de la commission française sur l'industrie des nations (Paris, 1856).

11. "Je ne me suis occupé que des arts, et cependant je ne sépare de l'industrie ni les lettres ni les sciences; à mon sens, les arts, les lettres et les sciences ne font qu'un avec l'industrie, et l'édifice industriel menace ruine quand ces trois appuis de sa base perdent de leur solidité." Quoted in Boime, "Reform," p. 4-5.
12. Ibid., p. 6.
13. Ibid.
14. Wordsworth, here quoted by Catterson-Smith, op. cit., p. 4.
15. Lecoq notes:

In either case might we reasonably suppose that intelligence, not only understood in its artistic, but in its most extended sense, would derive the greatest assistance from methodically exercised observation and memory, from the power to seize more efficiently and retain more certainly the images of objects; that even thought would benefit, having access to infinite combinations of ideas, that is, to the most lucid, durable images obedient at will.

Unless otherwise noted, these will be my translations. I shall provide the original French in footnotes where it seems necessary.

Dans l'un et l'autre cas donc, n'est-il pas plausible que l'observation et la mémoire acquérant, par l'exercice méthodique, le pouvoir de saisir plus nettement et de conserver plus sûrement les images des objets, l'intelligence non point seulement artistique, mais comprise dans son acception la plus étendue, trouverait un secours puissant pour les opérations même de la pensée, ayant dès-lors à sa disposition, pour servir à ses combinaisons infinies, des

idées, c'est à dire des images plus
lucides, plus durables et plus
obéissantes à l'appel de la volonté?

Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Education de la Mémoire
pittorèsque (Paris, A la Librairie Sociétaire, 1848),
p.15; hereafter cited as Education. Unless otherwise
noted, all references to this text will be to this, its
first edition.

16. Lecoq would become a full professor on February 27,
1844. Unless otherwise noted, this, and all other
biographical data on the art teacher derives from Félix
Régamay, Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran et ses élèves
(Paris, Honore Champion, 1903), p. 9.
17. Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Education, p. 6.
18. Etex's course was published in Paris in 1851.
19. All later proponents of memory drawing that this author
has encountered cite Lecoq's text as the seminal one.
The latest edition of the course is 1920. Also see:
Robert Catterson-Smith, Drawing from Memory and Mind
Picturing (London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd.,
1921). Catterson-Smith notes, "...it is three-quarters
of a century since Lecoq wrote, and in that period,
especially the last twenty years of it, a great deal
has been revealed concernig the unconscious or
subconscious working of the mind."(p. vii) Similarly,
he quotes from Henri Bergson to the effect that nothing
experienced is ever really forgotten. Disassociating
himself from earlier applications of memory work
(presumably those "catechistic" English method which
predated the importation to Great Britain of Lecoq's),
he notes that "the method advocated in this book tends
to check the tendency to take imitation for art." (p.
15) Also see G.A. Reid, R.C.A., Art Education in the
United States, Great Britain, France, Belquim and
Holland: a Report to the Council of the Ontario College
of Art (Toronto, 1925), where he notes the importance
of memory drawing as a "new development in training in
England, more particularly in the school at
Birmingham..."; that is, in an area over which
Catterson-Smith had jurisdiction. Also see above,
Chapter Three, footnote 65.
20. The commission of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts which would
approve Lecoq's plan included, in addition to Auguste
Couder and Raoul Rochette, Horace Vernet. Years later,
Vernet would write Lecoq, saying, "I promise to pursue
the dissemination of your ideas, which open up new and

vast horizons to art instruction." (Je vous engage à poursuivre la propagation de vos idées, qui ouvre à l'enseignement de l'art de nouveaux et vastes horizons.) Regamey, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

21. Lecoq de Boisbauran, Education, p. 11.
22. Ibid., pp. 12, 13, 15.
23. Ibid., p. 13. Lecoq was certainly not the first artist or art instructor to notice the importance of memory to the creation of fine art, and to associate it with the resources of imagination. Thus, in 1744, Roger de Piles supplied one precedent when he noted:

Thus genius makes use of the memory, as a vessel wherein it keeps all the ideas that are present themselves to it. The Painter chooses those that are for his purpose, by the help of his judgement, and treasures them in a magazine, out of which he takes them as occasion requires.

In this context what seems most compelling is not the matter of Lecoq's originality, or the lack thereof, but the rise of a discourse on the instrumentality of memory, and the applicability of its various forms for art and/or industry. See Roger de Piles, The Art of Painting (London, 1744) p. 11.

24. Lecoq, Education, p. 13.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid., p. 15.
27. Lecoq notes:

And besides, the true object of study, the vital source from which one must always drink is nature; if one borrows from that master's style, it will yield the greatest originality.

Et, d'ailleurs, le véritable objet d'étude, la source toujours vive où il faut toujours puiser, c'est la nature; à ce maître-là si l'on emprunte son style, ce sera la plus grande des originalités.)

Ibid., p. 10.

28. Ibid., p. 14.

29. Ibid., p. 5. Also see above, note 20.

In the long run, however, institutional circumstances would underscore the fact that Lecoq could not entirely reconcile the conflict at the heart of his pedagogy. In 1863, the year the teaching reforms were announced, the Maréchal Vaillant, Minister of Fine Arts, authorized the opening of an "atelier annexe de l'école de dessin," where Lecoq could further pursue his experiments with any students who cared to enroll in his course. In 1865, Lecoq was appointed to the Légion d'Honneur and, in May 1866, he assumed the post of Adjunct Director at the Ecole imperiale de dessin in charge of studies, while Belloq remained chief administrator. At the awards ceremony of the Ecole, in August of that year, he delivered a lecture before an audience that included the Count Nieuwerkerke, Superintendant of Fine Arts and head of the Conseil in charge of the administration of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. In his lecture he declared his intention to integrate his pedagogical system into the main drawing programs at the school, and to offer a special course for advanced students from all fields of study. Later that year Belloq died, leaving Lecoq to direct the school. Lecoq then appointed Félix Régamey to be his second in charge. In the latter's biographical account of Lecoq's life, he testifies that, from the start, Lecoq was the object of discourteous attacks (anonymous letters) from other professors at the school who, for whatever reasons, had always opposed his pedagogical system. This went on for three years, until 1869, when Lecoq resigned from his post. Albert Boime has suggested that the Ecole de dessin was in a fairly constant state of flux during these years -- evident to him in the sheer number of times its full name was changed -- concerning the extent to which its activities should "serve as preparatory ground for the Ecole des Beaux-Arts or maintain rigorously its links to industry." Claiming that the Count Nieuwerkerke favored the latter, and that he viewed Lecoq as too involved with the former position, Boime posits that Lecoq was, in effect, fired. He bases his contention on evidence contained in "Procès-Verbaux de la commission instituée en 1868 sur la réorganisation de l'Ecole de dessin" (which I have not seen). If this is correct, it contradicts the substance of Lecoq's 1866 speech, in which he emphasized the value of memory work to all the arts, and for industrial purposes. This does not obviate the possibility that his speech was prepared

with internecine politics in mind. Nor, for that matter, would Boime's theory preclude the possibility that Lecoq's decision to modify the school's methods of drawing instruction to correspond with his own ideas alienated the other professors, thus creating an untenable climate at the Ecole, and contributing to Nieuwerkerke's possible decision to ask for his resignation. See Boime, "Reforms," p. 38, note 167; Régamey, op. cit., p. 11ff, where the contents of Lecoq's lecture are reprinted.

30. This text, a note added to Lecoq's "Lettres a un jeune professeur," derives from the 1879 edition and therefore was written between 1877 -- when the "Lettres" first appeared in print -- and 1879. This translation is from L.D. Luard's English edition of Lecoq's collected writings: The Training of the Memory in Art and the Education of the Artist by Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran (London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1911), pp. 96-97.
31. Ibid., p. 28
32. This course description derives mostly from the "Lettres à un jeune professeur" which carried the subtitle, "Sommaire d'une méthode pour l'enseignement du dessin et de la peinture;" I have also added some material from Lecoq's 1848 pamphlet where it seemed of special interest. Education, pp. 139-167. The former will hereafter appear as "Lettres."
33. Asked how a student recalls the absent model when it seems confused or vague, Lecoq quoted a student answering, to his approval:

The image seemed confused in its entirety, but if I apply my entire attention only to one detail, this part becomes sufficiently distinct so that I can draw it, thereby this first detail helps me to remember another, and little by little I arrive at the whole of the drawing.

L'image me paraît confuse dans son ensemble, mais si j'applique toute mon attention seulement à un détail, cette partie devient assez distincte pour que je la puisse dessiner, alors ce premier détail m'aide à me rappeler un autre, et de proche en proche j'arrive à l'ensemble du dessin.

Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Education, p. 8.

34. Ibid., p. 7.

35. Mais il est une étude tellement primordiale qu'elle doit se trouver à la base de tout enseignement du dessin, avant toute spécialisation, et comme la racine commune de toutes les tiges d'une même plante, quelque hauteur que chacune soit destinée à atteindre: je veux parler de l'anatomie. Cette connaissance de la structure de corps humain, resume lui-même de toutes les formes et aussi de toutes les couleurs de la nature, peut et doit être considérée comme une sorte de syntaxe des arts du dessin, et, comme telle, être apprise par coeur; et si nous voyons dans l'étude des langues la grammaire être donnée aux commençants comme moyen d'exercer la mémoire et en meme temps de la meubler de principes fondamentaux, nous devons nous appuyer en tout sur cette analogie précieuse. C'est au professeur à créer des conditions d'attrait qui fassent surmonter ce que cette étude peut avoir de pénible et de sévère.

Ibid., pp. 11-12.

36. Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Lettres, p. 139.

37. Ibid., p. 76.

38. For a more detailed discussion of how deeply this conflict affected Fantin-Latour's production, using his ill-fated project of an "Homage à Baudelaire" as an example, see my "Henri Fantin-Latour's 'Un Coin de Table,'" Arts Magazine, April, 1978, pp. 134-141. Auguste Rodin, another artist who studied for a time under Lecoq's tutelage, was quite a different case; his views on drawing are discussed at the end of this chapter. On the relationship between Manet's masterpiece and Lecoq's pedagogy, see: Judith Wechsler, "An Aperitif to Manet's Déjeuner sur l'herbe," Gazette des beaux-arts, sixth series, vol. XCI (1978), pp. 32-34.

39. E. Viollet-le-Duc, "Un Cours de dessin," L'Artiste, Vol. 5, November 7, 1858, pp. 154-156 (my translation).

40. During the winter of 1983-84 two articles appeared which deal with these issues in Baudelaire's art

criticism. The second to appear, Michael Fried's "Painting Memories: On the Containment of the Past in Baudelaire and Manet" (Critical Inquiry, Vol. 10, No. 3, March 1984, pp. 510-542), is by far the more problematic. Fried analyses Baudelaire's use of memory as a prominent theme in his art criticism from 1845-1860 -- especially in the Salon of 1846 -- for no other apparent reason than to rescue a thesis he developed in 1969 concerning Manet's need to work through the imagery of post-Renaissance European art in order to achieve the pure, monumental, internationalist ambitions of modernist painting (see his: "On Manet's Sources", Artforum, vol. VII, No. 7, March 1969, pp. 28-82). As Fried says in his more recent article:

In summary, I interpret Manet's multiple and often overlapping references to the art of the past as evidence of an attempt both to represent a certain vision of the authentic French tradition and to surpass that tradition in the direction of a universalizing or a totalizing of the enterprise of painting. (p. 516; his italics)

This tautologically directed reading -- not unusual in Fried's work -- results in some odd simplifications. For example, claiming that Baudelaire's mnemonic criteria constitute in their entirety a call for a recollection of the art of the past, one which, however, "must remain below the threshold of conscious awareness" (p. 521; his italics), it seems odd to him that Baudelaire's model artist in 1846 would be Delacroix, whose references to past art could at times be fairly transparent. To this he responds with a series of rhetorical questions:

...is it rather that the inapplicability to Delacroix's achievement of the double demand that I have drawn from the Salon of 1846 explains why Baudelaire left those demands mostly implicit, indeed why he could not have allowed himself to frame them in as many words, since the moment they were given definite form, their dissonance with Delacroix's art and, more generally, the enormous difficulty (verging on outright contradiction) of imagining how they might be satisfied would threaten to become manifest? And is this also why at

certain crucial junctures in the Salon, Baudelaire deploys quotations from the writings of others, as if in order to absolve himself, not precisely of responsibility for those quotations but, rather, of something like full consciousness of what they say and entail? Does the preservation of his own and Delacroix's naivete require nothing less? (p.522; his italics).

Fried's circumspect reading of Baudelaire's most complex, unstable and contradictory critical essay can be understood as an attempt to rescue a theory of modernism which, since the mid-1970s, has foundered because of its own narrowly phenomenological purview.

The other article -- Jean Clay's, "Ointments, Makeup, Pollen" (October, 27, Winter 1983, pp. 3-44) -- also touched on the relationship between Baudelaire's critical writing and Manet's art. Although I agree with Clay's reading of Manet's art, and with much of his discussion of Baudelaire's criticism, I detected one curious and, finally, rhetorical elision. Clay observed: "Baudelaire's plan aims at nothing less than the formation of a modern aesthetic: an art without recollections, nourished by the side issues, pulsations, and tensions of contemporary life." (p.34; my italics.) It is interesting that this statement follows Clay's citation of The Painter of Modern Life, an essay which contains the important -- though for Clay's purposes inconvenient -- section entitled, "Mnemonic Art." Perhaps Clay has chosen to use of the term "recollections" to apply only to the resources of voluntary memory. But under the circumstances it seemed odd that he ignored Baudelaire's advocacy of "true memory" -- which is indeed "nourished by the side issues, pulsations," etc. -- as an important resource for art production. The logic behind drawing from memory, as prescribed by Baudelaire, was based on the fact that it could oppose voluntary or "instrumental" memory, and all it stood for. Fried limits his discussion of this excerpt from Baudelaire's critical writings on memory to the last paragraph of his article, where he cited the "extreme modesty" of Guys' project in order to dismiss as irrelevant to "all ambitious new painting" Baudelaire's later thoughts regarding the relation of memory to art. Baudelaire's criticism goes beyond a concern with eclecticism in art (c.f., Fried's "containment of the past"), to address as well the larger problem of "containment" in the form of the artist's retreat by which he or she may

be protected from the spectacular effects of an emerging metropolitan consumer culture. Memory, understood in terms of its "voluntary" manifestations, could then persist as a resource for the conservative artist, while involuntary or "aesthetic memory," defined in opposition to the latter, would be valuable to high modernists (whether Manet, Proust, Joyce, Pollock, etc.). Meanwhile, "historical memory" -- in the sense of a "factographic" practice -- surfaced within the works of the historical avant-garde (whether Courbet, Seurat, or Heartfield).

41. Charles Baudelaire, "The Salon of 1846," in Art in Paris 1845-1862, trans. Jonathan Mayne (London, Phaidon, 1965), p.45.
42. Ibid., p. 46.
43. Ibid., pp. 60-61.
44. Ibid., p. 59.
45. Ibid., p. 48.
46. Ibid., p. 50.
47. Bartolomeo da San Concordio (1262-1347) quoted in Frances A. Yates, The Art of Memory (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 87. This quote concerns Artistotle's concept of memory. It is followed by Saint Thomas of Aquinas' supporting thoughts on Artistotle's suggestion.
48. Ibid., See Yates' first chapter, "The Three Latin Sources for the Classical Art of Memory," pp. 1-26.
49. This, at any rate, is the conclusion reached by William James, based on his study of this issue by nineteenth-century associationists such as James Stuart Mill, among others. He states: "The 'secret of a good memory' is thus the secret of forming diverse and multiple associations with every fact we care to retain." See: William James, The Principles of Psychology, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1983), esp. Chapter XVI, pp. 605-649. On the potential for synesthesia to function as a memory device, see: A.R. Luria, The Mind of a Mnemonist (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1987). For a recent "take" on memory see Israel Rosenfield, "Neural Darwinism: A New Approach to Memory and Perception," The New York Review of Books, vol. XXXIII, no. 15, October 9, 1986, pp. 21-27. The "new" in his title pertains to the attempt

to use the latest theories of neurobiologists -- predominantly those of Dr. Gerald M. Edelman -- to demonstrate a position which, however, is not far from William James'. Rosenfield, however, also takes issue with Freud's belief in the notion that memories are fixed permanently, and he closes his survey of Edelman's contribution on a puzzling note: "Edelman's theory of neuronal group selection challenges those who claim that science views individual human beings and other animals as reproducible machines and that science is little concerned with the unique attributes of individuals and the sources of that uniqueness. Humanism never had a better defense." What is puzzling is that Rosenfield evidently believes that science -- specifically scientific psychology -- functions in opposition to humanism, as the latter is understood in contemporary culture.

50. See: Walter Benjamin, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire", op. cit., pp.155-201, esp. pp. 157-59.
51. Stendahl, Scarlet and Black, trans. Margaret R.N. Shaw (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1977), p. 40.
52. Baudelaire, Salon of 1846, pp. 92-93.
53. Ibid., p. 92.
54. Ibid., p. 94.
55. Ibid.
56. Ibid.
57. Ibid., p. 95.
58. Ibid., p. 97.
59. Hippolyte Castille, Les Hommes et les moeurs en France sous le règne de Louis-Philippe (Paris, Paul Henneton et Cie., 1853), p. 212.
60. Baudelaire, Salon of 1846, pp. 113-116.
61. Ibid., p. 97.
62. Castille, op. cit., pp. 330-331. Speaking of the invention of the "roman feuilleton," the opposition to it of the Senator M. de Chapui-Montlaville and a "jeune parlementariste," M. de Riancey, Castille adds:

M. de Riancey ne se doutait pas de

l'hommage involontaire qu'il rendait à l'industrie intellectuelle. La littérature considérée comme une vile marchandise, eh! c'est ce que nous demandons depuis longtemps! Elle rentrerait alors dans le droit commun. La copie-culture pourrait s'exercer sans excise ni gabelle. Elle n'a pas même aujourd'hui l'avantage d'être un monopole comme le tabac, c'est à dire de trouver sa garantie dans l'administration de l'Etat, d'être tarifée et protégée par lui." (my italics)

In an essay on British architecture during the 1850s and 60s, Kenneth Frampton noted: "It is hardly an accident that the phenomena of wholesale kitsch appears exactly at this point of crisis, at this moment of the department store, in 1860, when bourgeois civilization, entering upon its first flood of affluence, finds itself equipped with a surplus of means over needs and is forced to create an instant culture of its own that outside sheer utility is destined to lie suspended between the asceticism of production (the Puritan ethos) and the comfort of consumption (the heritage of licence)." See: Kenneth Frampton, "Industrialization and the Crisis in Architecture," Oppositions, I, September 1973, p. 67.

63. Baudelaire, Salon of 1846, p. 116.
64. Ibid., p. 115.
65. Charles Baudelaire, "The Painter of Modern Life," in The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays, trans. Jonathan Mayne, (London, Phaidon, 1965), p. 16.
66. George Bataille, "Baudelaire" in Literature and Evil, trans. Alastair Hamilton (London, Calder and Boyars, 1973, reprint. New York, Urizen Books, n.d.), p. 42.
67. Enid Starkie's biography of Baudelaire recounts the events which led Baudelaire to follow the advice of Saint-Beuve and its ill effects. See: Enid Starkie, Baudelaire (New York, New Directions, 1958,) pp. 307-327.
68. Charles Baudelaire, Correspondence générale, ed. J. Crepet and C. Pichois, (6 volumes, Paris, 1947-1953), Vol. I, p. 157.

69. Charles Baudelaire, "Salon of 1859," in Art in Paris: 1845-1862, p. 147.
70. Ibid., pp. 152-153.
71. Ibid., pp. 154-155.
72. Ibid., pp. 153-154. Freud has written of photography:

In the photographic camera he has created an instrument which retains the fleeting visual impressions, just as a gramophone disc retains the equally fleeting auditory ones; both are at bottom materializations of the power he possesses of recollection, his memory.

Sigmund Freud, op. cit., pp. 41-2.

73. Baudelaire, "Salon of 1859," p. 156.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid., pp. 159-160.
76. Ibid.
77. Ibid., pp. 161-162.
78. Ibid., p. 168.
79. Ibid., p. 167.
80. Entry dated Sunday, 25 January, 1824, in The Journal of Eugène Delacroix, ed. Hubert Wellington, trans. Lucy Norton (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 22-23.
81. Ibid., p. 25. Entry dated Friday, 27 February, 1824.
82. Ibid., pp. 27-28. First citations from entry dated Sunday, 4 April, 1824; paragraph from entry dated Wednesday, 7 (April 1824).
83. Ibid., p. 43. See editor's note.
84. Ibid.
85. Delacroix anticipates some of Baudelaire's thoughts on imagination when he writes: "Advocates of that truism of the sensualists, nil est in intellectu quod non fuerit prius in sensu, may pretend that imagination is

nothing more than a form of memory, but they are bound to acknowledge that although all men have sensation and memory, very few possess the imagination which they claim to be composed of those two elements. With an artist, imagination does not merely consist in conjuring up a vision of various objects, it combines them for the purpose which he has in mind; it makes pictures, images that he arranges as he pleases." About "Interest, interesting" he states: "...imagination...is simply a kind of mirror where nature is reflected as she really is; thus giving us, through a powerful form of memory, the sight of things which the soul alone enjoys." Ibid., pp. 349-350.

86. On dating this essay see: C. Pichois, Baudelaire, études et témoignages (Neuchatel, 1967) pp. 86-92.
87. This concept of "managing" potential shock, derived from Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle, is at the heart of Walter Benjamin's argument concerning his analysis, "On Some Motifs in Baudelaire," op. cit. Sigmund Freud, Beyond the Pleasure Principle, ed. and trans. James Strachey (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1961).
88. Baudelaire, "The Painter of Modern Life," p. 38.
89. Ibid., p. 1.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid., p. 16.
92. Walter Benjamin, op. cit., p. .
93. Quoted in Bataille, op. cit., p. 25.
94. Baudelaire, "The Painter of Modern Life," p. 12.
95. Ibid.
96. Ibid., p. 15.
97. Ibid., p. 16.
98. Benjamin, op. cit., p. 156.
99. Ibid.
100. Ibid., p. 157.
101. Ibid., p. 159.

102. Ibid., p. 157.
103. Ibid., pp. 157-158.
104. Proust quoted by Benjamin, ibid., p. 158.
105. Ibid.
106. Ibid., p. 159.
107. Ibid., pp. 159-160.
108. Ibid., p. 157. This issue of the privatization of experience suggests a possible way of thinking about the Impressionists for whom, to greatly oversimplify, the construction of pictorial equivalents for the subjective perception of the world constituted a new and highly relativized "truth." In this sense one might consider that their project internalized, and found pictorial expressions for, the privatization of life in the later years of the nineteenth century. The Impressionist project, frequently and naively associated with a positivistic outlook and empirical goals, may be compared instructively to the artist who, in Baudelaire's sense, draws from memory. To the degree that the Impressionist rejects as untenable the notion of an objective and stable "truth" in favor of the more subjective and relativized truths that accord with the phenomenological attitude, such an artist would share with Baudelaire's painter of modern life the inclination to retreat, if only -- in the impressionists' case -- into the workings of a radically individualized perception. For a study of related issues, see Richard Shiff, Cézanne and the End of Impressionism (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1984).
109. Freud quoted by Benjamin, op. cit., p. 160.
110. Ibid., p. 161.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid., pp. 161-162.
113. Ibid. Italics added.
114. Ibid., p. 175.
115. See above, Chapter Two, footnote 19.

116. Quoted by Albert Elsen, op. cit., p. 163.

Chapter Five

1. Peter Bürger, op. cit., pp. 53-54. For a review of Bürger's text, which takes issue with his understanding of the neo-avant-garde, and with his intention to offer one explanatory theory of avant-gardism in general, see Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, "Theorizing the Avant-Garde," Art in America, vol. 72, no. 10, November 1984, pp. 19-21.
2. See: Francis V. O'Connor, ed., Art for the Millions (Boston, New York Graphic Society, 1973), p. 13ff.
3. See Holger Cahill's introduction to New Horizons in American Art, (New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1936); hereafter cited as New Horizons; and "American Resources in the Arts," in O'Conner, op.cit., p. 33ff; hereafter cited as "American Resources."
4. Cahill, "American Resources," p. 39, New Horizons, p. 17ff.
5. Cahill, "American Resources," p. 35.
6. Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 271.
7. Cahill, New Horizons, p. 20.
8. Barbara Rose, "The American Abstract Artists," American Abstract Artists: the Early Years, (exhibition catalogue, New York, 1980), pp. 12-13.
9. Cahill, "American Resources," p. 39.
10. Cahill, New Horizons, p. 18.
11. O'Conner, op. cit., pp. 17, 30, note 20.
12. Cahill, New Horizons, p. 30.
13. We look to the Middle Ages, when art was devoted to a subject matter which was of the deepest concern to everyone, when its symbols and allegories had profound meaning for the whole community.

For contemporary examples of community sharing in the art experience we must turn to societies such as those of the Pueblo Indians of our Southwest.

See: Cahill, "American Resources," pp. 36, 37.

14. Cahill, New Horizons, p. 18.
15. O'Conner, op. cit., p. 18.
16. Ibid., pp. 18, 182ff.
17. Cahill New Horizons, p. 18.
18. Ibid., p. 18; "American Resources," p. 35.
19. Cahill, New Horizons, p. 18.
20. See Clement Greenberg, "Art" (Review of water-color, drawing, and sculpture sections of the Whitney Annual), The Nation, February 23, 1946; reprint. in O'Brian, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 57-59.
21. James Sloan Allen, The Romance of Commerce and Culture (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983).
22. Allen, op. cit., p. 23.
23. Ibid., p. 79.
24. Dewey's criticism of the "Great Books" project and its backers is a telling manifestation of the philosopher's clarity, subtlety, and sophistication relative to Adler and Hutchins. In 1937, Dewey reviewed Hutchins's The Higher Learning, noting what he regarded as a thinly veiled "authoritarianism," a "contempt for science," and a blind faith in "fixed and eternal truths." He criticized Hutchins's disregard for the reality of the world in which he and others lived. That ignorance Dewey identified with the way that these neo-humanists felt obliged to return to the cultural traditions of the past in order to respond to contemporary social problems. In 1952, Dwight Macdonald would challenge such humanism while addressing the "religion of culture" in an article entitled, "The Book of the Millennium Club." Ibid., pp. 92, 103, 106-7.
25. Ibid., p. 23.
26. Ibid., pp. 26-27.
27. Neil Harris, Martina Rouddabush Norellin, Art, Design, and the Modern Corporation: The Collection of the Container Corporation of America (exh. cat. Washington, D.C., National Museum of American Art, 1985), pp. 32-3, 48, 58, 70.

28. Arthur J. Pulos, The American Design Ethic (Cambridge Mass. MIT Press, 1983), and The American Design Adventure (Cambridge, Mass. The MIT Press, 1988), esp. Chaps. 1 & 4.
29. For an introduction to the vast literature on this subject see: Richard Guy Wilson, Dianne H. Pilgrim, Dickran Tashjia, The Machine Age in American 1918-1941 (New York, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1986), esp. chapters 1-3. On the rise of modern American advertising during the 1920's see, Stuart Ewen, op. cit..
30. Pulos, The American Design Adventure, p. 165.
31. Ibid.
32. Untitled manuscript in Lepper materials, Carnegie-Mellon University Archives.
33. Bulletin of the Carnegie Institute of Technology, series 43, no. 11, May 1947, p. 62ff.
34. Untitled notes in Lepper materials, Carnegie-Mellon University Archives.
35. This entire course description comes from: Robert Lepper, "Processes in Professor Lepper's Courses in Pictorial Design, August 1948," copy of a manuscript in Lepper's possession, pp. 1-6.
36. Lepper's extraordinary statement warrants fuller quotation:

The postwar era will have as great a need for clarifiers of confusion in thought as the present has for engineers and production experts. Emotional and physical exhaustion, the necessity for digesting the meanings and responsibilities of victory, awareness of physical change, reconversions of industry and occupation will present enormous problems of readjustment. It is a normal function of the artist to act as a clarifier. However, he can hardly act effectively if he is content to consider himself primarily as a sensory animal. For his training to continue to emphasize sensory responses over other ideas is to waste the potential of his medium as well as his potential as an

individual.

Present restriction on the use of metals is extending broadly the familiar uses of wood, ceramics, glass and synthetics. A nine-fold increase in capacity for producing aluminum plus the appearance of magnesium in the metals field means a vast increase in material resources. These coupled with a great increase in power output obviously indicate permanent change in the character of the house, of domestic habit and activities as well as in the street and on the highway. The industrialization of the south and of the northwest through the development of their power resources will bring permanent change in regional character both there and in the older industrial regions with which they come into competition.

Untitled manuscript in Lepper materials, Carnegie-Mellon University Archives, date inferred from internal data, pp. 2-3, 5-7.

37. Ibid. p.5.
38. Pulos, The American Design Adventure, p. 165ff.
39. Op. cit., p. 54.
40. According to Richard Wilson, during the 1930s, Lepper also taught a foundation course stressing the "elements of visual perception." See Wilson, et al., The Machine Age, pp. 345-6.
41. Dean Keeble quoted in: Glen U. Cleeton, The Story of Carnegie Tech, II: The Doherty Administration: 1936-1950 (Pittsburgh, The Carnegie Press, 1965, pp. 136-7.
42. See note 24 above. On "organic" curriculum planning, see Cleeton, op. cit., pp. 135-138.
43. See: Lester D. Longman, "Why not Educate Artists in Colleges?" College Art Journal, vol. 4, no. 3, p. 134-5.

Longman, then head of the art department at the State University of Iowa, had been editor of Parnassus (predecessor, as the organ of the C.A.A., to the College Art Journal). Longman answered his own question

by noting first that the university was the only institution where artists could obtain that well balanced education of "the hand and the mind" which alone can equip them to rival the humanist artists of the past. Art schools, in his opinion, tended to emphasize technical instruction at the expense of broader humanities instruction. In his view it was not surprising that "the archeologist and the humanist view with dismay the exhibitions of contemporary art." Yet Longman was quick to criticize those who could not see that the intellect, and not just "pure emotion or intuition" actually played a role in the "impassioned 'self-expressions' of contemporary artists" like Picasso and Miro. Longman considered it a threat to the cultural life of the nation that in the United States an ill-defined "self-expression" was widely regarded as the essence of both pictorial modernism and of American progressive educational methods. Instructing the public in the true complexities of modern art was therefore crucial. Consequently, he criticized those who were still "capable of publicly debating whether even a single course in modern art should be allowed in college."

44. In The New Vision, Moholy asserts:

In this book the word "biological" stands generally for laws of life which guarantee an organic development.

In Vision in Motion, he reiterates:

Recognizing the arts as an integral part of our existence, this book takes as its basic premise the unity of the arts with life. Thus this book is an attempt to add to the politico-social a biological "bill of rights" asserting the interrelatedness of man's fundamental qualities, of his intellectual and emotional requirements, of his psychological well being and his physical health.

Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, The New Vision: Fundamentals of Design, Painting, Sculpture Architecture, trans. Daphne Hoffmann (New York, W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1938), p. 14; Vision in Motion (Chicago, Paul Theobald, 1947), p, 5.

45. The New Vision, p. 15.

46. Dewey is listed along with Pestalozzi, Fröbel, Colonel Francis W. Parker and the "recent Progressive Education Association." Ibid., p. 17.
47. At a conference organized by the Museum of Modern Art in 1946, the character of industrial design was discussed in these terms. According to Arthur Pulos, "relatively little was said about the designer's responsibility for the consumer's welfare or about the impact of products on the environment." While Alexander Kostellow acknowledged the contributions of Bauhaus theory as a clarification of functional design, he insisted that "it lacked compactness and basic integration, it possessed some contradictory elements; and in many instances, indulged in too lengthy and pragmatic experiments for experimentation's sake." See: Pulos, The American Design Adventure, p. 169ff, 177.
48. Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Vision in Motion, p. 12. On Moholy's admission that he had to change his ideas about design after coming to the United States, see Pulos, The American Design Adventure, p. 177.
49. Moholy-Nagy, Vision in Motion, p. 33.
50. Paepcke was the first, and most generous private supporter of Moholy's American ventures. See: James Sloan Allen.
51. J. Gordon Lippencott, "Industrial Design as Profession," College Art Journal, IV, 3, March 1945, p. 149.

The director of Pratt Institute, James Boudreau, evidently responded to the European attitude towards "forced obsolescence" by defending it, saying that it was not forced, but accelerated obsolescence; that a European philosophy of what was good should not be imposed on Americans, who should be able to discard products whenever they please. See Pulos, The American Design Adventure, p. 177.

52. "It was this sense of impending doom for Western culture that impelled a large audience to go to museums and buy contemporary art. Museum attendance did indeed increase at a surprisingly rapid rate..." See: Serge Guilbaut, How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 88-9. Although for a different purpose, Guilbaut has charted a documentary outline in which it is possible to discern the transformation of the institutional bases for art in

America before and just after World War II. I have gratefully followed his lead wherever possible in assembling the material for this part of this chapter.

53. In an article by Henry Hope entitled, "Temporary Exhibitions for College Art Departments," Charles Slatkin is quoted as saying that museums are becoming "community centers for both educational and spiritual refreshment." Hope supported the notion that temporary exhibitions at university art galleries are valuable because they "induce the public to come." A varied exhibition schedule, "with appeals to various groups has provided an excellent means of spreading the doctrine of art appreciation beyond the limits of enrollment in the department." See, College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3, March 1944, pp 3, 99-104. For article on Sherman see pp. 143-148.
54. Francis Henry Taylor, "Metropolitan Metamorphosis," Art News Annual, 1945-46, P.3.
55. Ibid., p. 5. Among the other articles which dealt with the matter of the museum as a lively educational institution, see Katrina van Hook, "Educational Activities in the National Gallery of Art;" Agnes Rindge, "Educational activities in the Museum of Modern Art;" Roberta Fansler, "On Education in an Art Museum;" Jane Costello, "Relation of Graduate School Training to Work in Museum Education;" Julia Phelps, "The Winthrop Collection and its Use in Teaching;" all in the College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3, May 1944. These derive from a symposium entitled, "The Future of the American Museum as an Educational Institution," at the Chicago Art Institute, March 24-25, 1944. Art News also noted that museum attendance had grown substantially: See "Museum Attendance Mounts During Year," Art News, vol. XLIV, no. 20, February 1946, p. 14. The trend towards increased museum attendance dates from somewhat earlier than this symposium. See footnote 52 above.
56. "U.S. Museums 1945 and the Future," Art News, vol. XLIV, no. 18, January 1946. p. 31.
57. Ibid. In 1944 the editors of Art News noted the adoption of colored walls to "relieve monotony" in the Metropolitan Museum where the collection had returned, in part newly cleaned, and was reinstalled after more than two years in its "war hide-out" near Philadelphia. See: "The Reopened Metropolitan Shows its Riches Anew," Art News, vol. XLIII, no. 8, June 1-30, 1944, p. 31.
58. Bern Porter, "New Projection," College Art Journal,

- vol. III, no. 1, November 1943, pp. 26-28.
59. Robert Goldwater, "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the U.S.," College Art Journal, vol. 2, no. 4, supplement, May 1943. For a sample of the postwar trend towards a more "scientific" approach to art history, see Samuel Cauman, "The Science of Art History," College Art Journal, vol. IV, no. 1, November 1944, pp. 23-32.
 60. Alfred H. Barr Jr., "The Study of American Art in Colleges: A Preface," College Art Journal, vol. 4, no. 4, May 1945, p. 179.
 61. Ibid., footnote 1, p. 181.
 62. Guilbaut, op. cit. pp. 55-59.
 63. Ibid., p. 65-6. Kootz sent his letter to The New York Times, in 1941. It expressed his belief that it had become very important for American artists to take advantage of the new cultural situation brought on by the fall of Paris. It prompted a response by E.A. Jewell, "The Problem of Seeing," The New York Times, August 10, 1941, sec. 9, p. 7.
 64. Guilbaut, p. 67.
 65. Aline Loucheim, "Who Buys What in the Picture Boom?" Art News, July 1, 1944, pp. 22-24.
 66. Ibid., p. 23.
 67. Ibid., esp. p. 24, where her headings include, "Investment or Speculation?" and "'Snob' or 'Prestige' Value?"
 68. Eugenia Lea Whitridge, "Trends in the Selling of Art," College Art Journal, vol. 14, no. 2, January 1944, pp. 59- 60.
 69. Guilbaut, op. cit., p. 94.
 70. Henry Schaefer-Simmern, The Unfolding of Artistic Activity (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1948), p. 4.
 71. "Department Stores Popularize Art," Life, January 3, 1944, pp. 44-47. For Pollock -- and Arnold Newman's photographs of him -- see "Jackson Pollock: Is he the Greatest Living Painter in the United States?" Life, August 8, 1949, pp. 42-45.

72. For Luce's -- and Life's -- enthusiastic reception of the Goethe Bicentennial Festival, organized by Hitchins, Adler and Paepcke in June 1949, and conceived by them as a celebration of the postwar renewal of humanist culture, see: Allen, op. cit., p. 147ff.
73. See, among others, Rosamond Frost, "Lee Ault Can Pick Them: Fast Rising Aesthetic and Monetary Values Confirm One Man's Taste," Art News, April 15-30, 1944, p. 16; "Today's Collectors: Pittsburgh Eclectic," Art News, March 1946, pp. 33-36; "Today's Collectors: Newport Radical," Art News, April 1946, pp. 39-40, 62; "Collectors Come out of Privacy," Art News, July 1946, pp. 15-19; "Today's Collectors: Lily Pons: a Diva in Art," Art News, August 1946, pp. 34-37.
74. Confining his investment theories to stocks and bonds, Mr. Neuberger alleges neither interest nor illusions about his paintings as gilt-edged securities. He thinks of them as an intellectual investment, and receives dividends in the form of recognition by others in the art world. He 'gets a kick' out of having his judgement reinforced by reproductions in newspapers and art magazines....
- "Broker Buys American," Art News, May 1946, p. 55.
75. Harper's Bazaar, April 1944, pp.68-70. For Sweeney's "Five American Painters" see, in the same issue, pp. 76-7, 122.
76. See: "Mondrian Makes the Mode," Art News, August 1945, p. 22.
77. Clement Greenberg, "Art," in O'Brian, op. cit., vol. II, pp. 57-8.
78. Clement Greenberg, "The Present Prospects of American Painting and Sculpture," Horizon, nos. 93-94, October 1947, pp. 28-29, reprinted in O'Brian, vol. II, pp. 162-3, 166.
79. John Rublowsky, Pop Art (New York, Basic Books, 1965), pp. 45-56.
80. See Peter Selz, "Symposium on Pop Art," Arts Magazine, April 1963, p. 37.

81. This data derives from the registrar's files at the Leo Castelli Gallery where the first entry to the gallery of a particular work is noted, as is its sale, return, resale, and present location.
82. Ibid.
83. Unidentified clipping in the miscellaneous file on Pop Art in the library of the Museum of Modern Art.
84. Geldzahler in Selz, op. cit., p. 37.
85. Leo Steinberg, "Other Criteria," in Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art (New York, Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 84.
86. Kramer in Selz, op. cit., pp. 38-39.
87. Donald Judd, op. cit. (1962), p. 52.
88. It seems to me imperative to grasp the relation of this development to the current popularity of abstract painting, and particularly abstract painting which has been so extreme...in denuding art of complex visual incident. This poverty of visual incident in abstract painting has given rise to practically every new development of the last couple of years; happenings, pop art, figure painting, monster-making, kinetic art -- all have in common, whatever their differences, the desire to restore to complex and recognizable experience its former hegemony over pure aestheticism.
- Kramer in Selz, op. cit., pp. 38-39.
89. Hilton Kramer, "Signs of Passion: The New Expressionism," The Revenge of the Philistines: Art and Culture 1972-1984 (New York, Macmillan, Inc., 1985, pp. 370-371).
90. Guy Debord, editor of the journal, Internationale Situationniste from 1958 to 1969, published La société du spectacle in 1967. See: Society of the Spectacle (Detroit, Michigan, Black & Red, 1970, Reprinted 1983).
91. Karl Marx, Capital (Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977), Vol. I, p. 77. Debord's involvement with Marx's theory of the commodity fetish is apparent when he notes, for example, "The spectacle in general, as the concrete inversion of life, is the autonomous movement of the non-living." That the spectacle refers to far more than the mass media, he notes:

If the spectacle, taken in the limited sense of "mass media" which are its most glaring superficial manifestations, seems to invade society as mere equipment, this equipment is in no way neutral but is the very means suited to its total self-movement. If the social needs of the epoch in which such techniques are developed can only be satisfied through their mediation, if the administration of this society and all contact among men can no longer take place except through the intermediary of this power of instantaneous communication, it is because this power of "communication" is essentially unilateral. The concentration of "communication" is thus an accumulation, in the hands of the existing system's administration, of the means which allow it to carry on this particular administration. The generalized cleavage of the spectacle is inseparable from the modern State, namely from the general form of cleavage within society, the product of the division of social labor and the organ of class domination.

Ibid., (n.p.) paragraph 2, 24. Like Debord's analysis of spectacular culture, Marcuse observed that in advanced industrial societies, "the technical apparatus of production and distribution...functions, not as the sum-total of mere instruments which can be isolated from their social and political effects, but rather as a system which determines a priori the product of the apparatus as well as the operations of servicing and extending it." In such a system the necessary degree of social control and cohesion are achieved through "new, more effective, and more pleasant forms". Marcuse also considered the difficulty of imagining forms of cultural resistance in social circumstances where a "comfortable, smooth, reasonable, democratic unfreedom" prevails. See: Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man (Boston, Beacon Press, 1964), pp. xv, 1.

92. "Late capitalism, far from representing a 'postindustrial society', thus appears as the period in which all branches of the economy are fully industrialized for the first time; to which one could further add the increasing mechanization of the sphere of circulation...and the increasing mechanization of

- the superstructure." Ernest Mandel Late Capitalism, p. 191.
93. Debord, op. cit., (n.p.) paragraph 34.
94. On the auction room as "one of the shrines of the political economy of the sign," where the increasing monetary value of the work of art is symptomatic of the production of pure "sign value," which itself reflects the artwork's diminished "symbolic value," see Jean Baudrillard, For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign, trans. Charles Levin (St. Louis, Mo., Telos Press, 1981), pp. 112-122.
95. Stephen Fox, The Mirror Makers: A History of American Advertising and its Creators (New York, William Morrow and Company, Inc. 1984), p. 181ff. Also: Vance Packard, The Hidden Persuaders (New York, 1957); W. B. Key, Subliminal Seduction (New York, Signet, 1973); Torben Vestergaard, Kim Schroder, The Language of Advertising (New York, Basil Blackwell Inc., 1985).
96. Debord, op. cit., (n.p.) paragraph 34.
97. Marcuse, op. cit., pp. 9, 13.
98. Debord, op. cit., (n.p.) paragraph 1.
99. Donald Judd, "Roy Lichtenstein," Arts Magazine, April, 1962, pp. 52-53.
100. "There are certain things that are usable, forceful, and vital about commercial art. We're using those things..." Swenson, "What is Pop Art?" in Coplans, op. cit., p. 53.
101. See Sidney Chafetz, "Four Early Lichtenstein Prints," The Artist's Proof: The Annual of Prints and Printmaking, X, 1970, pp. 48-51; also Ernst Bösche, Roy Lichtenstein: Das Frühwerk 1942-1960 (unpublished PhD. dissertation, Berlin, 1983), p. 51ff.
102. I want my images to be as critical, as threatening, and as insistent as possible....The closer my work is to the original, the more threatening and critical the content.
- John Coplans, "An Interview with Roy Lichtenstein," Artforum, vol. II, no. 4, October 1963, p. 31; reprint. in Coplans, op. cit., p. 52.

103. "Organized perception is what art is all about."
Swenson, "What is Pop Art?" in Coplans, Ibid., p. 53.
104. In a 1967 interview with John Coplans, Lichtensten described his appreciation for the economics of commercial art:

I like the idea of blue and white very much because a lot of commercial artists use it to get a free color. Blue does for black as well; it is an economic thing. So I liked the idea of an apparent economic reason for making one color work as two colors. Sometimes commercial artists use blue lines with yellow or two colors overlapped in a certain way to look like three colors. Using a configuration which has arisen because of economic expediency -- I like that!

"Talking with Roy Lichtenstein," Artforum, vol. V, no. 9, May 1967, pp. 34-39 (reprint. from exh. cat., Roy Lichtenstein, Pasadena Art Museum, 1967), reprint. in Coplans, op. cit., p. 87. For a discussion of the development of the Ben Day dot in Lichtenstein's art see Margaret Nesbit's essay, "Roy Lichtenstein: Birth of a Style, 1961-1963," in Richard Brown Baker Collects: A selection of Contemporary Art from the Richard Brown Baker Collection (New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery, 1975), p. 62ff. In her essay, Nesbit incorrectly assumes that Lichtenstein was not using his opaque projector to transpose his drawings of comic strip panels and ads until 1963 when he painted Image Duplicator. He has confirmed in conversations that his use of this device dates from his earliest Pop works in 1962. The use of industrially manufactured standardized dot screens to increase his precision in simulating the dot pattern dates from 1963.

105. According to Waldman, Golfball is comprised of "a series of black and white arcs that form an abstract pattern reminiscent of Mondrian's plus minus system." Diane Waldman, "Introduction," Roy Lichtenstein (New York, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1971), p. 11. See her page 16 for the comparison with Kenneth Noland's work.

Despite Harold Rosenberg's commitment to the tenets and intellectual milieu of Abstract Expressionism, he could be a perceptive critic of Pop. He introduced one discussion of Pop by stating: "The Pop mode...inaugurated a decade of pedagogy." He came to

this conclusion partly in response to the historicism and formal didacticism that marked interpretations of his art by Waldman, Suzi Gablik, Robert Rosenblum and Henry Geldzahler. Claiming that the function of art like Lichtenstein's is "to shift the (popular) image from the realm of the Sunday comics to the world of art," he noted that Pop "acculturates" the comic strips, billboards, etc. by passing them through "an art historical filter." The academic aspect of this project he identifies as "the pedagogy of the picture plane." This, and views like Waldman's that Lichtenstein is an artist who "understands art and achieves the 'ideal'" led Rosenberg to brand Lichtenstein a "modernist academician." Rosenberg also took issue with those who claimed Pop to be "everybody's" art. Noting that it "cannibalizes both majority and minority art for its own aesthetic purposes," he concluded that, "not everybody's world but the enlarged, self-conscious art world of the decade recently concluded has replaced the Abstract Expressionists' world of artists." Moreover, he asserts that "the rising curve of aestheticism in the sixties, with its concept of the world as a museum, represented a withdrawal by the art world from the intensifying politico-social crisis and intellectual confusion in the United States." In an article on "de-aestheticization," he added further complexity to this view by approaching the culture of the late '60s from a different angle which still has bearing on Pop: "In thus shrinking the difference between art and facts to the question of motive, de-aestheticized art goes hand in hand with aestheticized events, with the increasing injection into actual situations of the ambiguity, illusoriness, and emotional detachment of art." What he describes can be related to the social structures which Pierre Bourdieu connects to the aesthetic gaze: a detachment from "use" which he identifies with social and economic privilege. See: Harold Rosenberg, "Marilyn Mondrian, Roy Lichtenstein and Claes Oldenburg;" "De-aestheticization," in The De-definition of Art (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983), pp. 28-38, 108-120.

106. See my "Lichtenstein's Expressionist Takes," Art in America, vol. 71, no 1, January 1983, 84-89.
107. Interview with Coplans (1967), Ibid., p. 87.
108. The artist quoted in: Marcia Tucker, "James Rosenquist," in James Rosenquist (exh. cat., New York, Whitney Museum of American Art, 1972), p. 14-15.

109. Ibid., pp. 11, 20.
110. Ibid., p. 16.
111. Judith Goldman, James Rosenquist (New York, Viking, 1985), pp. 21-2.
112. "I used to drink it. I used to have the same lunch every day, for twenty years. I guess the same thing over and over again." Gene Swenson, "What is Pop Art?" p. 26. For a brief survey of the Campbell's Soup campaign, see Sidra Stich, Made in U.S.A.: an Americanization in Modern Art, The '50s & '60s (exh. cat., Berkeley, University of California Press, 1987), p. 90ff.
113. Calvin Tompkins, "Raggedy Andy," in John Coplans Andy Warhol (New York, New York Graphic Society, n.d.) p. 13.
114. My sense of Harvey as a latterday Jimson was supported by the contents of the Graham press release, as remembered by Irving Sandler.

I have the original Brillo Box (sic) here. The Brillo Box (sic) was designed by an Abstract Expressionist. His name is James Harvey. When Andy's show of the Brillo Boxes (was) at the Stable Gallery, the Graham Gallery, which was Harvey's dealer, came out with a press release saying that while Andy was selling these for 300 dollars...here this poor starving artist James Harvey, had to support himself by making commercial things like Brillo Boxes (sic).

The brillo box which Sandler still possesses is an "original" -- evidently the only one to which Harvey ever did affix his signature. There is also reason to believe that the artist had considered suing Warhol, perhaps at his dealer's urging. See Patrick S. Smith, Andy Warhol's Art and Films (Ann Arbor, Michigan, UMI Research Press, 1986) pp. 169-70, 461.

115. They have all steered away from the slick advertisement that imitates the modern fine arts.

Lucy R. Lippard, Pop Art (New York, Praeger, 1966), p. 90.

116. The photograph for the CBS Records advertisement was taken by Sol Mednick. See: Art News, Summer 1954, p. 44ff., 75.

Conclusion

1. John Dewey, Art as Experience, p. 326-327. Consider the possibility that what appeared to Dewey as art's potential to embody social cohesion has recently reemerged as social "grease." I insert this reference to Hans Haacke's project, On Social Grease (1975), to point out the way in which art's potential imaginatively to facilitate social cohesion has been recognized by heads of multinational corporations; reason enough for them to sponsor cultural activities and collect art. On the other hand, British sociologists and practitioners of cultural studies have demonstrated how, among economically, racially, and otherwise marginalized social groups, forms of "subcultural" expression have defined group identity in opposition to the dominant culture. Thus, Dewey's concept of art as an experience which was once rooted in an anthropological view of ritualized community traditions, can be seen to survive modernity, though not quite as Dewey imagined. On Haacke's project, see: Brian Wallis, Hans Haacke: Unfinished Business (exhibition catalogue, New York, The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1986), pp. 152ff. On subcultures, see: Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson, et. al. op. cit.
2. Ibid., p. 343
3. Ibid., pp. 343-344.
4. Ibid., p. 344.
5. Such a theory of aesthetic value is implicit in later writings by Roland Barthes; for example, his Empire of Signs (1970), trans. Richard Howard (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., 1982). It assumes an explicit form in works by Jean-Francois Lyotard, like his Driftworks (New York, Semiotext(e), 1984).
6. On the issue of "presence" versus contingency in contemporary art, see Michael Fried, "Art and Objecthood," in Gregory Battcock, ed., Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology (New York, P.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968), pp.116-147.
7. Dan Flavin, "...on an American artist's education..." Artforum, VI, 7, March 1968, p. 28.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 32.

10. Ibid.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. See: Craig Owens, "Back to the the Studio," Art in America, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 99-107. His discussion is predicated upon the influence of Flavin's text. The early presence at Cal Arts of a feminist art program is noted by Paul Brach in a responding letter to the editor of Art in America, printed in vol. 70, no. 4, April, 1982, p. 11.
15. This is the philosophy of the New York Academy of Art, founded in 1980 on the principle of an "academic training system...evolved over the centuries". This despite the fact that such a system "has virtually disappeared in this century", as its brochure, dated 1984-5, openly states. It may be noteworthy that Albert Boime is on the Advisory Council of the school, one of whose founders and directors is Stuart Pivar, friend of Andy Warhol who has supported this endeavour.
16. Concerning the matter of history and historical retrieval Debord noted two tendencies that seem pertinent:

The end of cultural history manifests itself on two opposite sides: the project of its supersession in total history, and the organization of its preservation as a dead object in spectacular contemplation. One of these movements has linked its fate to social critique, the other to the defense of class power." Ibid., (n.p.) paragraph 184.

As an example of journalistic delirium over the new technologies of art conservation, consider the following comments by John Russell:

And when we were shown the infrared camera that can edit out the paint layers in an early Netherlandish painting and isolate on a TV screen the black-and-white underdrawing that no one had seen in more than 500 years, we felt

a tremor almost of awe. Never could the artist have foreseen that anyone else would see that drawing. Yet, seeing it, we know something indispensable about him. What we learned, in fact, was that we see more, know more, command more and can correlate more than ever before.

John Russell, "Art Preservation: A Race Against Time," The New York Times, Sunday, May 5, 1985, Section 2, p. 1ff.

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

467-543, Figures

U·M·I

Bibliography

- Albers, Josef. "Creative Education" (1928). Hans Wingler, The Bauhaus, trans. Wolfgang Habs, Basil Gilbert. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1969, pp. 142-3.
- Alexander, Thomas M.. John Dewey's Theory of Art, Experience and Nature: the Horizons of Feeling. Albany, State University of New York Press, 1987.
- Allen, James Sloan. The Romance of Commerce and Culture. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Ames, Adelbert Jr., et al. "Vision and the Technique of Art," Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. LVIII (May 1922-May 1923), pp. 1-47.
- Ashwin, Clive. Drawing and Education in German-Speaking Europe 1800-1900. Ann Arbor, Michigan, UMI Research Press, 1981.
- Baker, Richard Brown. unpublished interview with Roy Lichtenstein, November 15, 1963, New York, Archives of American Art.
- Barnard, H.C.. A Short History of English Education from 1760-1944. London, University of London Press, 1949.
- "The Barnes Foundation: An Experiment in Education." Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol. 1, no. 1 (April, 1925), p. 3ff.
- Barr Jr., Alfred H. "The American Art Research Council and the Colleges." College Art Journal, vol. IV, no. 1 (November 1944), pp. 39-43.
- "The Study of American Art in Colleges: A Preface." College Art Journal, vol. 4, no. 4 (May 1945), pp. 179-181.
- Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." Image-Music-Text: Roland Barthes, ed., trans., Stephen Heath. New York, Hill and Wang, 1977.
- "That Old Thing, Art..." The Responsibility of Forms, trans. Richard Howard. New York, Hill and Wang, 1985.
- Empire of Signs, trans. Richard Howard. New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, Inc., 1982.

- Bataille, George. "Baudelaire." Literature and Evil, trans. Alastair Hamilton. London, Calder and Boyars, 1973; reprint. New York, Urizen Books, n.d., pp. 19-44.
- Gregory Battcock, ed. Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology. New York, P.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968
- Baudelaire, Charles. Corr spondence g n rale, ed. J. Crepet and C. Pichois. (6 volumes) Paris, 1947-1953.
- Art in Paris 1845-1862, trans. Jonathan Mayne. London, Phaidon, 1965, pp. 1-32.
- The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays, trans. Jonathan Mayne. London, Phaidon, 1965.
- Bayer, Herbert, et al. ed. Bauhaus: 1919-1928. Exh. cat., New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1938.
- Bell, Quentin. The Schools of Design. London, 1963.
- Benjamin, Walter. Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn. New York, Schocken Books, 1977.
- Benton, Thomas Hart. "Mechanics of Form Organization in Painting." Part I, The Arts, november 1926, p. 285-287; Part II, December 1926, pp. 340-342; Part III, January 1927, pp. 43-44.
- Boime, Albert. The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century. Second edition, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1986.
- "Ford Madox Brown, Thomas Carlyle, and Karl Marx: Meaning and Mystification of Work in the Nineteenth Century." Arts Magazine, vol. 56. no. 1 (September 1981), pp. 116-125.
- Albert Boime, "Franz Kline and the Figurative Tradition." Franz Kline: The Early Work as Signals. Exh. cat., Binghamton, State University of New York, 1977, pp. 1-22.
- "The Teaching Reforms and the Origins of Modernism in France." Art Quarterly, n.s., I (1977), pp. 1-39.
- Bottomore, Tom. A Dictionary of Marxist Thought. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1983.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste, trans., Richard Nice. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1984.

- "Broker Buys American." Art News, May 1946, pp. 54-55.
- Brown, Frank P. South Kensington and its Art Training. London, H.H. Smith & Son, 1912.
- Buchloh, Benjamin H.D.. "Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art." Artforum, vol. XXI, no. 1 (September 1982), pp. 43-56.
- "Theorizing the Avant-Garde." Art in America, vol. 72, no. 10 (November 1984), pp. 19-21.
- Bulletin of the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Series 43, no. 11, May 1947.
- Burchett, Richard. "The Central Training School for Art." Introductory Address on the Science and Art Department and the South Kensington Museum, no. 4., London (1858).
- Bürger, Peter. Theory of the Avant-Garde, trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Burty, Philippe. Maitres et petits maitres. Paris, Charpentier, 1877.
- Büsche, Ernst. "Roy Lichtenstein: Das Frühwerk 1942-1960." PhD. diss., Free University of Berlin, 1983.
- Cahill, Holger. New Horizons in American Art. Exh. cat., New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1936.
- Cantril, Hadley. Understanding Man's Social Behavior, Preliminary Notes. Princeton, N.J., Office of Public Opinion Research, 1947.
- Castille, Hippolyte. Les Hommes et les moeurs en France sous le règne de Louis-Philippe. Paris, Paul Henneton et Cie., 1853.
- Cauman, Samuel "The Science of Art History." College Art Journal, vol. IV, no. 1 (November 1944), pp. 23-32.
- Cavé, Elizabeth. La Couleur. Paris, 1863.
- Drawing Without a Master: The Cavé Method for Learning to Draw from Memory. New York, Putnam, 1868.
- Catterson-Smith, Robert. Drawing from Memory and Mind Picturing. London, Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1921.
- Chafetz, Sidney. "Four Early Lichtenstein Prints." The

- Artist's Proof: The Annual of Prints and Printmaking, X (1970), pp. 48-51
- Clay, Jean. "Ointments, Makeup, Pollen." October 27 (Winter 1983), pp. 3-44.
- Cleeton, Glen U. The Story of Carnegie Tech, II: The Doherty Administration: 1936-1950. Pittsburgh, The Carnegie Press, 1965.
- Cole, Sir Henry. Fifty Years of Public Work. London, G. Bell, 1884.
- "The Function of the Science and Art Department." Introductory Addresses on the Science and Art Department and the South Kensington Museum. London, Chapman & Hall, 1857.
- Collingwood, R. G.. Ruskin's Philosophy. Chichester, Quenton Nelson, 1971.
- Compton, Michael, ed. Towards a New Art: Essays on the Background to Abstract Art. London, Tate Gallery, 1980.
- Coplans, John. Andy Warhol. Greenwich, Conn., New York Graphic Society, n.d.
- Coplans, John, ed. Roy Lichtenstein. New York, Praeger, 1972.
- "An Interview with Roy Lichtenstein," Artforum, vol. II, no. 4 (October 1963), p. 31. reprint.
- "Talking with Roy Lichtenstein." Artforum, vol. V, no. 9 (May 1967), pp. 34-39.
- Costello, Jane. "Relation of Graduate School Training to Work in Museum Education." College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3 (May 1944), pp. 137-9.
- Cremin, Lawrence A.. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Crone, Rainer. Andy Warhol. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Das Zeichnerische Werk 1942-1975. Exh. cat., Stuttgart, Wurttembergischer Kunstverein, 1976.
- Crow, Thomas. "The Return of Hank Heron." Endgame. Exh. cat., Boston, The Institute of Contemporary Art, 1986,

pp. 11-27.

Curtis, Stanley James. History of Education in Great Britain. 7 ed., London, University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1967.

Dearborn, W.F., and H.S. Langfeld, "Portable Tachistoscope and Memory Apparatus." The Psychological Review (Princeton, N.J.), vol. XXIII, no. 5 (September 1916), p. 383.

Debord, Guy. Society of the Spectacle. Detroit, Michigan, Black & Red, 1970, Reprinted 1983.

Deitcher, David. "Henri Fantin-Latour's 'Un Coin de Table.'" Arts Magazine, April, 1978, pp. 134-141.

--- "Lichtenstein's Expressionist Takes." Art in America, vol. 71, no. 1 (January 1983), 84-89.

Delacroix, Eugene. "Le dessin sans maitre," Revue des deux mondes, September 15, 1850, p. 1140.

"Department Stores Popularize Art." Life, January 3, 1944, pp. 44-47.

Derrida, Jacques. Speech and Phenomena and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs, trans. David B. Allison. Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1973.

--- "The Principle of Reason: The University in the Eyes of its Pupils." Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal, The New School, vol. 10, no. 1 (1984).

Dewey, John. "Affective Thought and Logic in Painting." Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol. 2, no. 2 (April 1926), p. 3ff.

--- Art as Experience. New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1934.

--- Democracy and Education. (1916) New York, Macmillan, 1966.

--- "Individuality and Experience." Journal of the Barnes Foundation, vol II, no. 1 (January 1926), pp. 1-6.

Dickens, Charles. Hard Times. New York, New American Library, 1980.

Dow, Arthur Wesley. Composition. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, Page and Co., 1913.

- "Art Teaching in the Nation's Service." National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, vol. 55 (1917), p. 91-96.
- "Modernism in Art." American Magazine of Art, January 1917, p. 113.
- "Practical Fine Arts -- Emergency Art Courses for War-Time Service." National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, vol. 55 (1917), pp. 460-464.
- The Theory and Practice of Teaching Art. New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1908.
- Duberman, Martin. Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community. New York, Dutton, 1972.
- "Dyce's Report to the Board of Trade, on Foreign Schools of Design for Manufacture." The Art Union, Sept. 1840, pp. 143-144.
- Eagleton, Terry. Against the Grain. London, Verso, 1986.
- Ecker, David, and Stanley S. Madeja, Pioneers in Perception: A Study of Aesthetic Perception: Conversations with Rudolf Arnheim, James L. Gibson, Nelson Goodman, Henry Schaefer-Simmern, and Hoyt Sherman. St. Louis, Mo., Cemrel, Inc., 1979.
- Ebbinghaus, Hermann. Über das Gedächtnis: Untersuchungen zur experimentelle Psychologie. Berlin, 1885.
- Eliot, George. The Mill on the Floss, ed. A.S. Byatt. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1985.
- Elsen, Albert. Rodin. New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1963.
- Ewen, Stuart. Captains of Consciousness: Advertising and the Social Roots of the Consumer Culture. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Fansler, Roberta. "On Education in an Art Museum." College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3 (May 1944), pp. 126-30.
- Fielden, K.. "Samuel Smiles and Self-Help." Victorian Studies, vol. 12 (1968-1969), p. 155ff.
- Flavin, Dan. "...on an American artist's education...." Artforum, VI, 7 (March 1968), pp. 29-32.
- Fleming, Donald, and Bernard Bailyn. The Intellectual

- Migration: Europe and American, 1930-1960. Cambridge, Harvard Univeristy Press, 1969.
- Fox, Stephen. The Mirror Makers: A History of American Advertising and its Creators. New York, William Morrow and Company, Inc. 1984.
- Foucault, Michel. The Archaeology of Knowledge, trans. A.M. Smith. New York, Pantheon Books, 1972.
- The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception, trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York, Vintage Books, 1975.
- Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison, trans. Alan Sheridan. New York, Vintage Books, 1979.
- Frampton, Kenneth. "Industrialization and the Crisis in Architecture." Oppositions, I (September 1973), pp. 57-82.
- Fried, Michael. "Art and Objecthood." in Gregory Battcock, ed., Minimal Art: A Critical Anthology. New York, P.F. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1968, pp.116-147.
- "On Manet's Sources." Artforum, vol. VII, No. 7 (March 1969), pp. 28-82.
- "Painting Memories: On the Containment of the Past in Baudelaire and Manet." Critical Inquiry, vol. 10, no. 3 (March 1984), pp. 510-542.
- Freud, Sigmund. Beyond the Pleasure Principle, ed. and trans. James Strachey. New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1961.
- Civilization and its Discontents, trans. James Strachey. New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1961.
- Frost, Rosamund. "This Business Ties Art into a Neat Package." Art News, XLIV, 7 (May 15-31, 1945), p. 13.
- "The Britannica Goes Americana." Art News, XLIV, 5 (April 15-30, 1945), p. 23.
- "Advertising Art Directors Pick their Annual Show." Art News, XLIV, 6 (May 1-14), 1945, 23-29.
- "Collectors Come out of Privacy." Art News, July 1946, pp. 15-19.
- "Lee Ault Can Pick Them: Fast Rising Aesthetic and

- Monetary Values Confirm One Man's Taste." Art News, April 15-30, 1944, p. 16.
- "Pepsi-Cola Competition." Art News, XLV, 1 (March 1946), p. 8.
- "Today's Collectors: Lily Pons: a Diva in Art." Art News, August 1946, pp. 34-37.
- "Today's Collectors: Newport Radical." Art News, April 1946, pp. 39-40, 62.
- "Today's Collectors: Pittsburgh Eclectic." Art News, March 1946, pp. 33-36.
- Gage, John. "The Psychological Background to Early Modern Colour: Kandinsky, Delaunay and Mondrian." Michael Compton, ed., Towards a New Art: Essays on the Background to Abstract Art. London, Tate Gallery, 1980. pp. 22-40.
- Gaugh, Harry F.. The Art of Franz Kline, 1930-1950: Figurative to Mature Abstraction. Ph.D. Dissert., Indiana University, 1972.
- Gautier, Théophile. "Ecole Imperiale spéciale de dessin: distribution des Prix -- Discours de M. Jules Pelletier." L'Artiste, vol. 5, September 5, 1858, pp. 7-8.
- Glaser, Bruce. "Oldenburg, Lichtenstein, Warhol: A Discussion." (Radio broadcast, 1964) reprint. in John Coplans, ed. Roy Lichtenstein, pp. 55-65.
- Goldman, Judith. James Rosenquist. New York, Viking, 1985.
- Goldwater, Robert. "The Teaching of Art in the Colleges of the U.S.." College Art Journal, vol. 2, no. 4, supplement (May 1943).
- Greenberg, Clement. "Art." The Nation, February 23, 1946. Reprinted in John O'Brian, Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism. 2 vols., Chicago, The University of Chicago Press 1986, vol. 2, pp. 57-58.
- "Cézanne's Composition by Earle (sic) Loran." The Nation, December 29, 1945. Reprinted in O'Brian, vol. 2, pp. 46-49.
- "The Present Prospects of American Painting and Sculpture." Horizon, nos. 93-4 (October 1947). Reprint. in O'Brian, vol. 2, pp. 160-170.

- Guilbaut, Serge. How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art, trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Hall, Stuart, Dorothy Hobson, et. al.. Culture, Media, Language. London, Hutchinson, 1980.
- Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain. London, Hutchinson (1976).
- Hamby, Alonzo H. Beyond the New Deal: Harry S. Truman and American Liberalism. New York, Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Harris, Neil and Martina Rouddabush Norellin. Art, Design, and the Modern Corporation: The Collection of the Container Corporation of America. Exh. cat., Washington, D.C., National Museum of American Art, 1985.
- Harrison, J.F.C. A History of the Working Men's College 1854-1954. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Hart, Henry. Dr. Barnes of Merion, an Appreciation. New York, Farrar, Strauss, 1963.
- Hebdige, Dick. Subculture: the Meaning of Style. London, Methuen 1979.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Question Concerning Technology." Basic Writings, ed. David Farrell Krell. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1977, pp. 283-318.
- Hess, Thomas B.. Willem de Kooning. Exh. cat., New York, Museum of Modern Art, 1968.
- Hewison, Robert. John Ruskin: The Argument of the Eye. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Hobsbawm, E.J.. The Age of Capital 1848-1875. New York, New American Library, 1975.
- The Age of Revolution: 1789-1848. New York, New American Library, 1962.
- "The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth-Century Britain." Labouring Men. London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964.
- Hofmann, Hans. Search for the Real and Other Essays. Sara Weeks, Bartlett H. Hays Jr., eds.. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1983.

- Hope, Henry. "Temporary Exhibitions for College Art Departments." College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3 (March 1944), pp 3, 99-104.
- Horkheimer, Max. "Art and Mass Culture." Studies in Philosophy and Social Science, vol. IX, no. 2 (1941), pp. 290-304.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. Dialectic of Enlightenment, trans. John Cumming. New York, Herder & Herder, 1972.
- "The End of Reason." Studies in Philosophy and Social Science, vol. IX, no. 3 (1941), pp. 366-388.
- Hughes, H. Stuart. The Sea Change: The Migration of Social Thought: 1930-1965. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Hunt, William Morris. Talks on Art, ed. Helen Mary Knowlton. Boston, Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1896.
- "Jackson Pollock: Is he the Greatest Living Painter in the United States?" Life, August 8, 1949, pp. 42-45.
- James, William. The Principles of Psychology. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Jameson, Frederic . The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Jewell, E.A. "The Problem of Seeing." The New York Times, August 10, 1941, sec. 9, p. 7.
- Judd, Donald. "Roy Lichtenstein." Arts Magazine, April 1962, p. 52.
- "Roy Lichtenstein." Arts Magazine, vol. 38, no. 2 (November 1963), pp. 12-13.
- Kelly, Earl, C. Education for What is Real. Forward by John Dewey, New York, 1947.
- Key, W.B.. Subliminal Seduction. New York, Signet, 1973.
- Kilpatrick, Franklin P., ed. Human Behavior from the Transactional Point of View. Institute for Associated Research, Department of the Navy, 1952.
- Kaspar Koenig, ed. Donald Judd: Complete Writings 1959-1975.

- Halifax, The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1975.
- Kepes, Gyorgy. "Education of the Eye." More Business, vol. 3, no. 11, p. 9.
- Education of Vision. New York, Braziller, 1965.
- Koffka, Kurt. Principles of Gestalt Psychology. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1935.
- Köhler, Wolfgang. Gestalt Psychology. New York, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1947.
- de Kooning, Elaine. "Franz Kline: Painter of his Own Life." Art News, November 1962, p. 68.
- Korzenik, Diana. Drawn To Art: A Nineteenth Century American Dream. Hanover and London, University Press of New England, 1987.
- Kozloff, Max. "Art." The Nation, November 2, 1963, pp. 284-285.
- Kramer, Hilton. "Signs of Passion: The New Expressionism." The Revenge of the Philistines: Art and Culture 1972-1984. New York, Macmillan, Inc., pp. 355-374.
- Krauss, Rosalind E. "The Originality of the Avant-Garde." The Originality of the Avant-Garde and other Modernist Myths. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1985, pp. 151-170.
- Kuspit, Donald. "Dewey's Critique of Art for Art's Sake." The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, vol. XXVII, no. 1 (Fall 1968), pp. 93-98.
- Laborde, Léon. De l'union des arts et de l'industrie. Exposition Universelle de 1851. Travaux de la Commission française sur l'industrie des nations. 8 vols. Paris, 1856.
- Lecoq de Boisbaudran, Horace. Education de la mémoire pittoresque. Paris, A la Librairie Sociétaire, 1848.
- Education de la mémoire pittoresque, application aux arts du dessin. Paris, Bance, Libraire-Editeur, 1862.
- L'Enseignement Artistique. Paris, 1879.
- The Training of the Memory in Art and the Education of the Artist by Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran, trans. L.D. Luard. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1911.

- Lepper, Robert. Uncatalogued materials in University Archives, Pittsburgh, Carnegie-Mellon University.
- Lichtenstein, Roy Fox. "Paintings Drawings, and Pastels: A Thesis." Masters thesis, Ohio State University, 1949.
- Lippencott, J. Gordon. "Industrial Design as Profession." College Art Journal, IV, 3, March 1945.
- Loder, Christina. Russian Constructivism. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1983.
- Longman, Lester D. "Why Not Educate Artists in Colleges?" College Art Journal, vol. 4, no. 3 (March 1945), p. 132-142.
- Logan, Frederick M. The Growth of Art in American Schools. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Loran, Erle. "Cézanne and Lichtenstein: Problems of Transformation." Artforum, vol. 2, September 1963, pp. 34-35.
- Cézanne's Composition. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1943; reprint. 1963.
- "Pop Artists or Copycats?" Art News, September 1963, pp. 48-9, 61.
- Loucheim, Aline. "Second Season of the Picture Boom." Art News, August 1945, p.9.
- "Who Buys What in the Picture Boom?" Art News, July 1, 1944, pp. 22-24.
- Luria, A.R. The Mind of a Mnemonist. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Lyotard, Jean-François. Driftworks. New York, Semiotext(e), 1984.
- MacAgy, Douglas. "Hoyt L. Sherman: Drawing By Seeing." College Art Journal, vol. VII, no. 4 (1948), pp. 331-2.
- Macdonald, Stuart. The History and Philosophy of Art Education London, University of London, 1970.
- Mainardi, Patricia. Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1987.

- Mandel, Ernest. Late Capitalism, trans. Joris De Bres (London, Verso, 1978).
- Mann, Horace. "Schmidt's Guide to Drawing." The Common School Journal, vol. V, no. 16 (August 15, 1843), pp. 241-43.
- Marcuse, Herbert. One Dimensional Man. Boston, Beacon Press, 1964.
- Marx, Karl. Capital. 3 vols., I, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977.
- Mérimée, Prosper. "Les Beaux-arts en Angleterre en 1857." Revue des deux mondes, October 15, 1857, pp. 866-879.
- Meszaros, Istvan. Marx's Theory of Alienation. London, Merlin Press, 1970.
- Moffat, Frederick C. Arthur Wesley Dow: 1857-1922. Washington, D.C., Smithsonian Institution Press, 1977.
- Moholy-Nagy, Laszlo. "New Approach to Fundamentals of Design." More Business, vol. 3, no. 11 (November 1938), p. 4ff.
- The New Vision: Fundamentals of Design, Painting, Sculpture Architecture. Trans. Daphne Hoffmann. New York, W.W. Norton & Co. Inc., 1938.
- Vision in Motion. Chicago, Paul Theobald, 1947.
- "Mondrian Makes the Mode." Art News, August 1945, p. 22.
- "Museum Attendance Mounts During Year." Art News, 20, February 1946, p. 14.
- Natanson, Maurice. Edmund Husserl: Philosopher of Infinite Tasks. Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Nesbit, Molly. "Ready-Made Originals: The Duchamp Model," October 37, Summer, 1986, p. 53ff.
- "Roy Lichtenstein: Birth of a Style, 1961-1963." Richard Brown Baker Collects: A selection of Contemporary Art from the Richard Brown Baker Collection. Exh. cat., New Haven, Yale University Art Gallery, 1975, p. 62ff.
- Noble, David F. America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism. N.Y., Alfred A. Knopf, 1977.

- Norris, Ross A. "The Cultured Mind The Skillful Hand: Art and Art Education at the Ohio State University, 1874-1944." Bound manuscript, Ohio State University Archive, ERIC document no. ED 175779.
- Novack, George. Pragmatism Versus Marxism: An Appraisal of John Dewey's Philosophy. New York, Pathfinder Press, Inc., 1975.
- O'Connor, Francis V., ed. Art for the Millions. Boston, New York Graphic Society, 1973.
- O'Doherty, Brian. "Doubtful but Definite Triumph of the Banal." The New York Times, October 27, 1963, Section 2, p. 21.
- Owens, Craig. "Back to the the Studio." Art in America, vol. 70, no. 1 (January 1982), pp. 99-107.
- Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders. New York, 1957.
- Pevsner, Niklaus. Academies of Art Past and Present. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1940.
- Phelps, Julia. "The Winthrop Collection and its Use in Teaching," all in the College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3 (May 1944), pp. 139-42.
- Pichois, C. Baudelaire, études et témoignages. Neuchatel, 1967.
- de Piles, Roger. The Art of Painting. London, 1744.
- Porter, Bern. "New Projection," College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 1 (November 1943), pp. 26-28.
- Pulos, Arthur J. American Design Ethic: A History of Industrial Design to 1940. Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1983.
- The American Design Adventure. Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1988.
- Régamay, Félix. Horace Lecoq de Boisbaudran et ses élèves. Paris, Honore Champion, 1903.
- L'Enseignement du dessin aux Etats-Unis, Boston, C.B. Stetson, 1874.
- Reid, G.A. Art Education in the United States, Great Britain, France, Belguim and Holland: a Report to the Council of the Ontario College of Art. Toronto, 1925.

- Renshaw, Samuel. "The Visual Perception and Reproduction of Forms by Tachistoscopic Methods." Journal of Psychology, vol. 20 (October, 1945), pp. 217-32.
- "The Reopened Metropolitan Shows its Riches Anew." Art News, vol. XLIII, no. 8 (June 1-30, 1944), p. 31.
- Revaissou, Félix. "De L'enseignement du dessin dans les lycées." Le Moniteur Universelle, October 16, 1854, pp. 71-2.
- Richardson, Marion. Art and the Child. Intro. Sir Kenneth Clark, Peoria, Charles A. Bennett Co. Inc., 1946.
- Ricoeur, Paul. Freud and Philosophy: an Essay on Interpretation, trans. Denis Savage. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1970.
- Rice, John. "Fundamentalism and the Higher Learning." Harper's, 174 (May 1937), pp. 587-96.
- Rindge, Agnes. "Educational activities in the Museum of Modern Art," College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3, (May 1944), pp. 132-7.
- Rose, Barbara. "The American Abstract Artists." American Abstract Artists: the Early Years. Exh. cat., New York, 1980.
- Rosenberg, Harold. The Tradition of the New. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- The De-definition of Art. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Rosenfeld, Israel. "Neural Darwinism: A New Approach to Memory and Perception." The New York Review of Books, vol. XXXIII, no. 15 (October 9, 1986), pp. 21-27.
- Rubin, Edgar. Visuell wahrgenommene Figuren. Berlin, 1921.
- Rublowky, John. Pop Art. New York, Basic Books, 1965.
- Ruskin, John. The Works of John Ruskin, (Library Edition), ed. E.T. Cook, Alexander Wedderburn. 39 vols, London, George Allen, 1903-12.
- A Joy For Ever. Works, vol. XVI.
- The Crown of Wild Olive. Works, vol. XVIII.

- Elements of Drawing. vol. XV; reprint., New York, Dover Publications, 1971.
- "Mr. Ruskin's Inaugural Address, Cambridge School of Art." Works, vol. XVI.
- The Stones of Venice. Works, vol. X.
- The Two Paths (1859), in Works, vol. XVI.
- Russell, John. "Art Preservation: A Race Against Time." The New York Times, Sunday, May 5, 1985, Section 2, p. 1ff.
- Russell, John, and Suzi Gablik, eds. Pop Art Redefined. London, Thames and Hudson, 1969.
- Ryerson, Margery, ed. The Art Spirit by Robert Henri: Notes, Articles, Fragments of Letters and Talks to Students, Bearing on the Concept and Technique of Picture Making, the Study of Art Generally, and on Appreciation. New York, J.B. Lippencott Company, 1939.
- Sandler, Irving. The Triumph of American Painting. New York, Harper & Row, 1970.
- Schaefer-Simmern, Henry. The Unfolding of Artistic Activity. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1948.
- Schack, William, Art and Argyrol: The Life and Career of Dr. Albert C. Barnes. New York, Thomas Yoseloff, 1960.
- Schiller, Friedrich. On the Aesthetic Education of Man, ed. and trans. Elizabeth M. Wilkinson, L.A. Willoughby. New York, Oxford University Press, 1982.
- "Science Contrives Princeton Ordeal." The New York Times, March 14, 1954, p. 82.
- Selz, Peter. "Symposium on Pop Art." Arts Magazine, April 1963, pp. 36-45.
- Sewell, William J. Jr. Work & Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1980.
- Sherman, Hoyt. "A Demonstration in New Methods of Teaching Art." Educational Research Bulletin, Columbus, Ohio State University, vol. XXII, no. 7 (October 13, 1943), p. 189.
- Cézanne and Visual Form. Columbus, Ohio University, 1952.

- Drawing by Seeing. New York, Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, 1947.
- "The Eye in the Arts." Educational Research Bulletin, Columbus, Ohio State University, vol. XXIII, no. 1 (January 19, 1944), pp. 1-6.
- Perceptualism: the Artist's Vision. Columbus, Ohio State University, 1944.
- Shiff, Richard. Cézanne and the End of Impressionism. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Smith, Patrick S. Andy Warhol's Art and Films. Ann Arbor, Michigan, UMI Research Press, 1986.
- Smith, Walter. Art Education, Scholastic and Industrial. Boston, James R. Osgood & Co., 1872.
- The Drawing Book of Standard Reproductions and Original Designs for Public Schools, Drawing Classes, and Schools of Art in America. Boston, J.R. Osgood & Co., 1872.
- Report on the Works of Pupils of the French Schools of Design. London, Simkin & Co., 1864.
- Stace, W.T. The Philosophy of Hegel. New York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1955.
- Stanton, Frank. "Memory for Advertising Copy Presented Visually Versus Orally." Pamphlet, Columbus, Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., March 1934
- Starkie, Enid. Baudelaire. New York, New Directions, 1958.
- Steinberg, Leo. Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art. New York, Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Stendahl, Scarlet and Black, trans. Margaret R.N. Shaw. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, Ltd., 1977.
- Stich, Sidra. Made in U.S.A.: an Americanization in Modern Art, The '50s & '60s. Exh. cat., Berkeley, University of California Press, 1987.
- Sweeney, James Johnson. "Five American Painters." Harper's Bazaar, April 1944, pp. 76-7, 122.

- Swenson, Gene. "What is Pop Art?" (Interviews with Eight Painters) Part I, Art News, November 1963, pp. 24-27, 61-65; Part II, February 1964, pp. 40-43, 62-66.
- Taylor, Francis Henry. "Metropolitan Metamorphosis." Art News Annual, 1945-46, p. 3.
- Thorndike, Edward L. "The Nature, Purposes, and General Methods of Measurements of Educational Products." 17th Yearbook. Bloomington, National Society for the Study of Education, 1918, part II, p. 16ff.
- Tucker, Marcia. "James Rosenquist." in James Rosenquist exh. cat., New York, Whitney Museum of American Art, 1972.
- "U.S. Museums 1945 and the Future." Art News, vol. XLIV, no. 18 (January 1946), p. 31.
- van Hook, Katrina. "Educational Activities in the National Gallery of Art." College Art Journal, vol. III, no. 3 (May 1944), pp. 130-132.
- Vestergaard, Torben, and Kim Schroder. The Language of Advertising. New York, Basil Blackwell Inc., 1985.
- Vinci, Leonardo da. Treatise on Painting, trans. A. Philip McMahon. 2 vols. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1956.
- Viollet-le-Duc, E. "Ur. Cours de dessin." L'Artiste, Vol. 5 (November 7, 1858), pp. 154-156.
- "Vision Institute Starts." The Ohio State University Monthly, vol. 41, no. 1 (October 15, 1949), pp. 3-5.
- Wagner, Anne Middleton. Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux: Sculptor of the Second Empire. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1986.
- Waldman, Diane. "Introduction," Roy Lichtenstein. New York, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1971).
- Wallis, Brian Hans Haacke: Unfinished Business. Exh. cat., New York, The New Museum of Contemporary Art, 1986.
- Wardle, David. English Popular Education: 1780-1975. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Warhol, Andy, and Pat Hackett. Popism: The Warhol '60s. New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980.
- Wechsler, Judith. "An Aperitif to Manet's Dejeuner sur

- l'herbe." Gazette des beaux-arts, sixth series, vol. XCI (1978), pp. 32-34.
- Weisberg, Gabriel. "Jean Charles Cazin -- Memory Painting and Observation in The Boat Yard." Cleveland Museum of Art Bulletin, vol. LXVIII, no. 1 (January 1981), pp. 2-16.
- Wellington, Hubert, ed. The Journal of Eugène Delacroix, trans. Lucy Norton. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Williams, Raymond. Culture and Society 1780-1950. New York, Harper & Row, 1959; first paperback edition, 1966.
- Wheeler, Raymond Holder. The Science of Psychology. New York, T.Y. Crowell Co. 1929.
- Whitman, Artis. "What is the Limit of Your Mind?" The Reader's Digest, June 1953, p. 25ff.
- Whitridge, Eugenia Lea. "Trends in the Selling of Art." College Art Journal, vol. 14, no. 2 (January 1944), pp. 59-60.
- Wilson, Richard Guy, Dianne H. Pilgrim, et. al. The Machine Age in American 1918-1941. New York, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1986.
- Wingler, Hans. The Bauhaus, trans. Wolfgang Habs, Basil Gilbert. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1969.
- Woodworth, Robert S., and Harold Schlosberg. Experimental Psychology. New York, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1938.
- Yates, Frances A. The Art of Memory. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Zeltner, Philip M. John Dewey's Aesthetic Philosophy. Amsterdam, B.R. Grüner B.V., 1975.