A–B

A COURSE. The 'A' Course was an experimental undergraduate course in the Sculpture Department of Central St. Martins School of Art and Design in London, initiated in 1969 by Peter Kardia (then Atkins), Garth Evans, Peter Harvey and Gareth Jones. The programme worked with a variety of rules, constraints and staged situations that were intended to challenge the acquired habits and previous training of students. Instead of providing advise and criticism, the tutors' main role was to ensure that the prescribed rules were followed. The initial project in the A Course has become notorious: it was called the 'Materials Project', some part of which was re-enacted three years later for the BBC. This resulted in a film titled 'The Locked Room' in which students are seen to be locked in a room together with limited amount of a specific material and a set of rules. Today, the A Course stands out as a salient example of the recurring attempts by art tutors and professors to catalyse a pedagogical turn from within the institution.
      See: LOCKED ROOM

ANHOEK SCHOOL. The Anhoek School is an experimental all-women's graduate school, run from Brooklyn, New York by Mary Walling Blackburn. The curriculum of the school spans various forms of cultural production, ranging from the political to the aesthetic and theoretical. Tuition costs are mediated by a barter system: students labour for the school in exchange for classes. Classes are small (5 to 7 people) and the location of the school shifts, depending on the course topic and occasion. Recent courses include 'The Mutinous Classroom' and 'Stealing Horses: The Invention of Possession'.
      See: BARTER

ANTIOCH COLLEGE is a private liberal arts college in Yellow Springs, Ohio that was founded in 1850. Educational reformist Horace Mann (1796–1859) was the first president of the school. In the early twentieth century, Antioch College introduced a cooperative education model, which combines classroom teaching with practical work experience. Among the early students of the college were women, and the school was open to black people. Throughout the twentieth century, the school flourished as a cradle of social activism and critical thought, most notably fuelling the civil rights movement during the 1960s.

ANTIUNIVERSITY. The Antiuniversity of London was a short-lived educational experiment founded by David Cooper and Alan Krebs in 1968. Based on principles of self-organisation and communal living, the project was supposed to take place whenever and wherever participants wanted. The Antiuniversity aimed to eliminate traditional institutional structures and to abolish the distinctions between students, teachers and administrators. Its curriculum covered radical politics, existential psychiatry and artistic avant-garde. As the artist and activist Jakob Jakobsen has pointed out, the Antiuniversity was structured much like the Free University in New York, founded in 1965, but also heavily drew its inspiration from anti-institutional movements of the 1960s, especially the anti-psychiatry movement which had focused on abolishing the boundaries of institutions as well as the doctor/patient distinction.
      See: FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

BANKING MODEL. Paolo Freire develops his concept of the 'banking model of education' in his seminal book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* of 1968. With the concept, Freire describes the notion that the student is an 'empty account', a vessel that is merely to be filled with knowledge by the teacher. In the banking 'approach', education is conceived of merely as a direct transfer of knowledge. More precisely, as Freire points out, '[t]he students are not called upon to know, but to memorize the contents narrated by the teacher.' The banking model 'transforms students into receiving objects' and thereby 'attempts to control thinking and action, leads men and women to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power'. In Freire's theory of pedagogy, and especially what he calls 'the problem-posing concept of education', the learner is considered as co-producer of knowledge. However, as Freire argues, the 'banking' model is not only reductive in respect to the student but also to the teacher, which is also effectively 'dehumanised'. As an alternative to this, Freire develops a particular kind of humanism that considers one's humanity as fundamentally incomplete: education is based on an awareness of this incompleteness, and the strive to be 'more fully human'.
      See: FREIRE, PAOLO; PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED; PROBLEM-POSING; TEACHER-STUDENT CONTRADICTION

BARTER is a system of exchange by which goods or services are directly exchanged for other goods or services – including teaching and various forms of knowledge production — without a medium of exchange such as money. Barter is in some respects similar to gift economies, which also operate without a medium of exchange, but it is based on a system of reciprocal exchange which is immediate and not delayed in time. Barter is usually bilateral, but may also assume more complex forms when it is mediated by barter organisations. In a limited extent, barter usually exists in parallel to monetary systems. In times of monetary crisis, where a currency may be unstable or unavailable, barter often replaces money as a means of exchange.
      See: ANHOEK SCHOOL; TRADE SCHOOL

BAUHAUS. The Staatliches Bauhaus was a renowned school for art, crafts, design and architecture operating from 1919 to 1933. Founded by Walter Gropius, the school was known for it attempt to unify art, crafts and modern techniques of production. The school was organised around the idea that objects should be designed according to first principles (instead of following precedents) and that production was an integral part of the design process. Inspiration was found in revolutionary art movements and design experiments of the early 20th century. The structure of Bauhaus consists of a six-month preliminary course (*Vorlehre*) — a period defined by a synthetic approach that has become especially influential — followed by three years of workshop training in combination with form theory. In these three years, students specialise by choosing a workshop that was defined in terms of a material: 'wood' for instance designates the joinery and wood-carving workshops. The basic structure of general introductory year, followed by a period of specialisation is still influential in many art and design schools today.
      See: ULM SCHOOL OF DESIGN

BLACK MOUNTAIN COLLEGE. The famous Black Mountain College was founded in 1933 in Black Mountain, North Carolina as an experimental college in which the study of art was seen as central to liberal arts education. The school was largely influenced by the principles of the philosopher and educational reformer John Dewey, whose theories emphasised 'learning by doing', generic capacities like problem solving and critical thinking, as well as an integrated curriculum based on thematic units. Founded by John Andrew Rice and Theodore Dreier, Black Mountain College argued for a kind of education that took into account the 'whole student' ('heart, head and hand') through the combination of study, manual work and the experience of living in a small commune. It was the first American experimental college based on complete democratic self-rule, interdisciplinary study and extensive work in the creative arts. Unrestrained by conventional structures, the college reflected on its own dreams and ambitions as part of a democratic process that was to constantly reshape the institution.

INTERVIEW WITH ANN DEMEESTER
Julia Retz & Laura Holzberg

Julia Retz & Laura Holzberg: What are, in your view, the main challenges faced by art education at the moment?

Ann Demeester: The first issue that comes to mind is particularly pressing in the Netherlands but that is shared with many Northern European countries. More and more, the view on art education is becoming utilitarian and based on a narrow idea of vocational learning. Instead, the question posed to art schools is increasingly: what kind of student do you produce? Education is not seen as something that is valuable in itself, or something of which the results may be uncertain: art schools are simply expected to deliver professional artists. As you know, students that have passed through art education could become artists, but they could equally well become designers, go on to work in the creative industries, or continue to work as a cultural anthropologist. Even the visual art departments within art schools, as opposed to the other departments such as graphic design, photography or jewellery, do not exclusively produce artists. What art schools produce is, perhaps, people with a certain knowledge of visual art, with certain critical or creative capacities, et cetera – but not necessarily artists.

An academy does not make artists, just like a curatorial programme — including the one we run at De Appel arts centre — does not simply transform people into curators. In my view, it can only function as a preparation by providing an environment in which students can potentially become artists, curators, and so on. I believe that it is the practice itself that turns students into an artist or a curator, not the educational system or any other form of training. This means that you should be able to leave the precise outcome of a programme open, and that it is not possible (or desirable) to focus directly on the 'production' of artists. Unfortunately, this view is not shared by most of the policy-makers and administrators, who tend to have a very utilitarian view.

This is linked to the second point, which is once again widely shared but maybe particularly pressing in the Netherlands. Art academies are, like art institutions, increasingly expected to continuously show their activities to the public. The new minister of culture in the Netherlands recently mentioned that she often cycles past the Rijksakademie van beeldende kunsten, a major post-academic institution in Amsterdam, thinking that it is such a pity that they do not open their doors to the public more often. Now, I think we are very lucky with the new minister — she has much more of an understanding of culture and art than the previous one, who introduced the disastrous cuts in the cultural sector

— but I disagree with her expectations from art education. If you cycle past the faculty of law in Amsterdam, do you expect that you can go inside all the time, see the results of the students' work, and maybe take part in the teaching? Is it important that these activities can constantly be communicated to a general public? Of course not. In my view, the same goes for art education.

Art academies essentially function within a specific context, in relation to a specific field, and a specific group of practitioners. Of course, the work of students can be presented to the public from time to time, but an art school needs to be able to create a relatively closed and protected environment, which provides a sense of security and gives students the freedom to experiment and make mistakes — this is absolutely essential. Because art education, like any kind of education, demands a certain intimacy, it also needs a certain measure of trust and confidence from policy makers and the public. Education ultimately takes place behind close doors, so academies should not be expected to show what is going on within their walls all the time. The desire for total and continuous transparency is detrimental. This insight is something that can no longer be taken for granted. These last two issues are very important today, at least in the Northern European context: on the one hand, the idea that academies serve a utilitarian purpose; on the other hand, the idea that art education needs to be exposed to the public all the time.

The boundaries of the academy are also questioned from within. Indeed, most people agree that the academy should provide a space where you can make mistakes — but at the same time, it should prepare students for the world out there. Therefore students should sometimes be exposed to some kind of pressure from the outside. Especially when it comes to visual art students, there tends to be a discussion about this exposure. Should academies invite curators and gallerist to meet the students and speak to them while they are still in school? In these discussions, the point is often made that it is important to explain the students how it works 'out there': this is how you make a portfolio, this is how you talk to a curator, this is how you file a subsidy, and so on. On the one hand, I think: sure, why not. If you do not learn it at that moment you might never be introduced to it — no one will take you by the hand after you have graduated, you are simply supposed to know about it. On the other hand, this approach is so functional, so pragmatic, that it could have a disturbing effect on some students. It is a very precarious balance.

Finally, a third and broader issue has to do with the present condition of art education. This is a question we often ask ourselves at De Appel arts centre, not only in relation to our own programme but also in relation to art education in general. How do we currently teach ? What is it that we do, when we are doing it?

The methods and pedagogical models on which art education is based often remain undefined. Universities tend to have clear pedagogical models, schools tend to be based on clear pedagogical models — public schools, Montessori schools, Dalton schools. There are clear models to

2

describe how you teach and how students are supposed to learn. But in art
academies, postgraduate courses, or curatorial programmes like the one
we offer, the method, the model, the assumptions that underlie education
are not as clearly defined. Art education typically takes place in a very
informal context and conversation plays a major role in it. This kind
of education might seem free or without rules at first sight, but it is
in fact based on a model, however implicit – or rather a composite, a
collage of models. As a result of the Bologna process, many art schools
of course needed to formalise their curriculum, but still it seems
that many have clear systems and procedures, but no explicitly defined
pedagogical models… This is perhaps another challenge for art education:
how to do this without lapsing into a discourse of self-legitimisation?

Suhail Malik, who is leading the critical studies programme in the Art
Practice MFA at Goldsmiths College, has recently brought up an important
conceptual distinction in relation to this question. In an essay called
'Educations Sentimental and Unsentimental', he introduces the distinction
between schooling and education.[1] The two terms stand for different
approaches to education, which in turn correspond to different types of
academies. Schooling is what takes place in the institution; it is very
formalised and traditional in terms of its organisation. It is based
on a strict curriculum and it is clear what is being taught, even if
it is maybe not so clear what people learn. Education is, by contrast,
open-ended, non-hierarchical, and typically considered progressive.
Here, the academy is organised by the students themselves: it is based
on the idea that academies should not be hierarchical, organised top-
down, but function as an open source structure, which is supposedly very
democratic. It is an approach to education that is popular in many art
schools, but also in some of the bottom-up schools organised by artists.

1 Suhail Malik, *Educations Sentimental and Unsentimental: Repositioning
the Politics of Art and Education* in: Red Hook Journal, August 2011,
www.bard.edu/ccs/redhook, consulted 10 June 2013.

The problem with the first model of education is of course that it is
too fossilised and sterile. Its structure is fixed, even though the
reality is not fixed, but fluid. But the second model, which is often
uncritically regarded as democratic and progressive, is not without its
problems either. It pretends to be more democratic than the other but,
as it turns out, the opposite is often true. If you think of an informal
academy, like the Night School that is organised by Anton Vidokle, for
instance, the criteria for being admitted are not necessarily clear. It
might seem more open than a traditional institution, but in the end it
is a small group of people who decide if you are allowed or not – and
you do not really know why. Often it is the same small group of people
that – very informally – decides what is being taught. None of this is
transparent: as an outsider you simply have no idea about what is going
on and why it is done like this.

In other words, the idea of 'open source' education often turns out to
be opaque and elitist, even though it might seem inclusive at first.
Institutional forms of education, on the other hand, often prove to be

Interview with Ann Demeester

more transparent and more democratic because the choices and criteria are more transparent and explicit, which also makes it easier to challenge them. I think this offers a very interesting and important challenge to art education. How to navigate between these two poles? In my view, the ideal form of art education exists somewhere in between these poles: it is not a rigid institution based on the model of schooling, nor a totally open-ended anarchic academy. Both of these types have their own advantages and problems, so the question is how we can find a path in between.

JR & LH: De Appel arts centre is involved in education itself, most notably through the curatorial programme that you've run since 1994. What approach do you take to education?

AD: In a way, the simple fact that we run our curatorial programme and a gallerists' programme already implies a certain view on the concept of art education: namely, that we understand art education not to be limited to the training of artists. In our view, it equally involves the training of curators, of gallerists, et cetera – it is the professional development of all cultural producers within the field of visual arts.

In terms of our own method, conversations plays an important role – maybe you could say that we employ the conversation as method. The participants in the programme often engage in dialogues with the tutor and with one another. Teaching does not take place in the form of ex cathedra lessons, but through conversations, which are by definition reciprocal. Of course, this is an approach to education that we share these methods with many art academies and post-academic programmes. Apart from this, the method that we employ is probably best characterised as 'learning by doing'. We emphasise practise and the idea that people engage in processes of collective learning, peer-to-peer-education. The participants do not only learn from us, from the tutors or from the guest teachers, but also from each other. In this sense it also involves a kind of auto-education: education is both what is offered to you, and what you contribute yourself in the process of learning.

I am particularly interested in what we call the *foie gras* method. The idea is to stuff people with knowledge, to create a situation of complete overexposure. This means that, on the one hand, you take the responsibility to create this situation as an institution, to provide students with a lot of knowledge from the top down. Then you leave it up to the students to figure out what to do with it, to process this knowledge: this is when their process of learning takes place.

The two models that Suhail Malik introduces — that of schooling and of education — seem applicable here as well, and map onto two different methods of teaching that, in my view, need to be negotiated in some way. On the one hand, I also believe in open-ended, self-engineered learning processes. On the other hand, I think there is something to say for some traditional approaches to education and teaching. The traditional figure of the teacher or master enables a process of identification and resistance which can be very beneficial. People often quote *The Ignorant*

Schoolmaster of Rancière, referring to his idea of a completely equal, non-hierarchical teacher/student relationship. This is of course an extremely idealistic model that, in my view, does not work. In order to learn, it is important to have some kind of framework which is set for you. If nobody gives you this frame, you cannot resist it, appropriate it, redefine it yourself. On the other hand, if this framework is imposed too forcefully you turn people in to sheep who just reproduce. The question is how these extremes can be brought together, how we can think of a kind of hybrid.

<u>JR & LH</u>: The curatorial programme of De Appel arts centre is not connected to a university or another academic institution. What was the reason to set up this programme within an art institution?

<u>AD</u>: To start with, it is important to point out that this set-up is still relatively rare. At the moment there are masses of curatorial programs, at least 26 in the Western Hemisphere, but probably much more. Many of these are located at universities. In Britain, for instance, even the university of Essex and of Cornwall have curatorial departments. There are, as far as I know, only two programmes that are directly attached to an art centre: our curatorial programme and that of Le Magasin in Grenoble. Of course, there are also programmes that are connected to a larger museum, like the Whitney Independent Study Programme, but the programmes at De Appel and at Le Magasin in Grenoble are the only ones that are connected to an art centre or Kunsthalle.

Our curatorial programme is not part of a university or art academy for a very simple reason. We change and adapt our curriculum very often to current developments — basically every half a year. This is, in my view and in the view of the previous director, Saskia Bos, an important quality of a programme in this field. Both art academies and the universities are part of the official educational system. This means they have to follow rules and procedures imposed by the ministry, and are constrained by many formal obligations. These are constraints are very rigid: in order for people to get a certain diploma, their work has to meet specific requirements, the programme needs to be evaluated in a certain way, and so on. These procedures have their use, and for many kinds of formal education there mechanisms are not that problematic. But if you deal with something as fluid as curatorial practice, it is better not to be embedded in such a system because you have to be able to respond quickly.

Let me give you an example. I teach seminars in curating at the university of Amsterdam. Each time we want to invite a guest, there is a gigantic bureaucratic procedure in order to get that person's train ticket refunded, or even to provide a fee. With De Appel arts centre, we want to be able to respond straight away. When this or that curator texts me that he or she is in town, we can arrange a meeting the same day. When the Istanbul Biennale is doing an extensive discursive program, we can respond to it and do a workshop. If we have some budget left and think that the students have to see this wonderful show in Wuppertal, we can just get on a train and get there.

This flexibility is for us essential: not just because it provides a kind of freedom, but moreover because we believe that curatorial practice is about responding to the signs of the time. Therefore, this element also needs to be part of the training of curators: if the course itself would be very stiff, formalised and fixed it is simply impossible to meet these requirements. Of course, we also have fixed components in the programme. We always have workshops on exhibition history and on art in public space, for instance. But when something no longer seems relevant, we want to be able to decide quickly to do something entirely different. From one year to another, we want to be able to decide not to have a final project, for instance, but to close the year in a different way. So, this flexibility is not to do with a general question of wanting to be free from rules or constraints: it is necessary because it reflects curatorial practice as it is.

This independence also offers us the ability to determine our own criteria for selecting and admitting students. Our programmes have roughly the same selection criteria, which are not very formal: instead, we tend to base our assessment on individual dossiers. We see what trajectory a person follows, if this is interesting, what kind of ideas he or she has, whether someone would be able to learn something here, what they can contribute, and so on. We are not interested in degrees as such. Some people are trained as artists, some as sociologists, others as art historians, some people have never completed any education. We believe that what makes somebody into an interesting curator is definitely not the degree, but rather their profile, their trajectory, their interests and ideas. Therefore we simply do not take it into account as a formal requirement. This is probably similar for other non-academic curatorial programmes; but it would be impossible in most universities or postgraduate programmes in art schools.

We have this freedom in devising our programmes because they are embedded within an art institution. Therefore, we do not have to produce a fixed amount of students, or to prove the quality of what we are doing. Also in a formal sense, the curatorial programme is simply part of our artistic programme. In terms of funding, this means that we do not receive money for the curatorial programme itself: we use part of the grants we receive for the art institution. Because of this structure, we are not evaluated or supervised on this level – we are an art institution, not a school.

But being outside of academic institutions and not offering an accredited degree also offers problems. This is especially the case for students from Asia. For Chinese students, for example, the typical career follows a trajectory which is very hierarchical and oriented on diplomas. Even though everybody might recommend them to do the programme of De Appel arts centre instead of a very formal MA in curatorial studies at the University of Vienna, it is still important for them that diplomas are the first thing that institutions in China tend to look at. As the art world is continually expanding, it becomes clear that the needs in different part of the world are very different. For Indian students, on the other hand, it proves to be difficult that De Appel arts centre does

not have a strict curriculum because this is necessary in order to apply for grants. So they prefer to go the curating programme at Goldsmiths, for instance, because it is based at a university and therefore enables them to apply for a grant. These are practical issues, which nevertheless strongly affect the programme.

JR & LH: Within art institutions, the theme of education also plays a role in a different way. Public programmes and education departments have come to occupy an important position within art institutions of various kinds, ranging from museums to biennials and large periodical events like Documenta. What is your view on this tendency, in which education becomes a means of involving the general public?

AD: Through their education programme, art institutions indeed tend to have the ambition to involve a larger and broader audience than just experts and professionals in the process of thinking. But on many occasions this is difficult to achieve – sometimes the results in fact turn out to be the opposite of these intentions. The discourse within art institutions often addresses specific questions, and sometimes it is in fact important to discuss them only among specialists. The issues discussed are often outside of the expertise of many people, for the simple reason that we have not all spent the same amount of time thinking about them.

These are questions that we discuss quite often with students, especially in relation to the wave of 'new institutionalism': the idea that art institutions need to be more democratic, open, and allow for more participation by the public. This is often achieved by introducing a discursive component in the programme, instead of just showing art. Quite often, however, it seems that precisely the institutions with these supposedly open and participatory programmes actually excludes many people. A large part of the audience that is relatively 'uninformed', in the sense that they are perhaps not able to join specialised discussion, can still have an active interest in visual art precisely because it can be encountered in a different way — because it is something that you see.

If the activities of an art institution are mostly discursive, and thereby seemingly open to participation, this can in fact trigger a feeling of estrangement, and reinforce the image of elitism that art institutions already suffer from. Maybe I polarise the two aspects too much, but I certainly think that many of the educational programmes in art institutions are extremely exclusive – maybe not on purpose, but simply because we have not found a good way of involving people who are not informed or knowledgeable about contemporary art, but only have a curiosity.

I have often discussed this issue with Maria Hlavajova, the director of BAK, basis voor actuele kunst in Utrecht — an institution that focuses very much on discursive activities. Their programme is specifically directed at people that are already well-informed, which is in my view a completely legitimate strategy that may be more interesting and effective than many attempts to incorporate the general public. A programme like this might not make an inclusive gesture, but instead create a kind of

community. An environment like this, as a forum for specialists and experts, might be more suitable to produce certain kinds of knowledge.

This is also a challenge for many Biennials or for events like Documenta: how to find a format in which such knowledge can be produced? Increasingly, art fairs also include education programmes, but often for a completely different reason: it becomes a vehicle for legitimatising their own position, making the point that they are not just commercial but also produce knowledge. But in reality there are very few moments where this takes place in a new and interesting way.

Simon Sheikh has an interesting view on the problem of education programmes, which addresses the institutional framework in which they are organised.[2] These days many art institutions, especially the larger ones, are marked by a strange division of labour. Exhibitions are made by curators; the education programme is devised in an education department; promotion is the responsibility of communication or marketing departments. These are parallel strands, that engage in some exchange and interaction, but no real collaboration. The curator provides some information to the education department, and the education department comes up with a related discursive programme, or events that should help to understand the exhibition.

2 See Simon Sheikh, 'Letter to Jane (Investigation of a Function)' in: Paul O'Neill and Mick Wilson (eds.), *Curating and the Educational Turn*, Amsterdam: Open Editions, 2010.

Sheikh argues that this is a very problematic structure. A curator should have an interest in education and marketing or communication, because this is how an exhibition reaches an audience. Conversely, marketing and education departments should not look at the input of the curator as a kind of burden. Instead of a rigid division of labour, he argues for a process of close collaboration. In his view, these different departments should in fact be united: the task of the curator does not stop with the exhibition, and the task of education and marketing does not begin at a later stage — the process of thinking about exhibitions and discursive events should all start together.

Someone who has a very interesting way of dealing with educational programmes is Pablo Helguera, an artist and who also worked in education departments of the MOMA and the Guggenheim. He develops genuinely new formats that are at the same time highly specialised and very inclusive. In a way he deals precisely with the challenge that Sheikh points at. He tries to incorporate education in his work as a curator from the very start, not as a kind of complementary program or obligation. Instead, they think of the exhibition as an educational format, and tried to think of the education programme as something that should really emerge from the art itself and have a close relation to it, instead of being forcefully linked to the exhibition.

Ann Demeester is director of De Appel arts centre and head of De Appel Curatorial Programme in Amsterdam.

When proposals for a new building in the early 1940s (including a plan by Josef Breuer and Walter Gropius) turned out to be too expensive, staff and students built one wing of a larger design by A. Lawrence Kocher – later called the Studies Building – by themselves. Notable members of the teaching staff were Josef Albers, John Cage, Willem de Kooning, Buckminster Fuller and Merce Cunningham. After a period of mounting debt and internal disputes, Black Mountain College finally closed down in 1957.

See: FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

CENTER FOR URBAN PEDAGOGY. The Center for Urban Pedagogy (CUP) is a non-profit organisation in New York City, founded in 1997 by artist and architect Damon Rich. Through art and design the CUP creates educational tools that aim to improve the quality of communities – in their own words, to 'use the power of design and art to increase meaningful civic engagement'. The organisation actively collaborates with local participants, educators, advocates, designers and students. Their 'Urban Investigations' are 'project-based curricula that enable high school students to explore fundamental questions about how the city works, using collaborative research and design'. Investigations always start from a basic question, such as ' Where does our water come from?', 'Who owns the Internet?' or 'Where does our garbage go?'. In order to find answers, students do not remain bound to classroom learning but instead 'engage in field research […] visiting real sites and interviewing decision-makers and stakeholders'. In the approach of CUP one may recognise Paolo Freire's notions of co-investigation and problem-posing, as well as Colin Ward's insistence on a engagement with one's immediate environment.

See: EXPLODING SCHOOL; PROBLEM-POSING.

COMPULSORY MIS-EDUCATION. In his book *Compulsory Mis-education* (1962), Paul Goodman criticises the tendency to increase the years of compulsory education, arguing for a reform of the educational system of primary grades, high school and college. '[E]ducation must be voluntary rather than compulsory, for no growth to freedom occurs except by intrinsic motivation.' He argues for a diminishment of what he calls the monolithic school system, arguing instead for various and variously administered educational opportunities. (61) Instead of channelling all government funding directly to schools — a tendency that rests on the faulty equation of education and schooling as its institutionalised variant – Goodman contends that there should be more space for experimental schools but also for 'plausible self-chosen educational proposals, such as purposeful travel or individual enterprise'. Goodman also argued that, in order to foster independent thought and expression, pupils and students could, under professional guidance, get involved in local newspapers, independent radio, little magazines and theatres in order to countervail the influence of mass media.

See: GOODMAN, PAUL; MORATORIA

CONSTRUCTION OF CHANGE. The famous Groundcourse, run by artist Roy Ascott at Ealing School of Art in the early 1960s, construed artistic practice as a behavioural problem, and conceived of art education along the same lines. As writer and curator Elena Crippa explains, Ascott's essay 'The Construction of Change' (1963) argues that '[t]he focus of his interest was not in the finished artwork, but in the process of doing, of which many aspects can be examined rationally; and in the substance between artist and spectator, both contributing to the shaping of the artwork's meaning'. Drawing on this conception, Ascott imagined art schools to be 'structured as homeostatic organisms, living, adaptive instruments for generating creative thought and action'. In this process, one of the main challenges was to deconstruct learned behaviour — a challenge that was conceived through the theoretical framework of cybernetics. As Crippa recounts, 'the nature of drawing was questioned in a number of exercises which set strict parameters, as in the case of a project defined as time-drawing of the model: "Draw her hair in three seconds, face in three minutes, left hand thumb nail in three hours, legs in six seconds, right ankle in two days."'

See: GROUNDCOURSE

CONTINENTAL DRIFT. The seminar 'Continental Drift' was organised between 2005 and 2008 as a collaboration between the 16 Beaver Group together with theorist Brian Holmes. The 16 Beaver Group is an artist community running a social and collaborative space on 16 Beaver Street in downtown Manhattan. The space functions as an ongoing platform for presentation, production and discussion, accommodating a variety of events such as reading groups, panel discussions, film screenings and workshops. The Continental Drift seminar was considered an 'experiment in collective autodidacticism' and presented as an attempt to develop new modes of research and practice, outside of the academic system and the museum context.

COPENHAGEN FREE UNIVERSITY. The Copenhagen Free University (CFU) is an artist-run institution established in May 2001 in Copenhagen, Denmark. It was founded by Henrietta Heise and Jakob Jakobsen, and considers itself as part of the International Situationist movement. The CFU has hosted discussions, conferences and screenings, and published a guide called the *ABZ of the Copenhagen Free University* (with entries ranging from 'self-institution' to 'uneconomical behaviour' and 'mass intellectuality') and several small books. Heise and Jakobsen present the CFU as a critical response to the widespread idea of the 'knowledge economy' as a means of framing and evaluating knowledge production: instead, it works 'with forms of knowledge that are fleeting, fluid, schizophrenic, uncompromising, subjective, uneconomic, a-capitalist, produced in the kitchen, produced when asleep or arisen on a social excursion — collectively'.

See: FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

DESCHOOLING SOCIETY. In the introduction to his seminal book *Deschooling Society* (1970), Ivan Illich argues that 'for most men the right to learn is curtailed by the obligation to attend school'. The title of the book refers to his conviction that the ethos of society at large – not just its institutions — need to be 'deschooled'. The school thus function as a paradigm for a plea for deinstitutionalisation that also concerns others 'agencies of the State': the church, the party, the army, the media, etcetera. In Illich' view, '[n]either new attitudes of teachers towards their pupils nor the proliferation of educational hardware or software (in classroom or bedroom) nor finally the attempt to expand the pedagogue's responsibility until it engulfs his pupils' lifetimes will deliver universal education'. Instead, he argues for the development of 'alternative institutions built on the style of present schools' and contends that such a process of 'deschooling' is the only means towards effectively achieving universal education.

See: ILLICH, IVAN; FUNNELS AND WEBS; SCHOOLING AND DESCHOOLING

DESKILLING. As art critic Benjamin Buchloh argues, deskilling is 'a concept of considerable importance in describing numerous artistic endeavours throughout the twentieth century with relative precision' — endeavours 'linked in their persistent effort to eliminate artisanal competence and other forms of manual virtuosity from the horizon of both artist competence and aesthetic valuation'.

See: DESCHOOLING

DESCHOOLING AND DESKILLING: ON THE PEDAGOGICAL TURN
Vivian Sky Rehberg

The 'pedagogical' or 'educational' turn has emerged in contemporary art
over the past two decades as a critical shift that values and promotes
education as such, but questions traditional models for teaching and
learning and the institutional structures (architecture, bureaucracies,
hierarchies) associated with those models. This 'turn' has infiltrated
contemporary art on the levels of production, distribution, and
reception, institutionally and discursively, through educationally-geared
artistic and curatorial practices, display strategies, and exhibitions,
as well as programming and publishing.

Today's pedagogical experiments in contemporary art are largely
driven by a desire to reflect upon and assert political resistance
to the instrumentalisation of education by governments and markets,
and to formulate responses to the increasingly fuzzy line between
private interests and the public good. Many projects are socially and
politically motivated, and come with an implicit or explicit critique
of the expansion of a 'neo-liberal market' for education. Alternative
educational structures and platforms stress more open access, and appeal
to broader audiences via the reduction or absence of fees, voluntary
teaching and learning, and the freedom that comes with the rejection of
a pre-determined curriculum, learning outcomes, criteria for assessment,
and the need for quality assurances, all of which are necessary features
of accreditation requirements for degree-granting programs worldwide.

This deliberate unravelling of traditional educational formats in order
to emancipate subjects has been called 'deschooling', a term conceived
by educator Ivan Illich in his landmark *Deschooling Society* (1971) to
describe a de-institutionalization of the educational matrix in order
to release its radical potential. Current alternative educational formats
owe a large debt to Illich's thinking. Those of us who work inside the
art educational institutions that are the focus of critique would do well
to think this term alongside another: 'deskilling'. Deskilling relates
to the development of labour processes and involves the incorporation
of science and technology to the detriment of human labour, the loss
of workers' control over the labour process, replacement of skilled
labourers with machines, the widening gap between workers and executives,
the managerial re-organization of workers into jobs for which they
are not necessarily trained, and the fragmentation of production into
specialized tasks that strip workers of their autonomy.

Art historian John Roberts has studied the historical links between
deskilling labour processes and art making, particularly with respect
to Duchamp's readymade. The term 'deskilling' has since reappeared in

the work of art historians and theorists, artists and thinkers who are currently grappling with the effects of the rise of immaterial modes of production and immaterial labour in cognitive capitalism, which creates value by adding cognitive labour and the production of knowledge to material production. For Roberts, the era of deskilling has redefined artistic skill one step further: 'artistic skill is no longer confined to the manipulation of a given medium within a tradition of discretely crafted works, but is the cross-disciplinary outcome of an ensemble of technical or intellectual skills embedded in the general division of labour.'[1]

1 John Roberts, 'Art After Deskilling,' *Historical Materialism* 18 (2010): 91.

Since artistic skills have been reconfigured as conceptual prowess, artists are fully released from the grip of traditional hierarchies, and the author re-fashioned as a multi-tasking executive, who delegates artisanal work, manages projects, takes care of her own publicity, and markets her own product. Paradoxically, based on this accepted account of the development of artistic production and education in the west, we find ourselves caught in a position not where artistic skills and competencies have been tossed aside, but where one set has been replaced by another, where the extension of the artistic skills and competencies into conceptualization processes and intellectual activity has merged with the expansion of the forms and formats for art's symbolic presentation and explication. Contrary to deskilling in the labour force, the 'deskilling' of artistic production does not leave the artist bereft of capabilities, but increases them exponentially. The era of deskilling in art is also the era of deschooling in art education. Untangling the historical and contemporary valences of these terms may help us develop more relevant and critical educational platforms within institutions and without, while questioning the political and ideological significance of our own turns.

Vivian Sky Rehberg is course director of the Master of Fine Art programme at the Piet Zwart Institute, Rotterdam

INTERVIEW WITH JURGEN BEY
Christine Just & Sahar Mohammadrezazadeh

<u>Christine Just & Sahar Mohammadrezazadeh</u>: What do you see as the most important development in art and design education at the moment?

<u>Jurgen Bey</u>: An important change that is taking place in art and design education right now is to do with the emergence of numerous new master's courses. More than ten years have passed since the introduction of the bachelor/master system in Europe, but the development that was initially triggered by the Bologna accords is still taking place. For students, MA programmes may extend the time of education a bit, but also offer an opportunity to people that are interested in research. Whereas completing a bachelor's degree means that you know the profession, a master's course can function less like a learning process and more like a research position. A master's programme should allow students to specialise and develop their own interests. Therefore, some courses should be tailored to the individual student, allowing everyone to engage in their own research. But it may also be interesting to work on a common topic: in these cases there is not only a personal benefit but also a collective process of investigation and learning. Outside of the school, good ideas are often kept for oneself – as an artist or designer, you learn that you need to claim a good idea, protect it and sell it. This often hinders exchange. In education, however, it is simply impossible to sit on all your ideas: you can only learn and develop if you share your knowledge and experience – this is a very special quality of education, and one of the reasons why education is so interesting.

<u>CJ & SM</u>: Besides their relation to research, what are for you the other distinct qualities of postgraduate programmes?

<u>JB</u>: An MA programme also offers an opportunity to reflect critically on a profession or discipline. Undergraduate programmes tend to be tailored to the common ideas and expectations about a profession. An undergraduate programme in graphic design, for instance, seems a good place for training graphic designer with the skills that are usually expected from them. In a master's programme, on the other hand, existing ideas about our profession can be put into question: it is a place where we can rethink what it means to be an artist, a designer, etcetera.

I believe that this question always needs to be redefined in the context of our own time: for instance, what does it mean to be an interior archi-tect today? For a long time, the profession of the interior architect was based on the idea that it was possible to separate between the building and the interior. Nowadays this is no longer obvious. Consider, for in-stance, the trajectory I follow when travelling from Rotterdam to London:

after driving to the airport in a car, I walk straight into the airport, go through a tunnel into an airplane, fly to London in an airplane, go through customs, take the tube, walk through the tunnel from South Kensington to the V&A, then walk outside for 100 meters before entering the building of the RCA. What is the interior here, what is the building? Where does architecture stop and interior design begin? And is it not equally possible to think about this experience from the perspective of other disciplines, for instance that of a filmmaker? It is important to raise such questions — and master's programmes offer a chance to do so while experimenting with possible answers. This is why I thought it was important to work with two different kinds of courses at the Sandberg. On the one hand, we have flexible, changing studios that focus on investigating one specific topic and run only for a limited amount of time. On the other hand, we have permanent studios that remain related to a profession or discipline — such fine art, graphic design, interior architecture, applied arts – while rethinking what this profession means today.

CJ & SM: What are your thoughts about the role of art schools in relation to society?

JB: This is somehow related to the question of research. In my view, the role of the artist is to raise questions, even if they cannot be solved immediately. It is about trying to understand why things are the way they are and to questions the state of things. In art or design school, you may never have encountered a 'real' assignment, only hypothetical ones, but at least you have encountered problems and learned to raise questions. I have been involved in education for a long time – always, in a sense, because I basically started teaching immediately after I graduated myself — and I have a strong belief in the ability of education to make a difference. Especially in the case of master's programmes, one way of making a difference is by allowing students to engage in the kind of research and questioning that is more difficult to sustain outside of school.

In economic and political terms, we are living in a strange and challenging time. The crisis is undoubtedly affecting art and design education: less and less money is available for institutions. Nevertheless, the attitude of students tends to be optimistic, despite the circumstances. There is a belief in the future and an idea that you have to make the world happen. Because students bring this optimism and a desire to change things, I believe that academies can play an important role in a time like ours. Especially now, art and design schools need to provide a space where new ideas can be tested and where new practices can be invented.

Jurgen Bey is a Dutch designer and director of the Sandberg Institute in Amsterdam. In 2002 he co-founded Studio Makkink & Bey, which he leads together with Rianne Makkink.

180 DEGREES
Lucy Cotter

A fly walks across a newspaper. The faster he walks, the faster the words
pass beneath him. The words are moving so fast now, they are streaming
past. No longer words as such but letters, hieroglyphs, patches of black
on white. Places. A full stop becomes a passing island. A 'G' a curved
entrance and a cul-de-sac. A black line becomes a road. The fly changes
direction at random, walking diagonally across the text, running upwards
then downwards. The faster he goes the more the words feel like an
attack; a torrent rushing beneath him. Slowing down, his walk becomes
a dance in and out of blackness.

The train of reading grinds to a halt, its brakes screeching. Visual
literacy and material cognition have now taken centre stage in the
production of knowledge, the former norm of textual literacy considered
too limited for a real encounter with the world. The changeover went more
quickly than was first expected, the seeds already having been planted by
the flourish of practice-based sciences, the rise of artistic research
and the proliferation of material cultural studies. The universities
are a different place now, intellectually (and increasingly physically)
clustered around the art academies. Close looking, listening and touching
replace close reading as the standard academic practices. Students with
poor visual, aural and haptic scores are allowed to apply for the lower,
text-based, parts of the university system. The government is trying to
decide whether to allow them to be granted degrees on the same level.
There is much controversy about the proposition that text-based knowledge
can reach the same standards or be as rigorous in its approach as
practice-based knowledge.

The intuitive knowledge produced through visual and material encounters
is valued as being the direct vision of the mind by the mind with nothing
intervening. The thing in question is no longer cut out of the whole of
reality by language or rational understanding. Reflecting the continuity
of the flow of inner life, the new immediate consciousness is scarcely
distinguishable from the object seen.[1] Studied intellectual endeavor is
now considered a secondary and rather suspicious means of knowing. The
loss of knowledge entailed by prioritizing the 5% of thought produced
consciously was no longer considered an acceptable basis for institutions
that claim to be engaged in knowledge-production.[2]

1 See Henri Bergson, *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*,
New York: Citadel Press, 1992, p. 32–34.

2 George Lakoff and Mark Johnson assert, 'Conscious thought is the tip of an enormous iceberg. It is the rule of thumb among cognitive scientists that unconscious thought is 95 percent of all thought—and that may be a serious underestimate. Moreover, the 95 percent below the surface of conscious awareness shapes and structures all conscious thought.' *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*, New York: Basic Books, 1999, p. 12.

A Japanese architect was asked some years ago why it was almost impossible to locate the door to enter the museum he had designed. His answer was that difficulty would be the quality of the future. Ideas that have sprung from intuition and begin by being obscure are now appreciated for this quality. This obscurity is seen to operate like a torch, shedding light on other areas around itself.[3] There is widespread consensus among academics that the historic focus on textual representation did not only provide an impoverished image of things, but that it took on the weight of an 'index of reality' that had become stabilized to the point of relative inertia.[4] Even those initially against the change of epistemic focus acknowledge the extent to which the new literacies create conditions for new thought. Many embrace the newfound freedom to engage with things that lie beyond the grid of intelligibility.[5] Speculation continues on why such a shift remained beyond discussion in the academic field for so long among the very people who confronted one another at the level of declared interest in intellectual innovation.[6]

3 See Henri Bergson, *The Creative Mind*, p. 30 and 35. Bergson discusses the relative disregard of intuition vis-à-vis intelligence in the history of philosophy.

4 I draw here on Bill Brown's statement that 'Representation does not provide 'impoverished images of things'; rather 'certain segments' of representation 'take on the weight of an index of reality and become stabilized' […].' 'Thing Theory', Critical Inquiry, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Autumn 2001), pp. 1–22, 8.

5 Bill Brown observes, 'Things lie beyond the grid of intelligibility the way mere things lie outside of the grid of museal exhibition, outside of the order of objects.' 'Thing Theory', p. 5.

6 As Pierre Bourdieu suggests, the more fundamental politics of any field lies in 'everything that remains beyond discussion (in the field) that is, beyond the reach of discourse and which is accepted tacitly without discussion or examination by the very people who confront one another at the level of declared political choices.' *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005, p. 132.

Reading has not so much disappeared in the new educational system as been displaced. New reading practices have emerged that aim to undo the forced clarity of text in response to the now widespread recognition that there is inevitably more intellectual content in disorder than in order.[7] Among the new practices, 'generative reading' is perhaps the most prevalent. Guided by the creative reading of dyslexic scholars, texts are read in a staccato-like fashion, pausing at random to produce constantly renewed outcomes. The notable difference between generative reading and post-structural reading is the fluidity of the words themselves, with given letters now perceived in a variety of spontaneously perceived combinations. 'Associative reading' based on observations of artists' engagement with academic text is also common. With this reading practice, students are not encouraged to consider the text in relation to existing

frameworks of references, but as a departure point for an open-ended trajectory of associative thinking. Moments of apprehended meaning and finds through 'misunderstanding' are considered more important here than comprehension in the old sense.

7 See Henri Bergson, *The Creative Mind*, p. 97.

The decision to relegate old-style academic reading to the sidelines and to focus on material outcomes was expected to bring about a short-term decrease in textual output. Often compared to the technique of 'mulching' a garden in which weeds had become too prevalent to be removed singly, it was hoped that the barren period would be followed by unprecedented fertility in writing.[8] In fact the initial silence that emerged immediately opened up possibilities for interpreting that silence, for imputing speech to it and inevitably writing.[9] The writing that has subsequently emerged comes from a different place. Drawing on hands-on knowledge in the flow of life as much as conceptual thinking, it seems to be building a vocabulary and a language of its own, a way of writing that feels closer to making.

8 Mulching is a technique used in gardening in which plastic sheeting is laid around plants to avoid weed growth, or, as I have envisaged it here, an old carpet is laid over a piece of weed-ridden area for a given period to clear the ground and enrich the soil for growth to begin anew.

9 Susan Sontag, 'The Aesthetics of Silence', *A Susan Sontag Reader*, New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1982, pp. 181–204, 191.

The former dominance of reading texts by theorists distanced from practice had instilled a sense of passivity that was verging on hopelessness among the younger generation of students. Perhaps the most dramatic outcome of the epistemic shift has been a newfound sense of agency. Sensitivity to and knowledge of materials and their latent possibilities has facilitated a kind of pouvoir-savoir — a feeling of 'can-do-ness' that comes from really knowing something in the hands-on sense of the word.[10] There is a shared realization that it has not all been done before; that there are ways of thinking that we don't even know about yet.[11]

10 I draw here on Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's retranslation of Michel Foucault's term 'pouvoir-savoir' in 'More on Power/Knowledge' in Thomas E. Wartenberg, ed. *Rethinking Power*, Albany: Suny Press, 1992, pp. 149–173.

11 See Susan Sontag, 'The Aesthetics of Silence', p. 192.

Lucy Cotter, PhD is an independent writer and curator and head of the Master Artistic Research at the Royal Academy of Art, The Hague (KABK). She is currently working on a book entitled *Art and Not Knowing* and guest editing a special edition of *Diecisiete* (Mexico City) on artistic research.

AUTONOMY
Steven ten Thije

Within art education autonomy is perhaps one of the most complicated and paradoxical concepts. Autonomy etymologically refers to something that dictates its own principles — *auto* (self) + *nomos* (law). Traditional education, however, is designed to impose principles on students. So, when one of the first 'autonomous' art schools opened in 1861 in the form of the short-lived 'studio-school' of Gustav Courbet (it was announced as an 'open studio') the first thing Courbet did was to abolish the division between master and student. A more recent example from art history is Joseph Beuys who threw all the work of the students out of the window the first class to create an open situation, which could then be filled with conversations about new work made. All this was then graded with the highest mark since there was no basis for discriminating judgement.

What both these examples point towards is the difficult task given to art educational institutes, and more so the teachers within them, to create a pedagogical framework for an activity — making art — that from the early 19th century was considered more and more as autonomous.

Artistic autonomy thereby is so complex, because it binds together three different ways of understanding autonomy. It refers to the autonomous subject in politics (as the free, autonomous citizen); economics (as the free market); and philosophy (as free speculation). Autonomy thereby is not only present in these fields but also connects them by introducing a similar structure in each domain. Autonomy not only refers to the possibility of something to 'be' autonomous (something that is impossible, since things always exist in relation to other things), but more the human ability to abstract from a situation and to look at things as though they are self-sufficient, as though they are autonomous. Autonomy in this sense refers to the act of separation that is necessary for something to appear as individual and as distinct in the first place.

The philosopher Immanuel Kant famously described this as the ability to experience something as 'purposeful without purpose' — seeing something as at peace with itself, without the person who recognises this self-sufficiency being tempted to interfere with it. This possibility of distancing is the central movement of modernity and marks all the three domains of life — politics, economy and science. Each domain was marked by the possibility to abstract through general laws/free speech, currency/free market, or free speculation/fundamental research, to arrive at a situation that would be the same for everyone and everything. And even if autonomy is perhaps inescapable, it is also experienced as highly problematic, for it bears the stigma of alienation. Even if autonomy was

ÉCOLE TEMPORAIRE. 'École Temporaire, run by Dominique Gonzalez-Foerster, Pierre Huyghe and Philippe Parreno from 1998 to 1999, was a series of workshops conducted at several universities and schools in Europe. In one, the artists rented a cinema for a day and screened a feature film, while narrating potential alternative scenarios before the start of each scene. Another workshop was a seminar held at the top of a mountain, a location only accessible by dogsled. In yet another, the artists interviewed the participants in the middle of a frozen lake. Each workshop was a situation filmed and edited by participants and addressed directly to the students at the beginning of the next class session, creating a chain of connections and continuity, and in this way constituting a school that stretched over a range of times, spaces and institutions.' (Anton Vidokle)

EXPLODING SCHOOL. The concept of the 'exploding school' was developed by anarchist writer Colin Ward, most notably in his book *Streetwork* (1973). In this book, Ward, who has a background as an architectural draughtsman, develops the concern with children's everyday lives and street culture that was also addressed in *The Child in the City* (1978). For Ward, the idea that an anarchist society, as a society that organises itself without authority, was no future possibility but already existed in everyday life 'as a seed beneath the snow', was most clearly expressed in people's self-motivated and self-organised spaces and communities. This expressed itself most clearly in the built environment — for instance in the way children make use of the built environment, which was described by Ward in *The Child in the City*. He argued that children, through play, appropriation and imagination, can counter adult-based intentions and interpretations of the built environment. In *Streetwork*, this idea is connected specifically to his interest in education, focusing on the (possible and already existing) learning practices and spaces outside of the school building — or what he alternatively describes as an 'exploding school' or a 'school without walls'.
See: WARD, COLIN; SCHOOL WITHOUT WALLS; CENTER FOR URBAN PEDAGOGY

FREE INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY. The Free International University (FIU) was an organisation founded in 1973 by German artist Joseph Beuys and run in collaboration with Klaus Staeck, Georg Meistermann and Willi Bongard. As Beuys argued in 1978, the various crises of his time (military, ecological, economical) required the question 'What can be done?' to be substituted by another one: 'How must we think?'. The FIU was considered as a response to this latter question. In terms of its structure, the FIU was intended to supplement the educational institutions provided by the state, but also aspired to legal recognition as an institute of higher education. The project existed as a registered non-profit association until its dissolution in 1988, more than two years after Beuys' death.
See: FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

FREE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK. The Free University of New York (FUNY) was a temporary educational and social project initiated by Allen Krebs, a Marxian economics professor, along with Sharon Krebs and James Mellen in 1965. The university opened in a loft close to Union Square, New York and at first provided a home for professors dismissed from various local academic institutions on the basis of their protest against the Vietnam War, or for holding other divergent views. Teachers included 'poets and writers, disaffected scholars, union organizers, activists, free-lance journalists and publishers , creative individuals of every sort'. Courses ranged from 'hallucinatory drugs to sexual liberation to astrology' and included various politically charged subjects, among which 'Black Liberation', 'Community Organisation', 'The American Radical Tradition', and 'Cuba and China'. Founded as an experimental school for the New Left, the school was influenced by other self-organised schools such as Black Mountain College, which had run during the preceding decades. Tuition for the first ten-week session was $24, with $8 for each additional course, with the possibility for welfare recipients to attend at no cost. As Roy Lisker recounts, in the following years, the school quickly dismantled on the basis of internal conflicts and a dogmatism in defining the curriculum, which prompted critiques of the project not being a 'free' university at all. In the late 1960s, various related projects emerged, based on the model and 'original spirit' of the FUNY, which together became known as the Free University movement – a movement that became especially important for the development of the New Left of the 1960s.
See: ANTIUNIVERSITY

FREIRE, PAOLO. Paolo Freire (1921–1997) was a Brazilian educator and philosopher. He wrote extensively on critical pedagogy and was appointed as Brazil's minister of education in 1988. Freire's most influential text is *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, published in 1968.
See: PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED

FUNNELS AND WEBS. In *Deschooling Society* (1970) Ivan Illich writes: 'Universal education through schooling is not feasible. It would be more feasible if it were attempted by means of alternative institutions built on the style of present schools. […] The current search for new educational *funnels* must be reversed into the search for their institutional inverse: educational *webs* which heighten the opportunity for each one to transform each moment of his living into one of learning, sharing and caring.' Research on the possible use of technology is necessary in order to 'create institutions which serve personal, creative and autonomous interaction and the emergence of values which cannot be substantially controlled by technocrats'. Hence, he argues, we need 'counterfoil research to current futurology.'
SEE: DESCHOOLING SOCIETY

GENERATIVE THEME. The concept of the 'generative theme' is developed by Paolo Freire in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Education, as based on Freire's model of learning situation in which 'teacher-student' and 'students-teachers' engage in a process of collaborative knowledge production, evolves around the collective proposition of a problem or a 'generative theme'. These generative themes are discovered through dialogue and refer to what Freire calls 'limit situations'. As Freire points out, the generative theme 'cannot be found in people, divorced from reality; nor yet in reality, divorced from people; much less in "no man's land." It can only be apprehended in the human-world relationship.'
See: FREIRE, PAOLO; PROBLEM-POSING

GIROUX, HENRY. Henry Giroux is an American cultural critic especially known for his work on education. Along with Paolo Freire, Giroux is considered a founding theorist of the critical pedagogy movement. Giroux distinguishes critical pedagogy firstly from the conservative notion of teaching: 'Teaching for many conservatives is often treated simply as a set of strategies and skills to use in order to teach pre-specified subject matter. In this context, teaching becomes synonymous with a method, technique, or the practice of a craft – like skill training. On the other hand, critical pedagogy must be seen as a political and moral project and not a technique.' Moreover, '[it] is concerned with teaching students how not only to think but to come to grips with a sense of individual and social responsibility, and what it means to be responsible for one's actions as part of a broader attempt to be an engaged citizen.'
See: FREIRE, PAOLO

GOODMAN, PAUL. Paul Goodman (1911–1972) was a novelist, playwrights, social critic and anarchist philosopher. He wrote various books on education and pedagogy, including *Growing Up Absurd* (1960) and *Compulsory Mis-education* (1964).

> See: COMPULSORY MIS-EDUCATION; MORATORIA

GROUNDCOURSE. The 'Groundcourse' was run by Roy Ascott at the Ealing and Ipswich art schools during the 1960s. Ascott, an artist, theorist and new media pioneer, was appointed at Ealing in 1961 to run the foundation course, which was inspired by the famous *Vorlehre* at the Bauhaus. He saw pedagogy as an extension of his artistic practice, which was especially linked to his interest in cybernetics. Particularly striking was his engagement with process and method, combined with the attempt to integrate various disciplines into his artistic practice. Besides various artists, Ascott amongst others involved a behavioural psychologist, biologist, engineer, sociologist and linguist in the programme. Art education was to function as a 'total process', based on various ways of 'stimulating consciousness'. As curator and writer Emily Pethick recounts in an essay on Ascott, among the many experiments that Ascott and his colleagues devised for his students involved an exposure to continuous flashes of extreme light in a dark lecture theatre, followed by their release in a hall filled with marbles. At Ipswich, for the 'Quadrangle Incident' project, the staff locked a group of students in the courtyard for over an hour.

> See: CONSTRUCTION OF CHANGE

HIDDEN CURRICULUM. The 'hidden curriculum' is a key concept in critical pedagogy and the critiques of the school as an institution. It plays an important role in the work of Henry Giroux and is employed, amongst others, by Ivan Illich in *Deschooling Society*. Here the 'hidden curriculum' is considered as a side effect of an education — lessons 'which are learned but not openly intended' (Jane Martin). As Roland Meighan has pointed out in his *Sociology of Education* (1981), 'the hidden curriculum is taught by the school, not by any teacher […] something is coming across to the pupils which may never be spoken in the English lesson or prayed about in assembly. They are picking up an approach to living and an attitude to learning.' Hence, the hidden curriculum concerns those lessons learned by pupils and students simply by attending school, such as the interaction with authority figures.

> See: FREIRE, PAOLO; GIROUX, HENRY; PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED

ILLICH, IVAN. Ivan Illich (1926–2002) was a social theorist and philosopher with Austrian, American, Mexican and German origins. Illich is well known for his critique of institutionalised forms of education, as it was set out in works like *Deschooling Society* (1971). He was also a co-founder of the controversial Center for Intercultural Documentation (CIDOC) in Cuernavaca and, in the 1960s, taught research seminars on 'Institutional Alternatives in a Technological Society'.

> See: DESCHOOLING SOCIETY

INFORMAL LEARNING. The concept of informal or 'casual' learning may be distinguished from the formal modes of learning that take place in an institutional context, typically defined in terms of the coupling of learning to teaching and, traditionally, the concept of instruction. As Ivan Illich has (amongst many others) stressed, most learning 'happens casually, and even most intentional learning is not the result of programmed instruction'. In *Deschooling Society*, he writes: 'Normal children learn their first language casually, although faster if their parents pay attention to them. […] Fluency in reading is also more often than not a result of […] extra-curricular activities. Most people who read widely, and with pleasure, merely believe that they learned to do so in school, when challenged, they easily discard this illusion.' Of course, this does not mean that planned learning cannot benefit from planned instruction — especially when acquiring skills.

> See: INSTRUCTION

INSTITUT DES HAUTES ÉTUDES EN ARTS PLASTIQUES. Co-founded in 1983 by curator Pontus Hultén and artist Daniel Buren, the Institut des Hautes Études en Arts Plastiques (IHE) was a centre for contemporary research in artistic creation based in Paris. The institute was small in scale and run by a fixed teaching group, consisting of Hultén and a few other permanent tutors. In addition to this, various guests were invited to take part in the programme and engage with the students in diverse ways. The institute has been described by Hultén as a crossover between the Bauhaus in Weimar and Black Mountain College; Buren describes the pedagogical model on which the programme was based as a kind of 'teaching without teaching'. Students had the chance to be confronted with the practices of various artists, but could form their own judgements about these practices.

INSTRUCTION. Ivan Illich develops a critical concept of instruction in his *Deschooling Society*, which is meant to detach it from the dominant mode of certification, which is based on passing through a curriculum in its entirety. 'Instruction is the choice of circumstances which facilitate learning. Roles are assigned by setting a curriculum of conditions which the candidate must meet if he is to make the grade.' Because 'learning frequently is the result of instruction, but selection for a role or category in the job market increasingly depends on mere length of attendance', school 'links instruction — but not learning – to these roles. This is neither reasonable nor liberating. It is not reasonable because it does not link relevant qualities or competences to roles, but rather the process by which such qualities are supposed to be acquired.'

LEARNING/TEACHING. One of the 'major illusions on which the school system rests', so Ivan Illich argues in *Deschooling Society*, is the assumption that 'most learning is the result of teaching': 'Teaching, it is true, may contribute to certain kinds of learning under certain circumstances. But most people acquire most of their knowledge outside school, and in school only in so far as school, in a few rich countries, has become their place of confinement during an increasing part of their lives'.

> See: DESCHOOLING SOCIETY; ILLICH, IVAN; INFORMAL LEARNING

LOCKED ROOM. The most notorious part of the 'A' Course, which ran at St Martins from 1969 to 1973, was an exercise referred to as the Materials Project or sometimes as 'Locked Room' project. On the first day of the course, the group of participating students worked in a room set aside for their exclusive use, from which they could not leave without permission and from which non-participants were excluded. They were provided with a series of materials – initially blocks of Styrofoam – and a set of rules. The rules forbid the use any other material beyond that handed to them and disallowed verbal communication during the six-week project.

> See: A COURSE

MORATORIA. As Paul Goodman argues in his *Compulsory Mis-education* (1962), educational policy 'must allow for periodic quitting and easy return to the scholastic ladder, so that the young have time to find themselves and to study when they are themselves ready'. Goodman refers to a proposal developed by Eric Erikson (1902–1994), a German-born American developmental psychologist and psychoanalyst, who argued for the importance of moratoria – temporary prohibitions of activity, a term that derives from the Latin *morari*, delay — in the psychosocial development of the individual. Goodman also bases the idea for 'periodic quitting' on the anthropological studies of

considered a precondition for modern society, it required the subject to break its connection with its direct environment and this was often regarded with negativity, as being thrown into an existence marked by inauthenticity.

Art plays a remarkable and paradoxical role within this complex economy of separation as both the ultimate icon of separations, while simultaneously being the last fortress for an authentic experience. Artworks are 'separation perfected', to use the tile of the first chapter of Guy Debord's *Society of the Spectacle*. They have no function other than to be and cannot be used by anyone except for a moment of experience in which case the meaning is completely exhausted in that intense moment of experience itself. (Something that has given rise to large touristic economy in which people undertake long journeys to see the original.) As though through a beautiful inversion modernity gave itself its one moment of authenticity — of completely being in line with what is — through the completely inauthentic work of art. (It is clear that in this, the work of art also was — and perhaps still is — a substitute for religious experience, which offers a similar moment of absolute tranquillity.)

The possibility to engage in this experience in modern society is facilitated by various institutions and practices among which the museum is perhaps the most central. In the museum the artwork is separated twice. First, it is placed physically in a separate building where it is allowed to be itself on the basis of its being removed from any other social context. Second, it is placed within an historical framework, making it — even if it is a contemporary piece — immediately a thing of the past and as such, distanced. This dual separation was supported by the academic discipline of art history, which formalised in parallel to the museum throughout the 19th century and created a more or less autonomous vocabulary to describe the intrinsic development of art. More generally autonomy became latently present all the time in the form of a 'museal' perspective that one could take up at any given moment, by abstracting from a given situation to look at it autonomously. The most famous instance of this latent ubiquity of an autonomous, museal experience is found in Marcel Duchamp's 'ready-made' which transformed common objects into objects that could be considered autonomously.

Within the field of art education, as already stated, this complex status of art as the concentrated form of modernity's general autonomy places both student and teacher in constant state of paradox. Constantly both have to ask themselves why they either give or take advice to make something that should be judge only for what it is itself. From the mid-19th century until very late into the 20th century (perhaps deteriorating after the events of 1989), this paradox was resolved through the historical concept of 'newness'. The work that was considered to be autonomous was the work that did not comply with existing formal principles and as such dictated its own laws. The most common name given to this model is the notion of being 'avant-garde'. This model, still present in the way in which art is made and discussed, has the great advantage of cohering with the historiographical function of the museum

and even produces a situation in which all art in some sense is made for the museum. It is in the museum, where all the variations of art from the past are collected and displayed, that the 'new' can stand out. To educate somebody to become an artist has therefore long meant to educate him or her in the history of art so that the artist can consciously introduce a new form into the already existing collection. Both Courbet and Beuys's gestures are part of this paradigm.

Recently, however, globalisation has broken the universality of the idea of 'one' history of art by introducing a multiplicity and simultaneity of several histories. Something that is intensified through the possibility of the Internet. This has put pressure on the historical paradigm and requires that the structure in which art is embedded needs updating. One can notice that the different proposals to do this follow the demarcation lines of politics, economics and science. In the '90s, and in fact already in the '80s, there was a considerable boom in the art market that created a situation in which art was no longer validated by the museum or art history, but by the market itself. This produced a whole separate economy of collectors and even new institutions, such as the Saatchi Gallery in which the auction plays a central role and is perhaps the moment where the work of art is most appreciated.

In parallel to this, one can also notice an increase in a new type of political art, going by the quite compelling title of 'relational art' or 'relational aesthetics', introduced by the French curator and critic Nicholas Bourriaud. In this field artworks have a tendency to completely dissolve in public life and in some cases are not even perceived as art anymore.

Finally there is the development that seeks to formalise art as knowledge production and manifests itself under the header of 'artistic research'. This domain has political backing within Europe as a result of the Bologna treaty that restructured higher education within Europe and made the possibility of artists' PhDs not only a theoretical speculation, but also an institutional reality.

In all these three domains the complex of the autonomy of art is somehow maintained, but is separated from its modern historical form. The most direct consequence of this is that the context in which artworks find themselves is more present and heteronomous then before. Artworks are much more directly and also sometimes solely considered as a speculative investment, a political proposal or a scientific theory.

Art education is still adjusting to this new reality. One general tendency appears to be a stronger emphasis on 'theory', which often is as a container term for all discursive activity that is linked to the work itself, but is not the work itself. To secure the specificity of the work, artists can no longer rely on the double protection offered by the museum and art history. Artists are now trained to position their work within a heteronomous context and need to redefine their autonomy and its paradoxical useless use by other means.

The consequences of this trend are difficult to predict, but structurally it results in a new type of artistic practice. In this practice an artist is educated to provide both the work itself and the interpretive context. By doing so the artist is no longer trained to make a historic work that belongs to pre-existing art history, but the artist more uses artistic strategies to engage with a certain topic and contexts that can be completely heteronomous to art history. It creates an open, but also uncertain situation, in which the skills the artist has are not understood as the skills to make a master piece, but are more considered as offering a distinct form of reflection that is more a way to approach something, than that it is something to be valued for itself as art. Art in this case is more a form of approaching something or a form of knowledge that can be 'used' to engage with many different subjects or situations. It changes art's autonomy into the autonomy of the artistic perspective. How to employ this perspective effectively is an important challenge for art education today and one that certainly is not resolved.

Steven ten Thije is a researcher and curator. He is currently writing his PhD at Hildesheim University, supported by the Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven. In relation to this project, he also works as a research curator for *Play Van Abbe*, an exhibition programme that started in November 2009.

INTERVIEW WITH ANTONIS PITTAS
Julia Retz & Laura Holzberg

<u>Julia Retz & Laura Holzberg</u>: Being a practising artist, what motivates you to engage in teaching?

<u>Antonis Pittas</u>: I do not necessarily have a clear idea about this. To some extent teaching probably responds to a need for a shared engagement with questions and problems that are important for students, but also for me. In my view, art education is for a large part built up around such relations of exchange that appear around shared problems. Because you often deal with problems that you have in common, the conversations are not only useful for students but often also for myself. On the way home, when I on my bike, I try to reflect on the discussions I have had. I try think about the problems we have discussed, what I have said and how all of this relates to my own practice. The teaching really helps me to position myself, and establish a clear relation between what I am saying and doing.

But teaching also responds to another, more basic need: it can give me a feeling of being directly helpful and useful. This may sound quite bizarre, but as an artist it is of course easy to doubt whether the work you are doing in your studio is actually useful. On the one hand, the need and the motivation for having an artistic practice are simply there, almost automatically. On the other hand, the relation between my personal views and society is an important concern — something I question constantly. Of course, you can establish this relation to society through the work, and this is of course something that I am trying to do. But still I feel that this relation is not as direct and immediately gratifying as in teaching. When I teach, I feel that I am contributing to society in a very direct way – it somehow makes me feel more real and have a certain attachment with reality that is not always present in studio practice.

<u>JR & LH</u>: How do you see your role as a teacher? You refer to teaching in terms of 'helping' — what kind of helping is this?

<u>AP</u>: I tend to consider my role as that of a coach. What does it mean to think of teaching art in terms of coaching? The idea that I work in parallel with my students and that we are building up things together really appeals to me. Occasionally I give some instructions, but in the end I am only supporting and assisting the work of the student. The main engine of the discussion is criticality: to constantly question the work, to question our questions, and develop the work in doing so. I tend to ask a lot of questions, but of course questions can make a specific point as well. On other occasions I act as a solution maker:

to identify the obstacles and problems that the student runs up against and to help finding a solution. I bring in my own taste and views, but always try to understand who is in front of me and adapt to the needs of the student. This is not always easy: you are often constrained to half an hour talks in you office. In order to be effective you need to be fast and straightforward. At the same time, you need to be open enough to understand what you can contribute. So you work together, but not on the basis of the romantic idea of a friendship between teacher and student, that you often encounter in art schools. To coach means that you maintain a certain distance, a difference in perspective, but that you still take on a responsibility for the work, which means that the results of the student also affect you. I think this shared responsibility is very important in art education, maybe even necessary.

This also means that teaching is based on some kind of generosity, and that a good artist is not necessarily a good teacher. Teaching requires specific kinds of talents and skills. I cannot stand it when a teacher is hired purely on the basis of their fame, or because someone has a weird or interesting personality. In many art schools there is a tendency to mix up these criteria.

JR & LH: To what extent should students be able to devise their own curriculum? What aspects of art education should be left open for students to decide on?

AP: I do believe that it is important to give students a certain responsibility for their own education. At the same time, the tendency to endow students with more of a say about their programme often means that the institution itself no longer takes a clear position. In my experience it is too often a safe option for the institution not to take the responsibility for a curriculum and simply let the students choose. There are certainly some dangers and pitfalls in this approach, which often seems to innocent. Students should have some freedom in forming their own curriculum, but sometimes it is beneficial to stage this process by offer very specific options rather than a complete freedom of choice. Again, I think that this should be about a shared responsibility. In a way it makes no sense to oppose the institution to students: the academy is a shared space that is always in part shaped by the students and teachers that are attached to it at a certain moment.

JR & LH: So it is important to distinguish clearly between teacher and student?

AP: I think it is important that there is a clear distinction between teacher and student, even if we absolutely need to question this distinction time and time again. The relation teacher/student seems almost archetypal, and I doubt if there is even a possibility of escaping from it. In a meeting with a student the distinction between student and teacher is in way already there, before anything has been said. This is not even about the tone of the conversation, how we talk, the language we use – the distinction also exists when I do not play the authoritarian

teacher. The situation is, as it were, already staged and the roles have been devised. I try to be very clear about this, and always remind myself and the student of the roles that we are in. I do not believe in an approach to teaching that is based on equality, friendship, and so on because it is just a lie – it denies an asymmetrical relationship that is clearly there.

JR & LH: Do you show your own work to students? To what extent do you separate between your work as a teacher and as a practicing artist?

AP: Either I do not show my work or I do it at the end of the year or workshop. When I show my work, some students like it, others do not – but that is not really the problem. As soon as students know your work, every question that you pose or any response you give may be seen through this filter. Sometimes it entirely dominates the relationship to students. Already after a brief introduction of my practice some students assume to understand your position, what you are thinking, or your expectations. If students have too clear a concept of your work and your intentions, it blocks possibilities in discussions. This is why I try to avoid showing it and leave some ambiguity about my position, except of course from those situations where I am explicitly invited to also present my work to students. In that case I show it in the end – I hope this at least introduces a period in which there is some doubt about your views.

Antonis Pittas is an artist based in Amsterdam. His work mainly consists of context-sensitive spatial installations, informed by architecture, art history, and the performative aspects of installation. Pittas teaches at the Rietveld Academy in Amsterdam and acted as a visiting tutor at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts in Copenhagen.

ARTISTIC PRACTICE AS LEARNING PRACTICE
Bik Van der Pol

We are in a period of abrupt transition. Recent occupations of public
squares, together with increasing and brutal capitalisation of private
information, firmly shows that it is necessary to re-establish
'public space' as a site of potential conflict over rights, information,
relations and objects. Today's public space urgently calls for
(re)articulation, so that the communities formed by and through these
events — 'called to order' by them — can take hold and enter the order
of the political. It needs to be conceived as a space that is recurrent
rather than permanent — a space that makes visible (that is to say
public) what is at stake. Debates over forms of common property such as
knowledge and culture show that public space is to be understood in the
broadest terms possible — as that which holds the fabric of experience-
as-community together. Threatened by forms or acts of exclusion,
privileged access and disinformation, these sites of public property are
just as precarious as natural resources, and need to be rearticulated
time and again. If the current economic paradigm forces us to retreat
from the realm of publicness, then what constitutes the public issue
today? This question is urgent in light of the current increase of
private ownership and privatisation, worldwide.

As political and economical forces have come to shape the perception of
culture, (art) education — regarded as a place of cultural production
— has fallen behind. Education and learning need to reclaim space; they
are means to participate in politics, and create forms of political
socialisation. If art is a form of organising relationships that can
produce new meaning and experiences, thereby effecting disruptions
or significant change in everyday life, it is timely to reinvest in
its place in society, especially in a world where the value of art is
increasingly challenged.

Taking this question very seriously, we founded the School of Missing
Studies in 2003 as a collaboration with artists, thinkers, and
architects. Initiated as a part of our practice, it is an organic,
nomadic, collaborative platform for experimental study and research of
the public environment — public space, public time, public good — as
it is marked by the current transitions. One of the qualities of the
project is that it may appear and disappear here and there, organised
by different initiators, in different forms. It escapes control and
formalisation. The latest stage of the project is an intervention in the
Sandberg Institute, where the school will operate as a as a temporary
master's programme. The question how to organise this, or rather,
the impossibility of organising it (and accepting this as an asset)
introduces the 'missing' into the School of Missing Studies.

Learning is a space of experience and encounter; as such it can be
a strategy for emancipation, and a potential response to public issues.
We strongly believe in the ability of artists to be in charge of their
own 'context' in a public environment — both in terms of production and
presentation. Taking the speculative, the undefined, the 'missing' into
account, artistic practice has the potential to turn the School — as
a model of learning, as a case study in itself — into a public sphere,
while investigating the socio-cultural and political functions of public
space. This school can be a spatial practice, spending time on analysis,
speculation and imagination, while employing relevant theoretical
writings and reflections on current developments. It can be based on
a kind of learning that is rooted in practice as a process of continuous
reconfiguration, using dialogue as its major mode of transfer. With this
in mind, the School of Missing Studies aims to develop a site where
artistic practices are articulated in dialogue and collaboration with
other fields of knowledge, ideally generating political agency towards
the need of a more 'general' practice for effecting change and innovation
in society. In the collective attempt to find common and uncommon ground,
participants examine how their individual practices can be positioned in
the context of abrupt transition, developing conceptual tools and methods
for a form of critical (self)education. This is how we work.

Artists Liesbeth Bik and Jos van der Pol have been collaborating
as Bik Van der Pol since 1994. Living and working in Rotterdam, their
practice engages with research and knowledge production, often seeking
to create platforms for communication and exchange.

Stanley Diamond, which emphasise that 'society neglects the crises of growing up'.

See: GOODMAN, PAUL

The MOUNTAIN SCHOOL OF ARTS is an artist-run school based in Los Angeles. Founded in 2005 by Piero Golia and Eric Wesley, the school offers a programme independent from academic institutions. Rather than a replacement to the university system, the MSA considers itself a 'supplement and amendment'. The small, fully functioning school now offers full scholarships to its group of students and may serve as an example of a more enduring self-initiated school.

MUTUAL AID. Mutual aid is a term in organisation theory, designating a voluntary reciprocal exchange of resources and services for mutual benefit. In Peter Kropotkin's theory of mutual aid, set out in his book *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902), which emphasizes the role of cooperation in evolution in addition to struggle, small groups based on this principle are discussed as a counter-model to the concept of the autonomous individual. Groups based on a principle of mutual aid are typically free to join and participate in, and the engagement in activities takes place on a voluntary basis. They are often non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic and non-profit, member-led and member-organised, with members controlling all resources. Historic examples of mutual aid groups include medieval craft guilds, the 'fraternity societies' that existed in the United States during the Great Depression, and the English 'workers' clubs' of the 1930 that provided health insurance.

See: WARD, COLIN

NON-SCHOOL. In 1966 Fluxus artists Robert Fillious and George Brecht founded the Non-School of Villefrance in Villefranche-sur-Mer, a French village. The motto of the school: 'A carefree exchange of information and experience. No students, no teachers. Perfect licence, at times to listen at times to talk.' The school, which consisted of little more than its motto, was one of the various projects that Fillious and Brecht initiated at the time, including their International Centre of Permanent Creation, which was to accommodate a variety of activities such as inventing games, writing letters and poems, and telling jokes, alongside the 'non-boutique' called *La Cédille qui sourit* (The Cedilla that Smiles), a 'sort of workshop and shop' where Fluxus multiples and small works were put on display.

NOVA SCOTIA. Nova Scotia College of Art and Design is an art school located in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada. During the 1970s, the school enjoyed an exceptional reputation for its emphasis on artistic innovation and political engagement. Gerry Kennedy, who was appointed as director in 1967, made the invitation of practicing artists as visiting tutors into a spearhead of his programme — a strategy that must have been especially effective because of the school's remote and relatively isolated location. Among the invited artists were Vito Acconci, Sol LeWitt, Dan Graham, Eric Fischl, Lawrence Weiner and Joseph Beuys.

PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED. Paolo Freire's book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968) is considered as one of the foundational texts of the critical pedagogy movement. In his book, Freire develops a model of pedagogy based on a specific set of relations between teacher, student and society — a model counterposed to the 'banking model', a concept Freire employs to describe the dominant mode of organising education.

See: FREIRE, PAOLO; BANKING MODEL

PROBLEM-POSING. The 'problem-posing concept of education' is introduced by Paolo Freire as an alternative to the 'banking' concept. He argues that it is crucial to abandon the goal and model of 'deposit-making' and, instead, 'replace it with the posing of the problems of human beings in their relations with the world'. Students define the 'problem', encountered in their everyday experience, collectively; learning starts from the posing of this problem as an act of 'co-investigation', while encountering new problems in the process. The 'banking' concept distinguishes two stages in the action of the educator: the first one, in which 'he prepares his lessons in his study or his laboratory'; a second one where 'he expounds to his students about that object'. The 'problem-posing' concept, by contrast, 'does not dichotomize the activity of the teacher-student'. It is 'not "cognitive" at one point and "narrative" at another' but 'always "cognitive," whether preparing a project or engaging in dialogue with the students'. Hence, Freire argues, '[t]he students – no longer docile listeners — are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher.'

See: FREIRE, PAOLO; GENERATIVE THEMES; CENTER FOR URBAN PEDAGOGY

PUBLIC SCHOOL. The Public School was founded by Sean Dockray and Fiona Whitton, emerged out of the gallery Telic Arts Exchange in Chinatown, Los Angeles. Dockray and Whitton describe the project as a 'school with no curriculum', in which classes are collectively proposed by the public on the TPS website. Essentially doing away with the superstructure of institutions and degrees, informal teachers and students, organizers and collaborators all find each other through the TPS interface to learn on their own terms. Conceived as a model (rather than a singular experiment), The Public School posits itself as a concrete alternative to dominant views and current tendencies in academia and consequently takes on an exceptional structure, characterised by an organisational mobility between positions of teacher, student and administrator, a specific economy, and potential reproducibility.

PUBLIC SCHOOL (FOR ARCHITECTURE). The Public School (for Architecture) New York was organised by architecture practice Common Room together with Telic Arts Exchange as an offspring of their Public School platform. Classes were held during the fall of 2009 in classroom installations that were temporarily located within existing cultural institutions.

See: PUBLIC SCHOOL

SCHOOL OF GLOBAL ART. The School of Global Art is a — thus far fictional — art school run by artist collective Lucky PDF. The School of Global Art 'provides a unique mix of online always-on resources with a real-world network of experts and professional, connecting you to the knowledge and skills that will empower you to learn, and to learn to learn'.

SCHOOL WITHOUT WALLS. Anarchist writer Colin Ward used the term 'school without walls' to refer to his idea the various extra-institutional learning practices that could take place (and already do take place) in the appropriation of spaces of everyday life, using as an example children's 'anti-authoritarian' appropriation of the urban space designed by adults. As Ward's collaborator Ken Worpole has described it, the point 'was to help get children out of school and into their communities, to talk to local people, and explore their neighbourhood, its amenities and utilities, and understand how buildings, streets, landscapes and social life interact'.

See: EXPLODING SCHOOL

SCHOOLING AND DESCHOOLING. Ivan Illich develops the concept of 'de-schooling' in his seminal *Deschooling Society* of 1970. In the opening chapter, called 'Why We Must Disestablish School', Illich criticises the process of schooling: 'Many students, especially those who are poor, intuitively know what the schools do for them. They school them to confuse

BEGINNINGS
Stine Hebert

Taking up a new position quite naturally involves thoughts about a new
beginning. Beyond my own personal experience of recently becoming the
dean of an art school, the notion of beginnings is important to consider
when thinking about education, since so much of the understanding
surrounding this subject seems to be determined by the logic of
progression: one simply starts at one point (admission) and ends up at
another (graduation). Perhaps this logic directs our thinking to such
an extent that it is worth suspending it for a moment in order to better
grasp what kind of education this interpretation proposes.

Beginnings are acts or processes of bringing something into being, which
in the case of art education involves organising the self in relation
to the academy as an institution, and for the self to determine a
relationship to the power at play in the kind of knowledge production
implied by this arrangement. Acquiring knowledge is not to be mistaken
for accumulating knowledge, and the process of becoming knowledgeable
cannot be situated in a locality that is entirely prearranged by the
institution. Deciding how to engage with the framework of the academy
is a quest and an important part of the preparation for working as an
artist, which involves finding a way to navigate its structures but also
to deal with the mutual expectations at play between the individual
student on one hand and the institution on the other.

In the case of art schools, some might argue that these expectations
are rather vague and as a consequence hard to traverse. The wide
implementation of the Bologna Process has satisfied the desire for
measuring outcome and impact for certain stakeholders by developing
'a comparability in standards' and a homogeneous structure based on
the bachelor/master division. However, for many of the people actively
working with those parameters this imposed mode of organising their work
has perhaps cleared up some questions while simultaneously creating
others. Having recently become part of an art school that has remained
outside of the Bologna Process myself, I often find myself wondering
about the potential harboured by other possible ways of organising
education and understanding the work of educating.

Today education has on many levels become connected to the marketability
of the degree that follows with the endeavour of having studied at an
educational institution. The implementation of BFA and MFA degrees has
supported that development and hence necessitates that the beginning
must lead to the end, otherwise it remains unclear what the value of
the education might be. An academy without degrees causes confusion in
this system of value fabrication and consumption. This is something I am

currently experiencing first-hand, spending much time at my desk to write letters in support of students who apply for international exchanges with other art schools or for funds to do independent projects, simply in order to officially certify that these students have in fact spent valuable time engaged with an institutionalised knowledge production that just happens not to be quantified by a formal degree. What does it mean in our contemporary culture for students to begin, perhaps begin over and over again, without getting to reach the conventional end point and instead graduate without a degree? The bureaucracy of insisting on remaining outside of Bologna is hence substantial and it is important to clarify what could be gained by it.

Etymologically speaking educating originates from the Latin *educatus* and *educare* — bringing up and out. This description supports the idea that progression constitutes the underlying dynamic of our understanding of learning, which in effect suggests the beginning has failed if it does not lead to its predetermined end result. If we desire to explore a move beyond this closed circuit, considering a beginning merely as the predecessor to an end, the follow-up question seems to be: when does one actually take up an education? If the organisation of education at an academy spans from admission to graduation, what would happen if this model was less rigid and linear?

Learning is an ongoing endeavour, which is obstructed when considered to have an end. With a more flexible institutional framework, learning requires an active engagement to be involved in formulating and defining this structure — an engagement that constitutes a process of education in itself. In such a situation it is up to each student to figure out how they wish to be involved in the institution and shape this framework for a period of time, but also how the self can be organised in relation to it. This perception of self-organisation goes beyond an oppositional position that is mutually exclusive to the institution, and is instead focused on challenging the relationships in our society — and, in this case, the relationship between the self and the organised community of the academy. Without a fixed structure in place, art education may not have one but several beginnings. If the structure of the academy and one's own relation to it can be continually rearticulated, art education could entail an open learning process that, I believe, holds great potential for developing independent artists, highly skilled at navigating the complexity of their profession and profoundly conscious of the conditions they engage with.

Stine Hebert is a curator and dean of Funen Art Academy. She is a co-editor of the anthology *Self-Organised* (Open Editions, 2013).

Mu-Chieh Chen, Christine Just, Dennis Schuivens, Haruka Uemura,
Julia Retz, Laura Holzberg, Sahar Mohammadrezazadeh

Editors: Does education play a role in your work as activist, organiser
and editor?

Marc Herbst: As an editor of a journal that is involved in political
and cultural organising and in educational projects, I constantly try
to understand what this work actually achieves. I constantly ask:
'What is this project? What are the diverse acts, of participating in
social movements and cultural flows, of living a conscious life and
participating in "civil society", of viewing and making *art*?' Through the
many conversations I have had with others, I arrived at the conclusion
that these are all processes of *continuing education* — of continuing
education, of self-education and of political education within a person
and a people's lifespan.

Experience, aesthetic experience in general, is a continued process
of education. And much political organising, in my view, is a series
of composed learning moments within that process. Within these continued
moments, those involved learn how to constitute and mediate power while
sharing interests across time, done in the shared space that is all our
existence. This is, at its root, an educational process. *Learning to be*,
together.

I have been involved in educational work individually and collectively,
through *The Journal of Aesthetics & Protest*. This has been traditional work
(as a university teacher and lecturer) but also less traditional
work, running teach-ins at campsites and campuses, doing agitprop,
gallery-based artwork, discursive projects — and as a random person
in the general flow of life. Some of these actions have been effective
at changing policies or hearts, or at directing collective productions
and investigations.

Less effective actions, upon reflection, have been very educational.
They represent things that have been, witnessed and shared; they
create a collective vocabulary for further reflection. These object
lessons offer their reflectivity to my friends at an interpersonal
level, but also occurs at local, regional and international scales with
different objects.

Ed.: You have been involved in the Occupy movement, of which
self-organised seminars, reading groups and libraries were a key part.
What are your thoughts about the role of education in the context of
a social movement like this?

MH: Yes, I was involved in the Occupation struggles at the University of California (UC) in 2009–2010, that are understood as one precursor of Occupy Wall Street. More recently, during the early weeks of Occupy Wall Street, our journal tried organising an abstract education project within Zucotti Park and other Occupy sites.

In 2009 the University of California was intensifying its slow suicide with tuition increases and austerity governance. This resulted in campus occupations in Northern California and various wildcat solidarity strikes that were unprecedented within the US in terms of their radicality. My peers and I, who worked as adjuncts throughout the UC system, had (by nature of our contractual relationships) little real information on our rights and capacities within the system. We began emailing one another gossip from around our campuses and sharing our own intentions for actions. This circular washing through of information became a whirlpool of empowerment. Soon after, we and others began to collectively organise a large non-academic encounter around these events: the Public School in Los Angeles. Because this project was not situated in a university, we decided to focus on the broader economic crisis. Because of its general appeal, we were able to dynamically incorporate local DIY cultural institutions. Theorist Brian Holmes got involved, and our organising resulted in a three-day encounter of theory and practice which drew folks from up and down the coast and east to the deserts and beyond.

Three things about the event were intellectually electrifying. Firstly, it was clarifying to so clearly witness how the relative institutional positions of each participant (tenured faculty, supported postgraduates, musicians, artists at very different positions in their careers, community organisers, etcetera) deeply informed their cultural praxis. Moreover, because of the intensity of the moment and its insistence on criticality, these days allowed our Los Angeles community to share concepts and critical observations that had been sitting unspoken within larger groups. The challenge of the occupations, wildcat strikes and their call for collective action, which addressed California's crisis of capitalism, had provided us with real objects over which to agonise. Finally, because this event was formally DIY, it avoided certain pitfalls of more spectacular discursive forms. These pitfalls are primarily the abstraction of knowledge; the allowance for knowledge to be misused by capital as a tool of social stratification, against solidarity. As a result, this event brought a lot of people together in thought, spawning new collaborations and initiatives.

Ed.: What about your experience at Occupy Wall Street?

MH: I viewed the early days of Occupy Wall Street (OWS) from a distance. If you remember, one question dogging its early successes was whether or not the movement needed an articulated agenda, a '5 Point Plan' or whatever. We at *The Journal of Aesthetics & Protest* were passionate about the concept that the success of OWS was primarily based on its appearance of being almost apolitically agenda-less. We understood that the American media was able to portray the occupation as an odd phenomenon that

required investigation and thought. By lacking a clear agenda, the movement avoided the usual marginalisation of the left by the American media.

We understood OWS then as an explosive forum, a uniquely contemporary model of popular education — an open air civics classroom. In many instances of Occupy, formal educational processes occurred throughout the protest. The many committees (several Occupy protests had specific education committees) proposed teach-ins and themed conversations on a daily basis. These committees often valorised lecturers for their pedigree and cache, though this valorisation was challenged in the instance of practice. Los Angeles, for example, had tents dedicated both to structured dialogs with formal presentations and to looser, open-ended discussions. A good slice of Los Angeles' diverse population came down to Occupy and participated in one form or other. These formal modes were, in addition to the presentations (music, lectures, film screenings), occurring on Los Angeles' more centrally located 'stage'.

That is one way in which education took place — at the most formalised level. But there was a far broader field of education occurring within the school of *being at Occupy*. It is a more experiential schooling, which involved a space of difference that was collectively constituted. Its easy to understand the process of the 'mic check' as some form of Socratic education. Furthermore, how else might we understand the communalising of existential necessity, of feeding and housing people, of engaging in legal processes, of getting along with one another then, than as one large educational experience?

As a project, our journal tried to take snapshots of this collective learning process. We used tools from the dramatically named processes of 'militant research'. It was a very ambitious project, too ambitious in fact to organise from a distance.[1] Militant research is research method began by the labour researcher-organisers in the United States and refined by Italian Leftists in the 1960s and 70s. One process has organisers asking structured but open-ended questions to specific populations in order to instigate and generalise particular lines of thought. Our goal was to do mass-surveys at OWS in order to provide a shared interrogation for all involved, while also collecting very precise data on the socio-cultural understanding and formulations occurring within Zucotti and elsewhere.

1 The results of the project can be found online at: http://joaap.org/webspecials/dispatches.html

Marc Herbst is an artist, independent scholar, activist and writer. He is co-editor of the *Journal of Aesthetics and Protest*.

Today, higher education is a fiercely contested issue. As the academy is increasingly exposed to market forces and ceaseless bureaucratisation, the institutions and practices of education need to be both defended and rethought — as a public good, as an autonomous sphere, and as a site of political subjectivation.

Art education occupies a peculiar position in this context. With the advent of the creative industries, art schools and departments have ceased to operate from a position in the margins of the academic system. Art and design education has become increasingly formalised, while at the same time giving rise to a variety of new divisions and specialisations, ranging from the proliferation of postgraduate courses to practice-base doctoral studies. The academy's relative distance from government interference, based on the outdated notion that cultural production has no real economic significance, is no longer compatible with the hopes and expectations projected on the so-called creative sector. In an attempt to regulate so-called productivity and performance, art academies are increasingly subjected to mechanisms of assessment and evaluation.

But the same autonomy that is threatened by these processes is in also a prerequisite of art education – especially in the contemporary context. As Marina Vishmidt has pointed out, it is in art education that 'autonomy — from intellectual autonomy, to autonomy as market agent and operator — emerges as the marker of the developed creative subject'.[1] In other words: even if it is measured purely in terms of its output of 'creative professionals', the art academy still needs to retain some degree of autonomy and exemption from regulation — and it is in this sense that it retains a specific potential. On certain occasions, art and design schools indeed offer a space for the kind of critical thought, interdisciplinary exchanges and experimental knowledge production that proves to be incompatible with the university system, in much the same way that literature departments offered a refuge for academic anomalies in the second half of the twentieth century.

1 Marina Vishmidt, 'Creation Myth' in: *MUTE Magazine*, July 2010, http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/creation-myth, consulted 10 June 2013.

In conjunction with the shifting institutional framework of art education, there has been a renewed engagement with informal and self-organised forms of learning, beyond the traditional remits of the academy. Over the last decade, artists and others have increasingly been involved in setting up experimental learning platforms, running informal art schools, and staging self-initiated reading groups or seminars.

On some occasions, such projects have remained formal attempts, limiting their concern with education as a form of artistic or curatorial practice to an investigation of the aesthetics of learning. Increasingly, however, these self-organised projects have been engaged in making decidedly political claims — also with regards to the educational system itself.

The proliferation of self-organised schools and alternative learning platforms, alongside the discourses and events emerging around it, has been so rapid and intense that the interest in education risks collapsing under its own weight, obfuscating the specific problems and concerns that prompted the projects in the first place — and which have now become only more urgent. But as artists' engagement with education ceases to be a novelty and superficial attention to the phenomenon has passed a point of saturation, the present moment also seems to offer an occasion to take stock, reflect and articulate the questions and challenges specific to the present moment. One of these is undoubtedly how self-organised education has put institutional mechanisms into question, uncovered its problems while articulating new possibilities.

To some extent, self-organised education may be seen as responses to the current predicament of existing academic programmes and to their very institutional basis. Rising tuition fees have put a distinct pressure on the expectations that art students have from their courses, degrees, and institutions. The prospect of insurmountable student debt in a time of economic crisis is one of the many aspects of the conjuncture that has prompted this engagement with self-organised learning. In the context of art education, self-organised education is often presented as a response to the entanglement of the 'gatekeeper' MFA programmes with the art market or the perceived inadequacy of art school curricula. But many of the artist-run projects also respond to a more general academic and institutional context: to depoliticised university programmes, to steadily increasing bureaucratisation and mindless evaluative mechanisms, to hierarchical academic structures, to the consolidation of disciplinary and departmental boundaries or the inertia of institutional programmes and their limited ability to address contemporary issues.

In responding to these problems, the artist-run educational projects function not only as commentaries or symbolic interventions, but often as serious attempts to provide a critical alternative to institutionalised forms of education. It is in this sense that experiments in education become genuinely experimental — that is to say, not merely marked by an uncertain outcome, but also by the possibility of failure that only arises when something is actually put at stake.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is also here that the self-organised platforms confront a number of unresolved questions. We are familiar with some of these: if we look beyond rhetorics of autonomy and independence, in what economies are these projects actually embedded? What motivates and sustains the investment of time and other resources on which they rely? It may for example be important to acknowledge that seemingly independent forms of organisation depend on existing institutional structures.

Many of the contributors involved in ostensibly self-propelling programmes ultimately rely on academic institutions to make a living or support their research. Moreover, in present-day capitalism, 'independent' self-initiated learning platforms are always imbricated in economies: they all too easy function as profitable enterprises, serving as an instrument accumulation of social and cultural capital even if there is no monetary exchange. As 'authored' projects, self-organised in fact often function as a form of cultural capital in itself, effectively connecting them into various other economies.

But even though the questions that need to be raised in relation to these self-organised projects bear most obvious relevance to their supposed 'autonomy' they are by no means limited to it. At present, a more fundamental range of questions is raised by critics of extra-institutional learning — Suhail Malik's critique of informal modes of education should be mentioned as a particularly incisive example[2] — and increasingly in the self-reflexive discourses facilitated by these learning platforms. These more fundamental questions challenge the very premises and effects of these educational projects. How is it that the convivial, flexible and open forms of organising map so seamlessly onto the informal power mechanisms permeating the art world? Does the refusal of the hierarchical structures and regulating mechanisms of academic programmes not risk providing fertile grounds for other forms of power — informal, unformulated, and more difficult to contest? And what kinds of selection and exclusion does a self-run art school put in place of the procedures governing public institutions, which, perhaps overly bureaucratic, are at least accountable?

2 Suhail Malik, Educations Sentimental and Unsentimental: Repositioning the Politics of Art and Education' in: *Red Hook Journal*, August 2011, www.bard.edu/ccs/redhook, consulted 10 June 2013.

The current economic and political conjuncture raises another set of questions that involve the role of the state. How can such experiments in self-organized education avoid affirming the rhetoric accompanying austerity measures and presenting them as a necessary step towards a more 'healthy' art world and educational system? Is a self-initiated seminar an effective response to an impoverished curriculum if it leaves the withdrawal of public support to which it responds unattended? Despite strongly diverging motivations and aims, self-organised educational projects risk complicity with the neoliberal logic of the 'Big Society,' where the promotion of community organising is matched by a withdrawal of state responsibility and a failure to recognise education as a common concern. With the increasing attention being given to artist-run experiments in education, self-organised art schools and other forms of learning outside the boundaries of academic institutions, the present moment may provide an opportunity to address precisely these unresolved questions.

Tom Vandeputte is a writer based in London and Amsterdam. He is a PhD candidate at the Centre for Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths College and a theory tutor at the Sandberg Institute. He is also co-editor of the forthcoming book *Contestations: Critical Experiments in Education* (Bedford Press, 2013).

process and substance. […] The pupil is thereby 'schooled' to confuse teaching with learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new.' The institution of the school is reproduced the idea that learning and education are a specialised affair: 'All over the world the school has an anti-educational effect on society: school is recognised as the institution which specialises in education. The failures of school are taken by most people as a proof that education is a very costly, very complex, always arcane and frequently almost impossible task.' Illich' book is thus effectively an argument for the deinstitutionalisation of learning.

> See: DESCHOOLING SOCIETY; ILLICH, IVAN

SITUATION. Paolo Freire discussed his concept of the situation in relation to his concept of education based on 'problem-posing'. The only starting point for a learning situation in which the student/teacher contradiction could effectively disappear, alongside the separation between the stages of the preparation of content by the teacher and its transmission by the students, was the positing of problems. The point of departure for this is the 'here and now' of the student-teachers and teacher-students: that is to say, 'the situation within which they are submerged, from which they emerge, and in which they intervene'. The concrete situation of the participants thus becomes the starting point for education; as co-investigators, Freire argued that they could collectively 'develop their power to perceive critically *the way they exist* in the world *with which* and *in which* they find themselves; they come to see the world not as a static reality, but as a reality in process, in transformation'. It is this awareness that transforms the 'here and now' of education into a 'dynamic present'.

> See: FREIRE, PAOLO; PROBLEM-POSING

TEACHER-STUDENT CONTRADICTION. The student-teacher dichotomy or contradiction is notably criticised by Paolo Freire, who comes close to arguing that it is to be abolished altogether. In his 'problem-posing' model of education, developed in his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, the roles of teacher and student are entirely rearticulated. The division of roles that remains in the process of dialogue which Freire imagines to unfold around the problem-posing of the students is the one between couple of 'teacher-student' and 'students-teachers'. In the learning situation envisaged by Freire, the teacher 'is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach'. Teacher and student are 'jointly responsible for a process in which all grow'.

> See: BANKING MODEL; FREIRE, PAOLO; PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED; PROBLEM-POSING

TRADE SCHOOL. Founded in 2009 in New York, the Trade School is a self-organised physical and digital platform for knowledge exchange that is open to the public. The Trade School is based on the principle of barter: classes are not paid for with money, but by contributing food, knowledge, thoughts, or art. Everyone who is part of the network is able to propose, organise or attend classes of their own interest. The project was initiated by a group of friends as an attempt to construct an educational model that values hands-on knowledge and the social nature of exchange. In the last years, the model has expanded to several cities, running for a few weeks or months on any given location.

> See: BARTER

ULM SCHOOL OF DESIGN. The Ulm School of Design (Hochschule für Gestaltung Ulm) was founded in 1953 by Inge Aicher-Scholl, Otl Aicher and Max Bill, a former Bauhaus student. Together with the Bauhaus, it is known as one of the most influential schools of design of the twentieth century. The Ulm School of Design operated in the post-war decades, between 1953 and 1968 and was known for combining practice and theory: the school, for instance, accommodated pioneering work in the area of semiotics (the study of signs and symbols). Theory was already an important part of the first year, where the methodology students introduced students to logic, mathematics, combinatorics and topology. The school offered an interdisciplinary curriculum which emphasised future cultural and social responsibilities. Like the Bauhaus, the programme of Ulm consisted of a basic course followed by several modules specialising in specific directions — in the case of Ulm these were amongst others Product Design, Visual Communication, Industrialised Building, Information (which lasted until 1962) and Filmmaking (which until 1961 belonged to the Visual Communication department). Considering itself as an experimental institution, changing its content and organisation of courses.

WARD, COLIN. Colin Ward (1924–2010) was a British anarchist writer and journalist. His books include the seminal introduction to anarchist thought and practice *Anarchy in Action* (1973), *Streetwork: The Exploding School* (1973, with Anthony Fyson) and *Talking Schools* (1995), a collection of lectures on education. Ward argued for an anarchism rooted in everyday experience and based on the idea of 'direct action' — the kind of collective action which is intended to reveal an existing problem, highlight an alternative, or demonstrate a possible solution to a social issue. In *Anarchy in Action*, he famously argued that 'an anarchist society, a society which organizes itself without authority, is always in existence, like a seed beneath the snow, buried under the weight of the state and its bureaucracy', thus describing anarchism not as a future society but as a mode of organization rooted in everyday life. Ward was heavily influenced by Peter Kropotkin, a prominent anarcho-communist (as well as zoologist and evolutionary theorist, amongst others) and his concept of mutual aid – a term in organisation theory that designates a voluntary reciprocal exchange of resources and services for mutual benefit.

> See: EXPLODING SCHOOL; SCHOOL WITHOUT WALLS; MUTUAL AID

WOCHENAUFGABEN. Oswald Mathias Ungers (1926–2007), the German architect, theorist and teacher who is also known as teacher of Rem Koolhaas, developed a pedagogical approach to design education based on strict weekly exercises (*Wochenaufgaben*). Through the exercises, Ungers attempted to develop a rigorous systematic approach to design education which focused especially on specific constraints. Each of the exercises took place in a conceptual framework that challenged students to abandon conventions and assumptions and required them to think for themselves: once of the exercises, for instance, involved the design of a family home where the entrance was positioned at 4,5 meters height; in others, students were to develop a building design in a context that introduced very specific problems, such as the design of a residential building along a highway. In this sense Ungers' projects resonates with experiments in art education such as the A Course at Central St. Martins or Roy Ascott's Groundcourse, even if it does so at an entirely different level. But besides being an instrument of challenging students' assumptions, Ungers' exercises were also considered as a means of knowledge production, where each exercise served as a basis for examining one particular issue or problem in isolation.

> See: A COURSE; GROUNDCOURSE

Art Education:
A Glossary

With contributions by: Ann Demeester, Antonis Pittas, Bik Van der Pol, Jurgen Bey, Lucy Cotter, Marc Herbst, Steven ten Thije, Stine Hebert, Tom Vandeputte, Vivian Sky Rehberg

This publication is the result of a series of theory seminars convened at the Sandberg Institute in the framework of the newly founded Studio for Immediate Spaces. The coincidence of the theory seminar with the start of this new academic programme was taken as an opportunity to reflect on the present condition of art education itself: its institutions, practices, models and infrastructure. ■ The texts gathered here have been contributed by a variety of cultural practitioners — artists, curators, theorists, educators and administrators sharing a direct engagement with art education — who were invited to develop some of the themes and concerns that emerged from the seminar discussions. ■ In addition to these essays and interviews, this publication documents the results of a collective research project, carried out by the students throughout the seminar, which has assumed the form of a glossary: an open-ended inventory of questions, concepts and case studies that may serve as a provisional toolbox for rethinking the academy.