Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education 8

Tyson E. Lewis
Megan J. Laverty *Editors*

Art's Teachings, Teaching's Art

Philosophical, Critical and Educational Musings

Springer

Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education

Volume 8

Scope of the Series

Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education signifies new directions and possibilities out of a traditional field of philosophy and education. Around the globe, exciting scholarship that breaks down and reformulates traditions in the humanities and social sciences is being created in the field of education scholarship. This series provides a venue for publication by education scholars whose work reflect the dynamic and experimental qualities that characterize today's academy.

The series associates philosophy and theory not exclusively with a cognitive interest (to know, to define, to order) or an evaluative interest (to judge, to impose criteria of validity) but also with an experimental and attentive attitude which is characteristic for exercises in thought that try to find out how to move in the present and how to deal with the actual spaces and times, the different languages and practices of education and its transformations around the globe. It addresses the need to draw on thought across all sorts of borders and counts amongst its elements the following: the valuing of diverse processes of inquiry; an openness to various forms of communication, knowledge, and understanding; a willingness to always continue experimentation that incorporates debate and critique; and an application of this spirit, as implied above, to the institutions and issues of education.

Authors for the series come not only from philosophy of education but also from curriculum studies and critical theory, social sciences theory, and humanities theory in education. The series incorporates volumes that are trans- and inner-disciplinary.

The audience for the series includes academics, professionals and students in the fields of educational thought and theory, philosophy and social theory, and critical scholarship.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/8638

Tyson E. Lewis • Megan J. Laverty
Editors

Art's Teachings, Teaching's Art

Philosophical, Critical and Educational Musings

Springer

Editors
Tyson E. Lewis
Art Education
College of Visual Arts
and Design
University of North Texas
Denton, TX, USA

Megan J. Laverty
Educational Philosophy
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY, USA

ISSN 2214-9759 ISSN 2214-9767 (electronic)
Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education
ISBN 978-94-017-7190-0 ISBN 978-94-017-7191-7 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-7191-7

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015948368

Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg New York London

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer Science+Business Media B.V. Dordrecht is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Contents

Biographical Statements

René V. Arcilla is currently Professor of Philosophy of Education at New York University's Steinhardt School. He earned a Ph.D. in Education from the University of Chicago in 1990. From 1990 to 2000, he taught in the Program of Philosophy and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University; he also directed this program from 1992 until his departure. In 1999, he spent a term at the University of Tokyo as a Visiting Professor. Professor Arcilla is the author of numerous articles and of the books *For the Love of Perfection*: *Richard Rorty and Liberal Education* (Routledge 1995) and *Mediumism*: *A Philosophical Reconstruction of Modernism for Existential Learning* (SUNY Press 2010). He also co-edited, with David Hansen and Mary Driscoll, the book, *A Life in Classrooms*: *Philip W. Jackson and the Practice of Teaching* (Teachers College Press 2007). His scholarly and teaching interests include philosophy of education, liberal learning, existentialism, and modernism.

John Baldacchino holds a Professorial Chair of Art Education at the University of Dundee in Scotland. He served as Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Professor of Arts Pedagogy at Falmouth University in England; as Associate Professor of Art and Art Education at Columbia University's Teachers College in New York; as Reader in Critical Theory at Gray's School of Art in Scotland; and as Lecturer of Art Education and Cultural Studies at the University of Warwick in England. He is the author of papers, articles, chapters, and books on the arts, philosophy, and education. His books include *Post-Marxist Marxism*: *Questioning the Answer* (1996), *Easels of Utopia*: *Art's Fact Returned* (1998); *Avant-Nostalgia*: *An Excuse to Pause* (2002); *Education Beyond Education*: *Self and the Imaginary in Maxine Greene's Philosophy* (2009); *Makings of the Sea*: *Journey*, *Doubt and Nostalgia* (2010); *Art's Way Out*: *Exit Pedagogy and the Cultural Condition* (2012); *Mediterranean Art Education* (with Raphael Vella, 2013); *Democracy Without Confession* (with Kenneth Wain, 2013); *John Dewey*: *Liberty and The Pedagogy of Disposition* (2014); and *My Teaching*, *My Philosophy*. *Kenneth Wain* (with Simone Galea and Duncan Mercieca, 2014).

Eduardo Duarte is Professor of Philosophy of Education and a recurring Lecturer in the Honors College at Hofstra University. He earned his doctorate and masters in philosophy at the New School for Social Research and his baccalaureate in philosophy from Fordham University. Duarte is the author of *Being and Learning* (Sense Publishers: 2012) and has published articles in *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *Educational Theory* and the *Journal of Philosophy of Education*. He is an active member of the Philosophy of Education Society and is the program chair of the PES 2015 annual conference and yearbook editor of the conference proceedings *PES Memphis 2015 The Blues/Soul Music*. Under the pseudonym Professor Iguana, Duarte is host and producer of *Dead Zone*, 88.7FM WRHU.ORG, a program documenting the improvisational jam music of the Grateful Dead and related musical configurations. Duarte lives with his family (Kelly, Kat, Sofie, Jaime) in Portland, Maine.

David A. Granger is Professor of Education at SUNY Geneseo, where he teaches courses in humanities and educational foundations and also serves as the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR). He is the author of *John Dewey*, *Robert Pirsig*, *and the Art of Living*: *Revisioning Aesthetic Education* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2006) and has published numerous articles on John Dewey and aesthetics in journals including *The Inter-American Journal of Philosophy*, *Educational Theory*, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, the *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Teachers College Record*, *Educational Studies*, and *Educational Change*. In addition, Granger serves as editor of the John Dewey Society journal *Education & Culture*.

jan jagodzinski is a Professor in the Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. He is a founding member of the *Caucus on Social Theory in Art Education* (NAEA), past editor of *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education* (JSTE), past president of SIG *Media*, *Culture and Curriculum*, Editorial Board Member for *Psychoanalysis*, *Culture & Society* (PCS), Advisory Board for *Journal of Lacanian Studies* (JLS), Review Board for *Studies in Art Education* (SAE), *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* (JCT), *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education* (JCRAE), *Visual Culture & Gender*, and nine other journals. He is the author of many books including the following: *The Anamorphic I/i* (1996 (Duval House Publishing Inc, 1996); *Postmodern Dilemmas*: *Outrageous Essays in Art & Art Education* (Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997); *Pun*(*k*) *Deconstruction*: *Experifigural Writings in Art & Art Education* (Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997); *Youth Fantasies*: *The Perverse Landscape of the Media* (Palgrave, 2004); *Musical Fantasies*: *A Lacanian Approach*, Palgrave, 2005); *Television and Youth*: *Televised Paranoia* (Palgrave, 2008); *The Deconstruction of the Oral Eye*: *Art and Its Education in an Era of Designer Capitalism* (Palgrave, 2010); *Arts Based Research*: *A Critique and Proposal*, with Jason Wallin (Sense Publishers, 2013), *Misreading Postmodern Antigone*: *Marco Bellocchio's Devil in the Flesh* (*Diavolo*

in Corpo) (Intellect Books, 2011); and *Psychoanalyzing Cinema*: *A Productive Encounter of Lacan*, *Deleuze*, *and Zizek* (Palgrave, 2012).

David Jelinek is an art teacher at the Collegiate School in Manhattan. He has written on teacher-student relationships in film and taught on the subject at the Pratt Institute. His sculpture was recently featured in a one-person exhibition at the Andrew Edlin Gallery in Chelsea.

Anne Keefe specializes in modern and contemporary poetry and poetics with an emphasis on visual culture and feminist theory. She holds a Ph.D. in literature from Rutgers University and an MFA in poetry from the University of Maryland, College Park. Her current book project focuses on the ways in which contemporary poets use ekphrastic poetry to investigate the perceptual politics of representation. Keefe was the 2013–2014 NEH postdoctoral fellow in poetics at Emory University's Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry. Her critical work has appeared in *Signs*: *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *Word & Image*, and *Contemporary Women's Writing*. Her first book of poems, *Lithopedia* (2012), won the Bull City Press book award. She is faculty in the English department at the University of North Texas, where she teaches writing and literature.

Megan J. Laverty is Associate Professor of Philosophy and Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her primary research interests are the history of philosophy of education, moral philosophy with a focus on language and communication, philosophy of dialogue and dialogical pedagogy, and philosophy with children and adolescents. Laverty is the author of *Iris Murdoch's Ethics*: *A Consideration of her Romantic Vision* (London: Continuum, 2007).

Tyson E. Lewis is Associate Professor in the Department of Art Education and Art History at the University of North Texas. His research interests include philosophy of education, aesthetics, art education, and critical theory. He is author of *The Aesthetics of Education*: *Theatre*, *Curiosity*, *and Politics in the Work of Jacques Rancière and Paulo Freire* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014) and *On Study*: *Educational Potentiality and Giorgio Agamben* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

Alexander J. Means is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Social and Psychological Foundations of Education at SUNY Buffalo State. His research examines educational policy and governance in relation to political economy, urbanization, human security, social inequality, and radical democratic theory. He is the author of *Schooling in the Age of Austerity*: *Urban Education and the struggle for Democratic Life* (Palgrave, 2013), which won a 2014 Society of the Professors of Education Book Award, and *Toward a New Common School Movement* (Paradigm, 2014) with Noah De Lissovoy and Kenneth Saltman. His work has also been published in numerous international research journals such as *Critical Sociology*, *Journal of Education Policy*, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *Policy Futures*

in Education, *Foucault Studies*, *Review of Education*, *Pedagogy*, *and Cultural Studies*, and *Critical Studies in Education*.

Samuel D. Rocha is Assistant Professor of Philosophy of Education at the University of British Columbia and a performing and recording artist. He is the author of *A Primer for Philosophy and Education* (Cascade 2014), and his next book, *Folk Phenomenology*: *Education*, *Study*, *and the Human Person,* is forthcoming with Pickwick Publications. He has released an EP, *Freedom for Love* (Indie 2011), and an LP, *Late to Love* (Wiseblood 2014).

Claudia W. Ruitenberg is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Studies, University of British Columbia. She is author of *Unlocking the World*: *Education in an Ethic of Hospitality* (Paradigm, 2015), editor of the *Philosophy of Education 2012* Yearbook (Philosophy of Education Society, 2012) and *What Do Philosophers of Education Do*? (*And How Do They Do It*?) (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), and coeditor (with D. C. Phillips) of *Education*, *Culture and Epistemological Diversity*: *Mapping a Disputed Terrain* (Springer, 2012). Her research interests include the ethics of hospitality in education, discursive performativity, agonistic political theory and political education, aesthetic education and theory, and epistemological diversity in educational research.

Stephanie Springgay is an Associate Professor in the Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Her research focuses on the intersections between contemporary art and pedagogy, with a particular interest in theories of matter, movement, and affect. Her most recent research-creation projects are documented at www.thepedagogicalimpulse.com, http://www.walkinglab.org, and www.artistsoupkitchen.com. She has published widely in academic journals and is the coeditor of the book *M/othering a Bodied Curriculum*: *Emplacement*, *Desire*, *Affect,* University of Toronto Press, with Debra Freedman; coeditor of *Curriculum and the Cultural Body*, Peter Lang with Debra Freedman; and author of *Body Knowledge and Curriculum*: *Pedagogies of Touch in Youth and Visual Culture*, Peter Lang.

James Stillwaggon is an Associate Professor of Education at Iona College, where he teaches courses in educational theory and diversity. His primary areas of interest are in the history of ideas surrounding childhood and education, including Platonic theories of the soul and Lacanian psychoanalysis. He is coauthoring a book with David Jelinek on representations of teachers and students in film entitled *Filmed School: Fantasies of Pedagogy and the Cinematic Imaginary*.

Sarah E. Truman is a Ph.D. Candidate at University of Toronto in Curriculum Studies (OISE) and Book History and Print Culture (Massey College). She the author of *Searching for Guan Yin* (White Pine Press, 2011). www.sarahetruman.com

Susan Verducci is an Associate Professor of Humanities and coordinator of the Liberal Studies Teacher Preparation program at San José State University. She coedited *Democracy*, *Education and the Moral Life*, *Taking Philanthropy Seriously*: *Beyond Noble Intentions to Responsible Giving*, and a special issue in *Studies in Philosophy of Education* on "Narratives in the Ethics of Education." Her current research focuses on intersections in philosophy of education and art education.

Joris Vlieghe is a philosopher of education who currently teaches ethics and education and philosophical foundations of education at Edinburgh University. His research deals with the role and significance of corporeity for education, the meaning of traditional school practices, the educational value of visual images, and the impact of digitization on (future) education. He is interested in phenomenological and poststructuralist approaches and especially in the work of Giorgio Agamben. He has widely published in the leading academic journals of his research field. He is also coauthor of three books on the future of the university (*Curating the European University*, Leuven University Press), on the public role of education (*De publieke betekenis van pedagogisch denken en handelen*, SWP), and on the role of images in educational research (in preparation).

Chapter 1
Introduction: Redistributing the Artistic and Pedagogical Sensible

Tyson E. Lewis and Megan J. Laverty

1.1 Dire Straits: The Crisis in the Arts and Teaching

In June of 2011, the Center for Arts Education in New York City released a rather shocking document titled "Accelerating Arts Education Funding Cuts and Loss of Arts Teachers Paint Grim Picture for City Schools" (Kessler 2011). Even before the financial recession of 2008, arts education has seen declining investments into arts education services and supplies, with only a 7 % increase since 2006 in certified arts teachers. But this increase in arts personnel is somewhat deceiving because only 16 % of high schools in NYC have certified arts instructors on staff. The arts are, as the report indicates, disappearing from schools—even those schools in the very heart of one of the "cultural capitals" of the world.

The extinction of arts programs is not isolated to NYC alone. The lack of support for the arts in education is a national issue. With pressure to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under high-stakes testing regimes, schools are focusing more and more on math, English, and science at the exclusion of the arts, which have been re-cast as an expendable luxury. While the NCLB Act of 2001 did acknowledge the arts as a core academic subject, the arts were quickly eclipsed by the push towards quantifiable improvements on standardized tests. The high-stakes nature of testing has most negatively affected low-income, inner city schools servicing minority populations. One study recently reported "the greatest erosion of the curriculum is occurring in schools with high minority populations, the very populations whose

T.E. Lewis (✉)
Associate Professor, Art Education, College of Visual Arts and Design, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA
e-mail: Tyson.lewis@unt.edu

M.J. Laverty
Associate Professor, Educational Philosophy, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: ml2524@columbia.edu

T.E. Lewis, M.J. Laverty (eds.), *Art's Teachings, Teaching's Art*, Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education 8, DOI 10.1007/978-94-017-7191-7_1

access to such curriculum has been historically most limited" (Holcomb 2007, p. 34). The result is a stark reality: there is a growing artistic apartheid where certain children are being aesthetically left behind.

In the face of the withering of arts-based programs or their replacement by design programs, there have been many attempts to re-frame arts in accordance with the very standards that have put them at risk of becoming extinct. In 2004, a report commissioned by the Arts Education Partnership and the National Assembly of State Art Agencies titled *Critical Evidence* (Ruppert 2006) provided empirical evidence that there are at least 65 ways in which an art-rich curriculum improves the cognitive skills necessary to raise test scores in math and reading. And even more broadly, policy statements like "Preparing Students for the Next America: The Benefits of an Arts Education" (2013) by the Arts Education Partnership argues that the arts are central to promoting American economic competitiveness. The arts are sold as strategic support for "bolster[ing] skills demanded of the twenty-first century workforce" by encouraging creativity, problem-solving, collaboration and communication, and increased capacities for leadership. The Partnership for twenty-first Century Skills also provides a "map" that connects the arts to the knowledge economy. Their policy statement argues that "business leaders and visionary thinkers concerned about preparation of students for the future know that the ability to be creative—a twenty-first century skill—is native to the arts and is one of the primary processes learned through the arts" (2010, p. 2). Arts can promote "healthy work habits" including flexibility, adaptability, and self-directing entrepreneurship, thus becoming a useful facet of our information/life-style economy. While some might remain supporters of STEAM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Art, and Math), such visions come dangerously close to reducing the arts to a mere use-value enhancing science and engineering outputs through creative and metaphoric thinking. To survive, the arts in schools have had to adopt the very languages and standards of markets that overpower them.

It is our contention that philosophy of the arts and of the aesthetic experience can help reclaim the radical potentiality of the arts that are missed when the arts become threatened with either (a) literal extinction or (b) mere strategic survivalism. Choices between bad and worse undermine what the arts have to offer: the different kinds of educational questions the arts ask of ourselves and our bodies outside of questions of utility and efficiency; the particular politics of artistic gestures that suspend set relations between identity, role, and function; the democratic potentials of sensorial interruptions and redistributions beyond hierarchies and economic, social, and political divisions; and the radical possibilities of collective production to break with the factory model. This is not to reduce arts to mere instrumental means to ends outside of themselves, but rather to remind us that when the arts speak, they teach "lessons" that perhaps cannot be learned anywhere else and cannot necessarily be efficiently mainstreamed by the mechanisms of the knowledge economy.

While not often included in discussions concerning the fate of the arts in education, standardization coupled with recession era budget cuts have also leveled damaging blows to the *artistic* nature of teaching. The result has been the increasing dominance of attempts to create "teacher proof" curricular materials based on

"scientific" and "evidence" based research. Beginning with *A Nation at Risk Report* (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983), there has been a pervasive emphasis on rigid and bureaucratized approaches to curriculum development that is decisively top-down (Moe 2003). The teacher-proof curriculum dictates the goals, content, and methods of instruction so that any teacher, abstracted from his or her particular life circumstances as well as specific teaching contexts, will be able to teach the exact same materials without deviation.

Critics of the prepackaged curriculum emphasize how teachers' work is being increasingly narrowed and simplified so as to be easily measured, managed, and standardized (McNeil 2000; McNeil and Valenzuela 2000). Such critics are right to point out that these approaches to instructional design demonstrate a suspicion of teachers and their work. Teaching as a complex, multifaceted, context sensitive, meaning-rich practice is being quickly eroded by another image of teaching as mere technical procedure. Henry Giroux (2010) has argued that the technical "dumbing down" of teaching is part and parcel of larger economic forces of neoliberalism and biopolitical management over life in schools. Wayne Au points to the "prescripted" curriculum (which provides a verbal script for teachers to follow) as a paradigm of a new form of Taylorism that reduces teachers to nothing more than technician, tests to commodified tools of control, and schools to immaterial factories. In short, teaching is no longer about creation. It is now a kind of "piecemeal" (Mahiri 2005, p. 82) task in a larger assembly line where conceptualization is distinctly separate from execution. Given such dire circumstances, what is at stake is not so much de-skilling or re-skilling so much as s-*killing* teachers.

While highlighting the potential causes as well as the significant losses of these changes in teaching, what we would like to emphasize is how this shift towards vocationalization or professionalization has a tendency to eclipse the *aesthetic dimensions of teaching as a craft* (see also Hickman 2011). In this sense, the question of the aesthetics of teaching is integrally connected to and tied up with the question of the politics of teaching within and against forms of instrumental skill reduction.

The two situations which we have outlined are, in themselves, well documented. Instead of adding to the vast literature concerning the various crises in arts education or teaching, we hope that combining two narratives, which are often held apart, reveals something new that, if they were kept separate, would not necessarily appear. In both cases, the aesthetic possibilities of perceptual (re)disruption, imaginative transcendence, and poetic experience are increasingly marginalized if not completely censored in favor of technocratic efficiency and economic viability. Cast in a more political light, perhaps it is not merely that the arts are useless or that teachers are too unreliable to manage their own classrooms but rather that the teachings of the arts and the arts of teaching are *politically* and *ethically* too disruptive to leave unaccounted for by managerial systems obsessed with maintaining a particular order of control. If Plato once censored the arts because of their potentially disruptive effects on the "impressionable" souls of the citizens of the republic, then perhaps we are still living in the shadow of this most primordial gesture—a gesture which has returned with a vengeance in the shape

of administrative advances within neoliberal and biopolitical networks of surveillance. While the particular configuration of the pressures exerted on the arts, art education, and the arts of teaching might very well be different in different countries, we would argue that what we are witnessing in the United States is a global tendency, and thus symptomatic of economic forces which are affecting (to some degree and with local particularities) certain common conditions underlying teaching, art, and politics.

Given this backdrop, we offer the following collection of essays, each of which presents moments wherein the arts of teaching and the teachings of the arts rupture, disrupt, distort, suspend, or negate this very backdrop. As such, this is not a collection concerned with *how* to teach the arts. There are rich traditions specifically located within art education that directly deal with this concern (see Gaudelius and Speirs 2002; Bresler 2007). Rather, this is a collection focused on the teachings of the arts themselves and how the arts affect perception, gesture, and embodied social relations in order to open up space and time for political turnings, imaginative alternatives, and affective intensities. In their own ways, each essay asks: What are the perceptual and sensorial pedagogies of the arts? If philosophical speculation is privileged as an access point to this question (rather than ethnography, history, and so forth), this is because, as Jacques Rancière (2006) argues, philosophical practice is a kind of "in-disciplinary thought" (p. 9) that eludes structures of hierarchical order and common sense distribution of roles. The poetics of philosophy—in all its diverse forms—shares a unique relationship to the arts, which also elude any attribution of unity, coherence, or essence, and thus continually neutralize attempts to suture form and function, practice and social role, appearance and utility. In turn, we also offer a set of essays that concern the arts of teaching—its theatrical, musical, poetic, and curatorial dimensions. In both cases, authors employ continental, aesthetic, psychoanalytic, phenomenological, postmodernist, and pragmatist notions of art in order to shed new light on the pressing importance of aesthetic sensitivities for rethinking what it means to teach, learn, feel, think, and act in today's world. As such, the essays in this collection speak not simply to art teachers (though they might find new philosophical frames through which to view their practices) but also to artists, philosophers, and educators in general: all those who have a concern for what it means to engage in expressions of sensual alternatives to what it means to *be* or *become*.

1.2 Precedents, Precursors, and Possibilities

In this section, we move to distinguish the approach of this collection from notable precedents: Kieran Egan (1942-), Elliot W. Eisner (1933–2014) and Maxine Greene (1917–2014)—three figures that represent specific moments of in-disciplinary thought. Along the way, we will further draw upon Rancière's writings and, more specifically, his understanding of the aesthetic as a heterogeneous regime of the sensible. In introducing Rancière's philosophy of the aesthetic, one of our

intentions is to move beyond more or less humanist understandings of the arts and of the art of teaching as involving the cultivation of specific civic skills or the expansion of subjective dispositions such as the imagination. Shifting from the mental to the embodied, the sensual, and the perceptual, enables many of the essays to take a post-humanist turn that is not prefigured in more or less traditional meditations on the aesthetic in relation to the educational. We also draw on Rancière to show that using terms like "aesthetic," "pedagogical" and "political" is double edged: on the one hand, these terms allow us to isolate important qualities or dimensions of our experience worthy of attention; on the other hand, they can prevent us from seeing how these qualities or dimensions permeate activities not recognizably artistic, educational, or political.

Egan (1988, 1990, 1992), Eisner (2004a), and Greene (2000, 2001) are erudite, intelligent, and passionate about the theoretical and practical possibilities inherent in conjoining the arts and education. These authors, over the years, have defended the inclusion of the visual and performing arts in the K-12 curriculum, effectively reinventing aesthetic education while establishing its new role in schools. In an effort to marginalize such traditional concepts as talent, genius, technique and mastery, they have introduced such ideas as imagination, wide-awakeness, and so forth. Their emphasis has been on art as process rather than as product. Engagement with the arts, they argue, must be cultural and participatory, as well as appreciative and critical. In other words, aesthetic education involves active exploration of different artistic mediums resulting in the initiation of teachers and students into new ways of seeing, hearing and feeling. The object—whether painting, performance art, or poem— must become, to quote Greene (2001), "objects of *our* aesthetic experiencing" (p. 17). Aesthetic experiencing leads to the discovery of alternative perspectives, a heightened consciousness of mystery, fresh significances and the construction of meanings. Aesthetic experiencing awakens us to new possibilities for being alive.

At the same time, these advocates for the arts in schools inevitably illuminated the aesthetic dimensions of teaching. Eisner (2004b)—drawing on Dewey—has written extensively on the central question "What can education learn from the arts about the practice of education?" (see also Hickman 2011). For Eisner, the marginalization of the *art* of teaching means that the aesthetically rooted, qualitative forms of thinking found in teaching are lost. While never providing a strict definition of what such forms of thinking necessarily include, Eisner does list clusters of possible traits including a keen awareness of qualitative purposes, the search for proportionality, somatic knowledge, the importance of attentiveness to practice, the need for flexible ends, a sensitivity toward the relationships between form and content, a valuing of multiple forms of expression, the importance of materials, and an emphasis on motivations for engagement. All in all, the art of teaching—or teaching as a craft—is enriched and expanded through engagement with the arts (broadly conceptualized). While Gert Biesta (2014) is right to problematize any strict identity between the art of teaching and the Aristotelian notion of *poiesis* (the production or fabrication of something through technical skill), it is important to note that this warning does not prevent us from examining

the aesthetic dimensions of teaching. Indeed, it is only through such an endeavor that we can come to appreciate the particular nature of teaching as a craft resistant to scientific instrumentalization.

There is no doubt that Egan, Eisner and Greene have been tremendously influential, and the secondary literature in multiple fields inside and outside of education on their work is too vast to cover here. It is thanks to their influence that we take a different approach in this book, one that is uniquely responsive to the insights from various theoretical schools of thought, the innovation of new technologies, and an inhospitable educational culture (as outlined above). Our focus is not on defending aesthetic education or, alternatively, arguing for the role of the arts in K-12 curriculum. We take this as a given, partly due to accomplishments of Egan, Eisner, Greene and others.

Contributors to the first part consider the formal features of different art forms—whether music, painting, poetry, performance, or film—with a view to illuminating their potentially pedagogical dimensions. Similarly, contributors to the second part consider teaching with a view to highlighting its various artistic or aesthetic dimensions. Unlike Eisner who makes general claims about "the arts" and teaching, essays we have chosen are more focused on the relationships between teaching and particular arts. Hence the title of the book: *Art's Teachings, Teaching's Arts*. Together, these essays celebrate the intrinsic diversity of the arts and teaching because the authors did not see themselves as having to advocate for one or the other under the auspices of a unifying conception like "aesthetic experiencing" or "wide-awakeness." We see this as an advantage because the authors are able to highlight the uniqueness of each art form by means of its educational qualities; and, they are able to highlight the aesthetic qualities of teaching that otherwise go unobserved.

Moving beyond Egan, Eisner, and Greene, many of the authors do not take the perspective of mind, consciousness, creativity, or imagination, either with respect to the creation of a unique artwork or with respect to entering a unique artwork. Instead, they focus on how characteristically aesthetic and pedagogical patterns, rhythms, and structures traverse diverse spheres of activity, from the artist's studio to the dynamics of a elementary school classroom, in order to shape fundamental ways of being that are, in many respects, pre-conscious, pre-thematic, and collective. Essays in this collection move more strongly toward questions of affectivity, desire, perceptual disorientation, atmospheric/bluesy moods, and embodied forms of collective swarm intelligence (see also the work of Ellsworth 2005). We think that this difference in approach reflects an underlying theoretical disparity. Egan, Eisner and Greene remain human-centric in their approach to the arts and arts education. Generally speaking, their strategy has been to defend arts education as essential in the nourishment and cultivation of vital human faculties, or as assisting in the realization of such cherished political ideals as democracy and justice. As important as these approaches have been, they assume that it is the humans who control the art and not the other way around. Deliberation is the critical issue because it is the locus of human agency and creativity. An aim of this collection is to go beyond the humanist paradigm by asking such questions as: What if we

deconstructed the subject and object distinction and conceived of matter as agential and active? What if arts were channels for pre-thematic flows of desire, sensation, or affect that de-form the subject as much as form it? What if we were to conceive of our world as comprised of moods and rhythms that govern our decision-making process? What would become of art and politics on this view?

More often than not, politics in art and art education is associated with social justice projects (Dewhurst 2014). Such work focuses on overt interventions into particular political problems facing communities. This is vitally important work, but what we want to focus on is the space and time of education in relation to the arts and how overlaps between the two create new, uncanny spaces of dis- and re-orientation that defy pre-scripted social, political, or economic roles. Art is not political only when its content concerns political interests or overtly calls for the cultivation of specific civic virtues or activist interventions. Art is politically *dis-sensual* when it affects distributions of bodies, objects, roles, and functions of people and things in (potentially) unpredictable ways, thus recalibrating ratios between sense and non-sense, noise and voice, subject and object, pleasure and pain, constitutive and constituting powers, and so forth. Against the prescribed allotment of people, places, and things (each with their own logics, performance assessments, and internal rules of conduct), the essays collected here cross boundaries to inquire into in-disciplinary grey zones where new orientations open up that intervene in the policing of boundaries separating teaching (as a purportedly rational, generalizable science) from art (as a purportedly irrational, personal talent).

On this point, the collection as a whole is inspired by the writings of Rancière. Our sense, following Rancière, is that artistic categories like classical, modern and avant-garde, derive their intelligibility from an historical and progressive understanding of art. They rely on transitions or advancements—from two-dimensional painting to three-dimensional painting, from representative painting to non-representative painting and from realism to romanticism—that contrast new from old. Reifying these contrasts into periods, however, gives "only one meaning and direction in history" (Rancière 2004, p. 26) depriving the aesthetic of its radical potential to disrupt such categories and narrative frameworks. As a "regime of the sensible," the aesthetic is distinguished by its heterogeneity, which Rancière (2004) illustrates with the following examples: "a product identical with something not produced, knowledge transformed into non-knowledge, *logos* identical with pathos, the intention of the unintentional, etc." (p. 22). In other words, the aesthetic both is, and is not, itself.

The aesthetic calls into question any given distribution of the sensible by offering a rearrangement or redistribution of it. It repurposes what can be said, done and thought by disturbing, disrupting, or interrupting the meaningfully given. It is, to quote Rancière (2004), "the dream of an art that would transmit meanings in the form of a rupture with the very logic of meaningful situations" (p. 63). It produces a doubling effect: intelligibility and a profound sense of the uncanny. For these reasons, art—and we would add teaching—is to be seen as a political endeavor.

It is now possible to reiterate an earlier point using a different terminology. In the following essays, the contributors explore the role of aesthetic and pedagogical regimes in disrupting managerial and technological modes of framing. By definition, the disruption introduces indecision and is an occasion for rethinking how we distribute differences between art and education. How effective this disruption is will depend on the extent to which it reconfigures experience through new modes of narration, practice, and visibility.

1.3 Essays in This Volume

The essays in this collection are organized into two parts: "Art's Teaching" and "Teaching's Art." The essays in Part One focus on the educative influence of the different art forms. Responding to concerns that art education remains disembodied, depersonalized and depoliticized, the authors address such questions as: How and in what sense does *this* art form "teach" us? How can this art form be employed in classrooms to promote educational virtues like open-mindedness, heightened awareness, experiences of de-subjectification/collectivization, and/or critique? In answering these questions, the authors draw upon a diversity of theoretical frameworks: Giorgio Agamben's critical theory, Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology, Deweyan pragmatism, Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, and Marxist-inspired thinking. Together, they effectively recast the arts as active, disruptive and interrogatory; and, our involvement in them as embodied and (de) formative. While theoretically diverse, we would argue that when read together the essays focus on moments of aesthetic dissensus wherein perception is disoriented and reoriented toward that which would otherwise be cast out as "improper." The ever-increasing sense of the possibilities for aesthetic re-partitioning of the sensible is further heightened by our intentionally eclectic list of authors, which includes philosophers who are also practicing artists, practicing philosophers of art, and researchers/theorists of art education.

Before addressing the particular pedagogies of the arts, we begin our collection with an essay that paints a broad overview of aesthetic education as well as a warning concerning quick and easy attempts to instrumentalize or functionalize the arts and arts-based education. Ironically we enter the collection with an exit. John Baldacchino starts begins his "exit pedagogy" with a reflection on the eternal return of the essential paradoxes of aesthetic education. With a provocative twist, he wonders whether or not recent attempts to make art education "functional" (under multiple constructivist and pragmatic guises) are not a kind of Hegelian sublation of the didactic moment of Romantic *Bildung*. To then move beyond the problem of such didacticism, Baldacchino proposes a new notion of *Bildung* that resists any positivity and is decisively negative. Using Kundera's novel *Immorality* as a jumping off point, Baldacchino highlights forgetting as an educational "lesson" to be learned from the "exit pedagogy" of the arts—a pedagogy that cannot assure us or comfort us or provide us with functional solutions to problems of perception, self, and identity. For Baldacchino, this means that we learn nothing from art.

Rather, art offers us the experience of *unlearning* the familiar and conventional, and in this sense opens us to new utopian possibilities that, in themselves, are always contingent and uncertain memories of that which has not yet happened. In many ways, Baldacchino's general reflections on the aporias of aesthetics and on aesthetic education set the stage for the more particular investigations of visual arts, literature, music, and cinema which we present below. The following essays could be read as a response to Baldacchino's provocative thesis: Do we learn anything, in a positive sense, from the arts? If so what and how? Do different art forms offer different "lessons"?

The next essay begins with something that is common to art *and* education, namely natality. Natality is the capacity to bring that which is new and unforeseen into existence. With a focus on the avant-garde of the Parisian art-scene, Joris Vlieghe establishes an important distinction between creativity (as a psychological and personal process) and creation (which is impersonal and common event). He argues that education, like art, has made it increasingly difficult to acknowledge creation because of contemporary demands that it invest in the creative originality and uniqueness of each and every learner. This focus on the creative originality and uniqueness of the artist or learner, Vlieghe concludes, suffocates true newness.

In the next set of essays, Susan Verducci, Anne Keefe and René Arcilla explain how a particular art form—narrative, poetry and cinema respectively—educates perception to overcome perceptual blindness. In the first essay of the three, Verducci argues that if educators are to cultivate open-mindedness in themselves and their students, then they need to move from traditional notions of rationality to a more robust understanding of what it is to hold a belief. She artfully explores how our most fundamental beliefs are widely networked and emotionally charged, contributing to their invulnerability and the creation of perceptual blindness. Open-mindedness, Verducci argues, does not prohibit the holding of strong beliefs, but it does oblige individuals to become available to what she refers to as perceptual openings. She proposes that teachers use narratives as a curricular means of creating such perceptual openings: occasions that lead us to see and feel differently. Narratives expose us to a wide variety worldviews, give us practice in adopting another's point of view and enable us to view our own beliefs from the position of a spectator. Put simply, narratives provide the friction needed if individuals are to monitor and revise their own beliefs.

Keefe agrees with Verducci that art can cause us to see differently and is, for this reason, pedagogical. Keefe also moves beyond a traditional notion of rationality, arguing that the reading and writing of poetry are inherently bodily experiences. She claims, following Merleau-Ponty, that because perception is a bodily perspective, perceptual changes result in bodily changes. Put differently, the body gains new significance and reach by means of novel interactions. Keefe illustrates this point with an analysis of two examples of twentieth century ekphrastic poetry: Margaret Atwood's "Manet's Olympia" (1993) and three poems by Marianne Moore. Ekphrasis, she argues, teaches new and more complex ways of seeing, either by interfering with gendered traditions of the image, as in the case of Atwood, or by showing how not everything is disclosed to artistic representation, as in the

case of Moore. The struggle to genuinely look again involves an embrace of the poet's language—its sounds, rhythm and lyric form—as an evocation of the artistic experience. Keefe urges teachers to transform the teaching of poetry from the solely intellectual practice of exegesis to a phenomenological trust in sensory, embodied logic.

The last of the three papers on perception considers the "counter-cinema" of Jean-Pierre and Luc Dardenne in *Rosetta's Stone*. Rene Arcilla interprets the film as articulating a constructive response to our neoliberal predicament by depicting characters struggling to survive on the margins of society. The Dardenne's use the powerful cinematic medium—the actor's bodies are filmed from very close range—to deconstruct the fantasies which movies normally give rise. Contrary to society's ideological reassurances, *Rosetta's Stone* reveals that violence is violating and that the only way to come to a proper understanding of violation is to acknowledge our complicity in violence. Hardened by misfortune, the characters are surprised by how they feel after having hurt someone; they feel that they have violated another's need for recognition. The Dardenne's position us, the viewer, to recognize that we cannot avoid being corrupted by a culture of violence. Rather than providing an escape into fantasy, their films reveal a state of affairs that we would prefer not to see. Their aim, Arcilla concludes, is not to invite a cathartic expression of sympathy, but to realistically represent the existential and ethical struggles incurred by capitalism.

As with Arcilla, James Stillwaggon and David Jelinek turn toward film as a kind of public pedagogy—this time, a pedagogy of desire. Beginning with an overview of our recent fascination with teacher scandals, Stillwaggon and Jelinek argue that the real scandal is an underestimation of how school films educate students to desire the authoritative teacher and educate teachers to desire the desire of their students. Throughout their chapter, Stillwaggon and Jelinek suggest that film is the most powerful teacher of all, structuring the fantasy of education in both its positive (performative) and negative (transgressive) dimensions. Films such as *Election* and *Notes on a Scandal* demonstrate that when teachers attempt to realize fantasies of the "ideal teacher," the fantasies turn into nightmares where desires to connect with students lead to relationships outside the symbolic order of teaching (illicit sexual affairs). At the same time, Stillwaggon and Jelinek, in a dialectical move, also argue that such films can and do play a role in recognizing the potentially beneficial nature of the educational fantasy, one that orients desire toward a better version of the self.

jan jagodzinski also is concerned with the pedagogy of film. His chapter positions contemporary cinema within the broader socio-political context of screen culture, media saturation, and digitization. Given the rise of digital technologies, there is now more than ever a threat to what Deleuze and Guarttari refer to as the Outside. The Outside is essentially a nonanthropomorphic space and time proverbially on the fringe of the human world of meaning and intentionality. Without this Outside, reality becomes nothing more than repetition without difference and the surplus or excess of the Outside is eclipsed for the continual play of simulacra across our many screens. This is the key threat posed by digitization which arts educators should be most concerned with. As an alternative, this chapter returns to

the question of film, and how film's pedagogy might retain a space and a time for the Outside. Importantly, jagodzinski folds together insights from Deleuze and Guattari and contemporary interest in the brain and neuro-images in order to posit a new, post-human desire that is affective and deterritorializing, pushing beyond boundaries of the control society of which digitization is but one symptom.

With Megan J. Laverty's paper we move from questions of perception, desire, and affective intensities to rhythm or the patterned and recurrent alternation of sound and silence that we find in music. She considers the broader existential significance of this phenomenon using Dewey's aesthetic philosophy. Laverty argues that if Dewey is right that (a) music exemplifies artfulness and (b) to live well is to live artfully, then an education in music—formal and informal—constitutes an education in how to live well. Artfulness, according to Dewey, involves the intelligent harmonizing of the precarious, novel and irregular with the settled, assured and uniform. Laverty explains what Dewey means by intelligent harmonization and contrasts it with those occasions when individuals act from enforced necessity, routine or blind impulse. Laverty offers an intrinsic justification for arts education that focuses on a quality not previously highlighted by Greene and others. Although clearly humanist, Laverty thereby aligns her with other post-humanist contributions by focusing on an iterative process constitutive of our material condition. The aim, as with so much of post-humanism, is not to control or direct this process in the interest of a *telos,* but to vibrate possibility.

In the spirit of Laverty's contribution, Alexander J. Means cautions against conceptions of the arts and arts education in terms of such non-instrumental capacities as imagination, innovation, and creativity. These are the core educational values of corporate-inspired and entrepreneur-led school reform; students must make, experiment, collaborate and question if they are to contribute to the "global knowledge economy." As the language suggests, the motivation is economic: imagination, innovation, and creativity are desirable commodities in light of their exchange value. Means proposes the creation of alternative value systems through engaging with what resists endless commodification, namely our fundamental commonality and equality. The aim, he argues, is to take seriously the idea that aesthetics and aesthetic education work to affirm and construct new forms of value rooted in the common. While aesthetic education may include the arts, it extends to the full range of human experience. Aesthetic education is communicative, community-building, and promises a new life for individuals. It is also, for these reasons, political. It disrupts and reconstructs the given orders of perception through creative acts. Thus, Means concludes that the genuinely aesthetic and the genuinely political are currently under threat; it would behoove us not to be seduced by educational discourse and policy which seems to pay homage to cherished virtues (such as creativity) without recognizing the larger context of capitalism which thrives on precisely these very same virtues.

Sarah Truman and Stephanie Springgay's contribution concludes Part One. As the title suggests, their analysis addresses the role of movement in art, pedagogy, and theory. They distinguish between absolute and relative movement and argue in favor of the former. Relative movement is symptomatic of the Eurocentric,

humanist anthropomorphic perspective because it conceives of movement as human-organized and human-controlled. In an inversion of hierarchies, absolute movement conceives of matter as movement; matter is vital, agential, and endlessly differentiating. The movement is intensive, flowing, and affective. When movement is conceived as absolute, pedagogy becomes emergent. To show that absolute movement can help us re-imagine materialist and post-humanist research-creation methodologies—a complex intersection of art, theory, and research—Truman and Springgay analyze Hazel Meyer's first artist-residency in a public secondary school in Toronto as an instance of absolute movement or swarming. In Meyer's work, art and pedagogy are political in the sense that they are dynamic; they involve movement; they disrupt objectification. The dynamic movement is experienced as an ecology of shifting flows and unpredictable foldings.

Truman and Springgay's contribution nicely segues into part two of the collection. Schools should not seek to expose students to either art, politics, or political art in the interest of emancipating them from their conventionality or ignorance. Instead, schools should aim to involve students in such dynamic swarming with its shifting intensity and immanence. Truman and Springgay remind us that art and pedagogy are not instrumental for a form of life; nor do they instantiate an idealized form of life. They themselves are forms of life in the making. We forget this at our own peril.

The second half of the collection moves from the teachings offered by various art forms to the art/craft of teaching itself. Citing Rancière (2010), we would argue that each essay attempts to understand the aesthetic unconscious of teaching. Just as psychoanalysis drew upon important developments in aesthetics in order to theorize its own practice, so too our authors argue that teaching draws upon various artistic lineages in order to become a craft with its own rhythms, gestures, and curatorial dimensions. In the opening chapter, Tyson E. Lewis argues for a new understanding of the art of teaching beyond what Agamben refers to as the ontology of effectiveness. Taking as his starting point the current terrain of educational discourse and practice, Lewis criticizes the dominance of learning as a symptom of this modern ontology that conflates potentiality and actuality, being and doing. The problem with effectiveness is that it leaves no ontological ground for impotentiality (the ability not to be this or that). And for Agamben, this means that there is equally no place in effectiveness for freedom. But Lewis also goes one step further and argues that even the most ardent critic of learning, Gert Biesta, reproduces the ontology of effectiveness. Through a careful reading of Biesta's work, Lewis discovers the need to reinvent teaching—and teacher education in particular—beyond both *poiesis* and *praxis*. What is called for here is a form of teaching that does not erase impotentiality but rather embraces it. To do so means understanding the gestures of the teacher as theatrical gestures, and thus beautiful.

The next two essays in this section focus on the musicality of teaching which interrupts the current emphasis on "data driven" technique and quantifiable assessments. Eduardo Duarte positions his contribution in relation to his own teaching practice, his scholarly interests in originary thinking, and his expertise in radio programming. The emerging phenomenology of education

focuses on learning by jamming. As a rearticulation of Aristotle's famous adage that we learn by doing, Duarte shifts registers to the aesthetic, emphasizing the unique and constitutive relation between music and teaching and learning. While different kinds of music are possible in a classroom, Duarte focuses on improvisational jamming. The educational jam session is, according to Duarte, a form of collective, improvisational dialogue that is phenomenologically akin to a free jazz ensemble. In both cases, jamming opens up a kairological time where the chronology of the everyday is suspended. Through the kairos of jamming, participants are moved outside of themselves into new possibilities existing in surplus of their individual wills, intentions, or assumed "intellectual" powers. The result is a de-subjectification of each participant and his or her presumed identity as this or that kind of learner. The de-subjectification experienced through jamming together opens up unforeseen potentialities to think and be differently than before. The role of the teacher here is that of the "conductor" who maintains the openness to potentiality in the jam. Duarte's prime example of one such conductor is the music making Socrates prized by Nietzsche in *The Birth of Tragedy*. On Duarte's reading, Socrates emerges as a conductor not just of any dialogue but of aporetic dialogue that sustains open-ended questioning by continually circling back upon itself. If measurable outcomes cannot be determined by such aporetic jam sessions, this does not mean that nothing is achieved. While escaping the exactitude of quantifiable scales of value found in educational assessment today, Duarte is keen to point to the work of the jam: the constitution of a community existing in the unity of difference where each contributes to the whole but in a singularly irreducible way. As such, jamming discloses another educational logic beyond the learning-testing regime of contemporary standardization, and its aporetic-operatic musicality opens education back up to the potentialities of a radical form of multicultural polyvocality.

In some ways, Sam Rocha's contribution is in dialogue with Duarte's but with a bluesy, tragic dimension added into the mix. Jazz, like education, faces a crisis: technocratic reductionism. Against this trend, Rocha makes an impassioned, phenomenologically rich plea for a return to the shared blue note that binds the two together as tragic art forms. Embodying the notion of jazzhop in the very form of the essay, Rocha rhythmically moves from John Coltrane and Miles Davis to canonical academic figures such as William James and Leo Tolstoy to novelist Toni Morrison in order to sensitize the ear of the reader to the undercurrent of the blue note that passes through multiple sonic channels, contexts, and voices both directly and indirectly implicated in educational projects. In all cases, what emerges is a shifting of musical registers from singing—which might be technically proficient according to set scales of excellence—to *sanging*—which recovers the blue note in the voice and returns the art of making music to its soulful, tragic center. But Rocha's emphasis on the tragic should not be read as a lament or a moment of despair. Quite the contrary. The tragedy of the blues is deeply spiritual, aesthetic, and full of profound love—a love that reigns supreme in the face of multiple, unheard-of obstacles facing teachers in schools today.

With his contribution, David Granger addresses the intimate interdependence of mind and body in order to call for a new kind of embodied anti-racist pedagogy.

He introduces analytic somaesthetics as the examination of the experiential dimension of the lived body that is feeling, sentient, and purposive. Such an examination discloses how ideologies of domination are covertly materialized in and maintained by norms of somatic or bodily behavior that remain largely inaccessible to conscious processes. Following Michel Foucault and others, Granger explains that the body is a malleable site for inscribing social power and the struggle to resist such inscription. Just as our bodies express prevailing ideologies, they are also a means of protest, resistance, and performative transgression. Granger focuses on racist somatic norms, including: avoidance of eye contact, maintenance of physical distance, construction of muscles, and alterations in breathing. He argues that, having eluded critical attention, racist somatic norms trigger, reinforce, and even heighten oppressive or discriminatory behaviors in our encounters with racial "others." Having explained why "rationalist" approaches to racism prove ineffective, Granger recommends that educators give students an opportunity to monitor and scrutinize their embodied habits—the artifacts of biopolitics—with a view to interrupting and transforming them. In heightening student awareness of their embodiedness and addressing the visceral logic of prejudice, teachers will artfully transform somaesthetics into a tool of anti-racist education.

Finally, Claudia Ruitenburg shifts from the aural dimensions of education to the visual with her chapter on curating. Today in a media-saturated landscape wherein students are barraged by any number of visual cues, Ruitenburg calls for a "curatorial turn" in education that will help students understand the need to make discriminating, critical, and creative choices in how they organize their visual worlds. For Ruitenburg, curating is not simply collecting. Rather it is the art of selecting and ordering. In this sense, it is always already a constitutive facet of teaching, which is a craft devoted in part to the careful selection and presentation of various materials. But Ruitenburg does not simply want to call attention to this as-of-yet underappreciated dimension of the art of teaching. In addition, she argues that now more than ever, teachers should thematize and make explicit their curatorial roles for three reasons. As the mediatized world of images often verges on disintegration and disconnection curating has not simply become a facet of life online but also a pressing necessity for navigating this complex terrain. Second, because teachers are always already selecting, framing, ordering, and presenting materials, it is important for them to become critical of these implicit decisions and the criteria informing their various selection processes. Finally, a curatorial turn is urgent precisely because of the need to understand the relation between selecting, organizing, and producing publics. Fragmentation is endemic in postmodern culture. Educators and curators alike share a unique role in addressing the problematic of isolation through the fostering of publics, or, as Ruitenburg seems to suggest, fostering the addressability necessary to enter publics.

Drawing on this final suggestion, we would like to conclude with a simple observation: editing a book is a curatorial experience in its own right. And, like curators in museums or classrooms, we find ourselves calling into being a peculiar counter-public: one that is concerned with the work of craft and the craft of work. While this public has no name as of yet (and indeed might be a multiplicity in its