Art History Pedagogy & Practice

Volume 2
Issue 2 *New Research in SoTL-AH*

2017

Why World Art is Urgent Now: Rethinking the Introductory Survey in a Seminar Format

Gretchen Holtzapple Bender
University of Pittsburgh

Follow this and additional works at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp

Part of the Art Education Commons, Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Educational Methods Commons, History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons, and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons

Recommended Citation

Bender, Gretchen Holtzapple. 2017. "Why World Art is Urgent Now: Rethinking the Introductory Survey in a Seminar Format." *Art History Pedagogy & Practice* 2, (2). https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp/vol2/iss2/2

Art History Pedagogy and Practice is published biannually by Art History Teaching Resources (AHTR) in partnership with the Office of Library Services of the City University of New York and the Graduate Center at the City University of New York. For more information, please contact info@arthistorypp.org.

Why World Art is Urgent Now: Rethinking the Introductory Survey in a Seminar Format

Cover Page Footnote

The development of the World Art curriculum at the University of Pittsburgh was launched by the tremendous foundation established by David Wilkins and Katheryn Linduff, pioneers in thinking about how, exactly, one teaches a survey that includes global content. My thinking about these endeavors was given further impetus by a 2013 workshop sponsored by the Global Studies and World History Centers at the University of Pittsburgh, "Inscribing the World," in which I was invited to present. Comments received from workshop participants were invaluable. The innovative seminar described in this essay, "World Art: Contact and Conflict," was developed and continues to be supported through a generous curriculum development grant from Pitt's Global Studies Center. Henry Skerritt partnered with me at various occasions to develop new content and a bibliography for the course. I am indebted to his efforts and the sense of partnership he provided in our endeavor. Additional support was provided by the University Honors College which gave me the opportunity to team-teach an initial pilot version of this course in the spring of 2015 with my colleague Gordon Mitchell from the Department of Communication. His insight and perspective on the themes of the course and teaching practices in general were invaluable. I have been fortunate to work over several years with adventurous, sharp and innovative graduate and undergraduate student teaching assistants who have undoubtedly left a significant imprint on the courses described here and my teaching practice. My work has been deeply enriched by their commitment and energy. I have consistently received support and encouragement from Kirk Savage and Barbara McCloskey, consecutive chairs of our History of Art and Architecture Department, who have given me the time, space, and intellectual support to launch and drive this project. I would also like to thank Alison Langmead for her editing assistance but more importantly keen pedagogical insight – from her I have learned much over the years. Kathryn Joranson has also been a wonderful colleague, helping me to articulate the value of research for undergraduate students, the contributions libraries can make to innovative learning practices in the classroom, and, more broadly, the connections between curiosity, creativity and engaged learning. Isabelle Chartier has been a partner in helping us redesign the Art Lab component of the large lecture course and her insights about how to teach in front of real objects are always inspiring. This important facet of the redesign of the large lecture class could not have happened without her. I would like to thank the University Center for Teaching and Learning at Pitt (formerly CIDDE) for their support. I collaborated with Carol Washburn, a curriculum development specialist, to organize and plan questions for a focus group that would enable me to determine the effectiveness of the course in achieving its learning objectives. Also, John Radzilowicz from the Center generously met with me to help revise the collaborative teaching assignment for the large auditorium version of World Art and imagine what might replace the standard exam. He also was particularly helpful in answering my questions about the broader SoTL scholarship that informed my project.

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License

This article is available in Art History Pedagogy & Practice: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp/vol2/iss2/2

Why World Art is Urgent Now: Rethinking the Introductory Survey in a Seminar Format

Gretchen Holtzapple Bender
University of Pittsburgh

Teaching a large introductory art history lecture like "Introduction to World Art" to 200 students a year can lead to frustration. The strictures of the teaching space, the weight of managing multiple students' needs and abilities, and the time commitment required for grading (when one is not content to simply revert to multiple-choice quizzes and exams) impose limitations that often stifle innovation and best intentions.

While I had previously been able to make some positive revisions to the course over the years, inspired by the long standing body of scholarship that advocates for collaborative, active learning, I took a more radical step to test both new teaching practices and a reprioritization of learning objectives for the fundamental gateway course for the discipline.[1] To do so, the World Art course was converted into a seminar format that takes contact and conflict as its theme. Content traditionally the purview of the introductory survey was instead reframed for a smaller group that included both advanced majors and students with no prior experience, who engaged with the material through more intensive critical readings and assignments. In so doing, I was primarily motivated by an urgent need to first understand and then convey not just the relevance of art history as a discipline, but also the productive urgency of the work it can do in a curriculum that engages students in thinking about difference and diversity. The experiment provided me with the space and time to work through a fundamental redesign of the classroom environment and my teaching methods and then contemplate how certain revisions could then translate back into the large lecture version of the course.

First and centrally, the authoritative stance imposed by a lecture format gave way in the seminar to a space for speaking and listening that was collaborative and exploratory. Articulated below is a call for art history teachers to embrace humility and fragility when faced with the daunting task of teaching broad introductory material. The instructor should become a participant who listens to and learns from the art encounters with students, as much as guides them. When this happens, curiosity and critical thinking are nurtured not just about content, disciplinary knowledge, and methods, but also alterity itself.[2]

This essay will first discuss the theoretical and disciplinary advocacy that inspired the initiative. Next, a consideration of the "art encounter" will follow—an event or

---

1 Kenneth A. Bruffee, *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge,* 2nd ed. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999); Elizabeth F. Barkley, Claire Howell Major, and K. Patricia Cross, *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*, 2nd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014); Roberta S. Matthews, "Collaborative Learning: Creating Knowledge with Students," in Robert J. Mendes, Maryellen Weimer, and Assoc., eds., *Teaching on Solid Ground: Using Scholarship to Improve Practice* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996); Michael Sweet, and Larry K. Michaelsen, *Team-based Learning in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Group Work that Works to Generate Critical Thinking and Engagement* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publications, 2012).

2 The new seminar was approved by the University of Pittsburgh's Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences to count toward our new "Diversity" and "Global Understanding – Cross-Cultural Awareness" general education requirements, in addition to its longstanding place as a course in the "Arts."

activity central to our disciplinary enterprise. What is it and why is it essential to train students to engage with artworks in this manner? I then advocate for "slow teaching" and conversation as the best teaching methods—for both experienced majors and novice general education students. Detailed below is a World Art teaching process: how and why key works and particular texts were selected, and how classroom activities were restructured and assignments redesigned. Primary learning objectives are explained, including the need to engage students in the practice of research.[3] The efficacy of the seminar experiment will be demonstrated through a close reading and assessment of student work produced in two significant assignments and student response as articulated in course evaluations and in a focus group designed in partnership with the University of Pittsburgh's Teaching and Learning Center. The essay concludes with a brief discussion of how the World Art seminar experiment has led to a fundamental revision of the large auditorium survey version of the course.

This experiment was generated by an initial question: who is the primary audience for an introductory art history class? This varies, of course, from institution to institution. The question is paramount. A single, uniform way of teaching this disciplinary foundation class is neither possible nor desirable. At my institution, the vast majority of students enrolling in Introduction to World Art are doing so to satisfy a general education requirement.[4] In all likelihood, it will be the only art or art history class the student takes while at university, and certainly the vast majority of students enrolling in the class has no intention of majoring in the field.[5] Knowing this led to a reprioritization of the learning objectives for the course.

Realizing that majors can attain fuller content knowledge across several semesters while enrolled in our diverse courses, and thus need not rely on the introductory course to achieve this, I emphasized "global understanding" as a central learning objective for both the lecture and seminar versions of the course. We, as a department, had recently added this as an objective for the program as a whole, defining this outcome as the students' ability to demonstrate knowledge of the diversity of human cultures across the globe, and to be able to address how cultures vary in terms of social, political, and religious contexts and value systems. They will also be able to identify that cultures can be defined in varying scales and that boundaries between groups of people are

[3] See additional supplementary material provided in the Appendices that give further clarity to course design and structure.

[4] When I started teaching this class in 2002, it was titled "Introduction to Art" and proceeded as a chronological survey that was global to some extent (a good representation of Asian material and some African and pre-Columbian), but the majority of works covered were canonical and Western. As a department, we wanted to reprioritize the "global" aspect of the course and renamed it "Introduction to World Art." I converted it from a chronological survey to one structured thematically and, over the years, a radical thinning of content has ensued. The class was always offered in a single semester, hence 15 weeks to cover the entirety of human artistic production. We now structure the class around close looking at select works, sites, and objects as case studies.

[5] Of 201 students enrolled in the large lecture section of Introduction to World Art in Fall 2015, 4 were History of Art majors, 4 Architectural Studies majors, and 5 Studio Arts majors. Thus, about 93% of students enrolled had *no* intention of becoming majors in these fields.

porous, with ideas exchanged through the mobility of groups, individuals, and objects, with cultural contact a zone of potential productive collaboration but also power inequity and conflict.

The experimental seminar was named "World Art: Contact and Conflict," and the course was structured around artworks, images, and sites that occupy the borders and meeting points where humans come to contend with each other.[6]

Great Aspirations

It has been two decades since Mark Miller Graham, in an edition of the *Art Journal* dedicated to rethinking the art history survey, associated the teleological overview by which the traditional course was structured with a particularly Western perspective, one that often delineated "civilization" and "culture" in Eurocentric terms. "The West ought to be problematized as a construct whose content and boundaries change through time and always in response to Others whose existence defines the West… The notion of the survey is tied to the authority of the panoptic gaze and the privileged perspective. If we reject that, we can start over."[7] More than this, art history courses, according to Graham, can be intimidating and exclusionary for many of the diverse students enrolled in them who then regard their estrangement as "the natural order of things."[8] Evidence that students regard themselves as outsiders to the elite world of art emerged in a recent focus

---

[6] My development of the "World Art" curriculum at the University of Pittsburgh was launched by the tremendous foundation established by David Wilkins and Katheryn Linduff, pioneers in thinking about how, exactly, one teaches a "survey" that includes global content. My thinking about these endeavors was given further impetus by a 2013 workshop sponsored by the Global Studies and World History Centers at the University of Pittsburgh, "Inscribing the World," in which I was invited to present. Comments received from workshop participants were invaluable. The innovative seminar described in this essay, "World Art: Contact and Conflict," was developed and continues to be supported through a generous curriculum development grant from the Global Studies Center. Henry Skerritt partnered with me at various occasions in the past years to develop new content and a bibliography for the course. I am indebted to his efforts and the sense of partnership he provided in our endeavor. Additional support was provided by the University Honors College which gave me the opportunity to team-teach an initial pilot version of this course in the spring of 2015 with my colleague Gordon Mitchell from the Department of Communication. His insight and perspective on the themes of the course and teaching practices in general are much appreciated. I have been fortunate to work over several years with adventurous, sharp, and innovative graduate student teaching assistants who have undoubtedly left a significant imprint on the courses described here and my teaching practice. My work has been deeply enriched by their commitment and energy. I have consistently received support and encouragement from Kirk Savage and Barbara McCloskey, consecutive chairs of our History of Art and Architecture Department, who have given me the time, space, and intellectual support to launch and drive this project. I would also like to thank Alison Langmead for her editing assistance and keen pedagogical insight—from her I have learned much over the years. Kathryn Joranson has also been a wonderful colleague, helping me to articulate the value of research for undergraduate students, the contributions libraries can make to innovative learning practices in the classroom, and, more broadly, the connections between curiosity, creativity and engaged learning. Isabelle Chartier has been a partner in helping us redesign the Art Lab component of the large lecture course and her insights about how to teach in front of real objects are always inspiring.

[7] Mark Miller Graham, "The Future of Art History and the Undoing of the Survey," *Art Journal* 54/3 (Autumn, 1995), 32-33. (Issue dedicated to "Rethinking the Introductory Art History Survey.")

[8] Graham, 31.

group session I conducted with students enrolled in my experimental seminar.[9] One student admitted to initial nervousness about taking an art class, feeling as if they knew nothing and that the subject would be intimidating: "I could tell you zero things about artistic production and human culture before this class." Another indicated a fear of "sound[ing] stupid." Students in this and most of my other World Art sections demonstrate trepidation of being perceived as uneducated—and hence inferior—and culturally naïve.[10]

One of the main motivating factors in my teaching is to make art and the various discourses that rise to explain it accessible, giving students the tools and confidence to speak as interpreters with standing. In addition, the new seminar course foregrounds the multiplicity of historical and contemporary perspectives and the way in which the interpretation of artworks and art historical explanation cannot escape being situated in particular worldviews. This is a partial way out of the imperialist conundrum posed by the traditional teleological survey. Robert Nelson scrutinized, among other things, the survey textbooks used in introductory courses, and argued that allowing "multiple 'speaking voices'" into the course "causes different civilizations to appear and disappear and to move from margin to center and vice versa."[11] Making these moves apparent and discussing them self-reflexively is one of the primary goals of the new course.

With the course structured around contact and conflict, mobility and exchange, I was attempting to adopt a planetary mode of thinking. In her response to the *Art Bulletin* series "Whither Art History," Griselda Pollock advocated that our discipline adopt Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's "planetary thinking" as guide, particularly in our endeavors as teachers.[12] Her summation grounded my efforts to revise the World Art course as it was configured and acted out. The world is not "given or imagined" but rather

> a becoming based on the work we do both in *opposition* to the dominion of globalization and in *fidelity* to incomplete dreams and desires for deep and real social justice and world-wide human dignity…Planetary thinking disowns many of the models for thinking the world and its others…we are neither thinking about them nor conceptualizing them: "them" becoming an other to the "we" who

---

[9] I would like to thank the University Center for Teaching and Learning at Pitt (formerly CIDDE) for their support. I collaborated with Carol Washburn, a curriculum development specialist, to generate focus group questions that would enable me to determine the effectiveness of the course in achieving my learning objectives. Eight students from the course volunteered to participate. I did not attend the session. My colleague led discussion, posing our predetermined questions, and generated a transcript of the conversation and student response. Student names were substituted by aliases so that I could not identify them. Also, John Radzilowicz from the Center generously met with me to help revise the collaborative teaching assignment for the large auditorium version of World Art and imagine what might replace the standard exam. He also was particularly helpful in answering my questions about the broader SoTL scholarship that informed my project.

[10] This point was underscored as well by Tamara Fox in a paper "Aesthetics, Teaching and the Indefinite," presented at the annual SECAC conference in Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015 in a panel moderated by Jason Hoelscher, "Art and Indeterminacy: Tactical Ambiguity in the Era of Standardized Testing."

[11] Robert Nelson, "The Map of Art History," *Art Bulletin* 79/1 (March 1997), 35.

[12] Griselda Pollock, "Whither Art History?" *Art Bulletin* 96/1 (March 2014), 13-17. The central text by Spivak referred to by Pollock is *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 51-68.

> make them an object of thought. We think the issue. Thinking is a process, thinking otherness, thinking the world, thinking sexual difference, means encountering the challenge of that which already includes us and from which we cannot abstract ourselves as "thinkers about."[13]

One particular phrase in Pollock's synopsis struck a chord, one where she amends Spivak's original. Planetary thinking "arises from…our condition as humans *intending toward one another"* [emphasis mine].[14] Could this not become the essence of teaching and learning—the continual working through and toward?

My teaching of World Art, both the advanced seminar and large auditorium sections, is predicated on the act of conversation centered on the physicality of *facing a thing*. Following a close reading of David Summers's *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, I organized the course around the fact that art history centers around an encounter: someone looks at, addresses, occupies, or faces something.[15] Our discipline is predicated on the act of interpretation as it emerges from this meeting point, an exchange that attends very carefully to the attributes of and issues of facture inherent to physical objects and sites. We are concerned with why and how human beings have made things.

The Art Encounter and the Situated Observer

Focusing on the centrality of the encounter as a starting point for interpretation, the class presumes that this is an empowering and vital endeavor for any student. Art and architectural history train individuals to not look beyond and through the small, intricate, and detailed material circumstances of the world around them and to engage in a conversation with the stuff that human beings take time to craft and conceptualize. Temporality plays a key role, as the encounter positions the present observer/interlocutor before a site or object that was constructed in a distant time. As Nelson has noted, "the art historical object was made by and for people other than the present writer and reader," and thus "continually reminds us of its alterity."[16] This temporal disparity solicits a particularly charged cognizance of history and of the gaps between human cultures living in different moments, but also of shared human experience and patterns that extend across

[13] Pollock, 14-15.

[14] Pollock, 14-15. Spivak's declaration is, "to be human is to be intended toward the other. We provide for ourselves transcendental figurations of what we think is the origin of this animating gift: mother, nation, god, nature. These are names of alterity, some more radical than others." (Spivak, 51-52) Pollock's rewording ("one another") is a significant shift as it redirects the "intending" from the transcendental to the particular. Pollock continues, "In the case of education as a distinctive and precious locus of encountering the other through literature or through art...Planetary thinking involves reading for the words, voices, images, inscriptions of those other planetary subjects." Similarly, this essay homes in on the particular experience of those of us who engaged in the World Art seminar and the works we encountered together, an approach that, while inspired by Spivak's abstract theorization of "Planetarity" (as a means of working against globalization and the forces of colonialism toward an environmentally inspired way of thinking ourselves thinking others as both at home on the planet and simultaneously alterior to it), begins and remains at the local.

[15] See David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London and New York: Phaidon, 2003).

[16] Nelson, 40.

time.[17] Likewise, art history provides a framework for students to investigate and empathize with the diversity of human culture across the globe, "facing" objects crafted in distant regions and/or crafted by others whose world pictures and values differ from their own and understanding how distinct cultures of varying scales have intersected throughout time.

As the "art encounter" often transpires across a gap both temporal and geographic, the act of interpretation and engagement defies definitive answers, closed and finite solutions. Observers must grapple with complexity, contradiction, and ambiguity. Art history is thus poised particularly well to contend with and center on diversity and global understanding as chief learning objectives. Over the past several decades, art historians have argued for the important contribution our discipline provides to a liberal arts curriculum by rightfully citing our students' capacity for critical thinking and employment of effective written communication and visual analysis skills (the latter sometimes referred to as visual literacy). We would be remiss at this juncture, when humanities disciplines are devalued as having little practical purpose, to not stress the way in which art historians think deeply about alterity and the ways in which humans have intersected throughout time in contact zones that are often charged and difficult. Insofar as art objects have often maintained elite status, art history is a means to interrogate power relations, to ask how and why human societies become stratified and how the spaces that we build to inculcate communal or collective identity are often inherently and subsequently exclusionary.[18]

As Pollock asserts, "the purpose of planetary work is not to make us feel at home but to unsettle any mastering of the world, and to make us fragile before affect and before alterity."[19] *Any* instructor of a sweeping introduction to art that aspires to global coverage must feel "fragile" before this daunting challenge. When we teach in our research areas, our expertise is comforting, and we can assume a position of deep knowledgeability. When we teach a global survey or expansive introductory course, we are almost continuously reminded of the tenuousness of our "expert" position. We will simply not live long enough to master our material, to know deeply what we want to know about the histories and works that we encounter. Each year, I formulate *more* questions about the works that have become part of the repertoire. And the repertoire itself shifts over time.

---

[17] For example, while David Summers warns that it would be folly to seek a universal definition or understanding of "art" that makes sense across all historical periods and cultures, he does attempt to locate some degree of universal understanding, connecting current observers to past observers and makers, through the "anthropomorphism of the conditions and values of real space," "external conditions interlock[ing] in one way or another with the conditions of human physicality." See Summers, 37-39. David Hulks wrestles with whether a thing such as "World Art" can exist and how one might go about thinking about it while avoiding "Hegelian colonialism." He advocates that art history should turn to the question of whether all human societies have art, forming alliances with anthropology and archaeology, not neglecting the prehistoric, and paying less attention to national and regional classification systems. See his "World Art Studies: A Radical Proposition," *World Art* 3/2 (2013), 189-200.

[18] These ideas are articulated in more detail in Summers, *Real Spaces*, 15-60.

[19] Pollock, 15. Pollock is leaning here on Bracha Ettinger's thinking about reading as a process of "self- fragilization." Bracha Ettinger, "Fragilization and Resistance," in *Fragilization and Resistance* (Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Fine Arts, 2009), 97-134.

Teaching the expansive introductory course requires humility, a trait not typical in our research practices.[20]

But, as Pollock implies, it is more than this. Assuming a position of humility and modesty in the classroom is central to effective teaching as it invites and enables open thinking. We should become guides in helping students structure questions. In addition, when we acknowledge our own subject positions and articulate what interests us in a transparent manner—why we choose to cover certain things over others, and what questions we still maintain about the material—we demonstrate that situated looking is inherent to the discipline itself, and thus our students, as situated observers, have a place and role to play in the discourse. Returning to Graham, these courses should not be about totalizing narratives or closure, the simple bestowing of traditional knowledge. Instead "we might prepare students to understand that many issues, art historical or not, are not easily resolved" and it is acceptable and even desirable to leave a class with more questions than answers—that they should feel empowered to contribute to the unfolding of thinking.[21]

Slow Teaching, Deep Learning, and Thick Description

Traditionally, the purpose of an introductory art history course was "to place a work, to establish its identity in relation to an author, a place, a movement, a style, a chronology, a culture, a national spirit," according to Pollock. She continues:

> I have always sensed that much of what is done in the history of art classroom is a kind of disciplining of thinking about art…Consistency and even uniformity of message safeguard the passing on of cultural capital for the next generation or across social constituencies…What kind of knowledge would be produced and what kind of subjects would we become through such readings that make art not the support for the narratives we learn to, or are disciplined to inhabit but the critical space of its own working through/working out as part of this making of the planetary as a fiction we are constantly in process of forging and seeking to share?[22]

In practical terms, how does one structure a course to encourage readings that generate a "critical space of its own working through/working out?" Over the years of teaching the survey, the content (number of works covered) has been radically reduced so that a fifty-minute class session will typically cover only two to three works, often ones from distinct regions or cultures whose juxtaposition provokes critical thinking and raises questions. A nice summation of my approach has been articulated by Berzel de Dios in a post to Art History Teaching Resources on "Slow Teaching."

---

[20] This point was raised by Laura Holzman, "Beyond the Exhibition? Art History as Public Scholarship," in a paper presented at annual SECAC conference in Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015 in a panel chaired by Cindy Persinger and Azar Rejaie, "Socially Engaged Art History."
[21] Graham, 34.
[22] Pollock, 16-17.

> Teaching slowly means sacrificing range, to not study the many artworks that we art historians see as vital to the curriculum. The payoff is a focus on deep learning: examining the social and historical context of an artwork as well as incorporating scholarly debates and theoretical approaches… My goal is not to unburden the curriculum so much as to shift the weight. I do not teach less material. I teach more focused material, building more sophisticated and advanced questions upon a basic and intuitive level of understanding. For me, teaching slowly is not a question of reducing complexity but rather of fomenting complexity by reducing quantity and rote memorization.[23]

In the seminar version of the course, we spent a seventy-five minute class session often focused on a single work as case-study. For example, when considering the Bayeux "Tapestry," we engaged with Carola Hicks' biography of the work.[24] While learning about this particular "masterpiece," her dense consideration of the work both at the moment of its creation and in future centuries provided students with a way to also regard art historical work—the types of questions art historians pose and the information they assemble to construct interpretations. This included an extensive consideration of the historical context and leading historical figures who are depicted in the "tapestry," the identity of the patron and how this is disputed among scholars, an iconographical consideration of the work's details, and an analysis of its visual modes of communication (how it works as a visual artifact). More than this, she also goes into considerable detail to help us understand the work's facture, all the way from the growing of flax and its harvest and processing to produce linen, to the dyeing of wool, to the embroidery technique employed, and to what types of individuals, considering social class and gender, would have been involved at each stage. She provides a hypothesis of what the work's original viewing conditions would have been (a medieval great hall) with an interest in its status as portable monument, one that likely could be moved from court to court. Thus, while learning about the Bayeux "Tapestry," we also discussed how art historians explain works of art. Her conclusion—that the work ultimately navigates, with exceptional skill, an inherently difficult and thorny political situation in the very recent aftermath of the Battle of Hastings, one that attempts to provide an explanation for these historical events that attends to the needs and interests of both conqueror and conquered—enables students to also see the work as multivalent and open to differing interpretive perspectives.

Bookmarking the semester at the beginning and end was a consideration of art's multivalence and what one does with the fact that historian/observer is always situated such that they are limited by particular perspectives, and so multiple narratives arise and intersect in art's history. We began with a reading of Clifford Geertz's definition of "thick description," which he proffers as a means of attempting to bridge the inherent disconnect, misunderstanding and ambivalence generated when communication is attempted between

---

[23] Berzal de Dios, "Slow Teaching," http://arthistoryteachingresources.org/2015/09/slow-teaching/. Accessed June 22, 2016.

[24] Carola Hicks, *The Bayeux Tapestry: The Life Story of a Masterpiece* (London: Vintage Books, 2006). I requested that everyone in the class choose to read one of the first three chapters of the text, but a small group of students was required to read all three and my prepared lecture notes. This "collaborative teaching group" then introduced the work to their peers and was tasked with leading class discussion. For a fuller discussion of the role of the "collaborative teaching assignment" in the course, see below.

individuals, through contact at a local level, who inhabit different cultures.[25] During the first week of class, students were provided an excerpt from Geertz's essay that defined "webs of significance" and were then asked to create or chart their own "webs," by which they could introduce themselves to the class.[26] This assignment served multiple purposes. It enabled me to begin to understand who my students were as individuals far more effectively than the standard questionnaire. Most situated themselves as familial beings with personal connections to tradition, history, popular culture, and issues about which they cared. I wanted to underscore that my intent behind the question ("Who are you?") was earnest and thus also shared with them a "web" I crafted to introduce myself. The focus group participants indicated that at the end of the semester, they suddenly realized the relevance and purpose of this initial "ice-breaker" assignment.[27] The webs submitted often interwove the mundane and the profound and enabled students to think about positionality itself.

At the end of the semester, we read a more theoretically ambitious attempt to apply Geertz's thinking about "thick description" to art historical interpretation by Eugene Y. Wang in an essay on Huang Yongyu's *Owl*, an ink painting that was implicated as blasphemous in the 1974 *Black Painting Exhibition* in Beijing.[28] Wang proposes that we adhere to the "visual effect" as a means of establishing an informed interpretation about an image or artwork, as it serves as a meeting point between intrinsic and extrinsic meaning. In introductory art history classes, we are often faced with initial student exasperation: how do you know that the work means this? What did the artist intend for the work to mean (intrinsic meaning)? How can we know what the artist intended? Students often resist complicated and assured narratives that provide closure and certainty, as they should. Usually, they are also unaware that it is acceptable (and unavoidable) for current observers to regard the work through their own particular lens of interest. Yet, if viewing art is simply and entirely subjective, then is there never any stable purpose or narrative providing substance and common ground to the work or image; can it simply mean whatever we want? The discipline hinges on an emphatic "no" in answer to this last question. Hence Wang's "visual effect" proposes a middle ground

[25] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 3-29.

[26] The full assignment prompt was as follows: "Clifford Geertz writes, 'Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take *culture* to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning.' When citing the above quote, Anthony Bogues has argued that the 'self' is always historicized but also historicizes itself by a thing we call narrative—telling stories and weaving "webs of signification." Supplement the survey questions you answered in class and contemplate how you would identify yourself to someone else. Who are you? What story would you tell? What are your 'webs of significance?' What cultures or worlds do you belong to? Use the space below or an alternate page to answer this in any way you see fit. See reverse for my own attempt to complete this assignment." The Anthony Bogues text is "The Humanities and Social Sciences: Knowledge, Change, and the Human Today," delivered as a keynote address on June 14, 2012 at the Brown International Advanced Research Institutes.

[27] Specifically, they noted that in a late-semester class when we discussed Terry Smith's thinking about "connectivities," the "webs of significance" assignment took on heightened meaning. They suggested that in future semesters, I recirculate the webs at this juncture and ask whether students would like to revise them. See Terry Smith, "Worlds Pictured in Contemporary Art: Planes and Connectivities," *Humanities Research* 19/2 (2013), 11-25.

[28] Eugene Y. Wang, "The Winking Owl: Visual Effect and its Art Historical Thick Description," *Critical Inquiry* 26/3 (Spring 2000), 435-73.

and provides the work itself with agency, providing observers with "visual evidence." This, admittedly, is heady stuff for an introductory course—and the students in my spring seminar followed his line of argument with differing degrees of comprehension—but they all successfully pondered the question: what do artworks say? How might we approach them and make sense out of them, seeking some semblance of objective and stable evidence, while also allowing the works themselves to remain multivalent—open to and welcoming different perspectives and understandings? This is deep and critical thinking. It has been shown that knowledge is more effectively acquired when students contend with and "address questions with dubious or ambiguous answers."[29] Between Geertz and Wang, we poked at these questions throughout the semester with almost every work we considered—from the Bayeux 'Tapestry' to Kara Walker, from war rugs created during the Soviet and NATO occupations of Afghanistan to the *Column of Trajan* and paintings and drawings produced by the Australian Aboriginal artists Ngarra and John Mawurnjul.

Conversation: The Collaborative Teaching Assignment

Above, I employed the term conversation when describing the work that happens in the classroom as we encounter works of art. My thinking about conversation as activity and process aligns closely with the meaning of the term employed by Kwame Anthony Appiah in *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, several chapters of which we read throughout the semester. For Appiah,

> conversation is hardly guaranteed to lead to agreement about what to think and feel. Yet we go wrong if we think the point of conversation is to persuade, and imagine it proceeding as a debate…Conversations across boundaries of identity—whether national, religious, or something else—begin with the sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that speaks from some place other than your own. So I'm using the word "conversation" not only for literal talk but also as a metaphor for engagement with the experience and the ideas of others. And I stress the role of the imagination here because the encounters, properly conducted, are valuable in themselves. Conversation doesn't have to lead to consensus about anything, especially not values; it's enough that it helps people get used to one another.[30]

In the focus group discussion with students enrolled in the seminar, we asked them to think about the difference between "discussion" (a term often employed when we think about teaching and classroom interaction) and "conversation." One student responded that the difference lies in "interacting with the other person and their ideas, as opposed to just interacting with a proposed concept," that there is more "bouncing" of ideas off each other in a conversation. Another added that these "bouncing ideas" move among the

---

[29] Bruffee, 15.
[30] Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York and London: W.W Norton & Co., 2006), 84-85.

numerous students in the room as opposed to unidirectionally from teacher to student and back again (question posed, answered, second question posed).

To ensure that conversation transpired effectively in the classroom, I developed the collaborative teaching assignment. (See Appendix B) Much scholarship has examined the value of collaborative activities and assignments conducted in classrooms that are active spaces for learning and community building. Ultimately, as Barkley, Major, and Cross argue, "it is the teacher's responsibility to become a member, along with students, of a community in search of knowledge" that is constructed, rather than dictated, "by creating a culture of shared artifacts."[31] Students were divided into teams, each of which closely examined a key work on their own time outside of class. They were tasked with teaching—*not presenting*—the material for the day. Attention was devoted to the difference between these two activities at the beginning of the semester when the assignment was introduced. The groups were asked to read more material to prepare for the day's lesson than the others, and they were aided by my past lecture notes and images. Their task was not just to provide fuller information about the work in question for their peers, but rather to connect the work to larger themes addressed by the class, pose key questions that point to what they themselves were not able to resolve or learn about the work, and design activities for the class that would enable us to understand theoretical ideas through concrete examples or tasks. I trace below the way in which conversation meandered for two of these sessions.

A group was tasked with helping us think about totem poles as artifacts and/or art objects, and engage with the scholarship of Aldona Jonaitis, Aaron Glass, Hilary Stewart, and Norman Tait.[32] The students were able to convey the complexity of meanings and functions inherent to these works, which immediately dispelled the notion (following Jonaitis and Glass) that there was a singular, unified way of understanding these artifacts. They cited:

- The diversity of pole functions that existed and their variation in style and function due to geographic and clan differentiation.
- The evolution of types over time, with shame poles and commercial poles being developed more recently than the other types.
- The indecipherability of the poles. While particular figures could be identified, the meaning of their interconnection was dependent upon oral tradition: the recitation of the work's meaning at its erection in a potlatch, a ceremony that was not documented in writing.
- The inextricability of the object from the potlatch ritual for which it was often created: one that transpired in the past at the work's initial erection, and was not accessible to outsiders.
- The insufficiency of the term "totem pole" itself, deriving from mistranslation and misunderstanding, imposed by Western anthropologists.

---

[31] E.F. Barkley, K.P. Cross, and C.H. Major, *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A handbook for college faculty.* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005), 9.
[32] Aldona Jonaitis and Aaron Glass, *The Totem Pole: An Intercultural History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2010) and Hilary Stewart, *Looking at Totem Poles*, with foreword by Norman Tait (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1993).

They then posed focused questions for the class as a whole, and a lively debate ensued about the advantages and disadvantages of totem poles appearing at locations outside of their original context in mainstream commercial and tourist sites. They asked whether this is an effective means for artists who have struggled financially due to institutionalized racism, inequality, and political suppression to support themselves and communicate a sense of pride in their heritage. Or does the appearance of the poles at commercial, mainstream, and often tourist locations lessen their power, impact, and meaning? Questions then raised by students in the class included: do poles in these locations become simply shallow significations of "Native" heritage? Or does our "outsider" interest to see the poles remain authentic, by which we essentially mean "uncontaminated by the forces of modern tourist interest," actually recapitulate colonialist primitivism? To help ground these questions, the group turned directly to a Tlinglit carving, *The Hunt,* by Tommy Joseph (2013), located immediately adjacent to our building in the Carnegie Museum of Natural History, to work through these issues. They then posed several interesting questions about the connection between totem poles and our earlier discussion about iconoclasm: if a pole is willfully left to decay in a natural setting once it is erected, is this a form of iconoclasm? Also, does the willed decay counteract the pole's original purpose to memorialize a claim made by a clan or individual? How does one reconcile the two?

Finally, the group connected "cultural tourism" to popular tattoos that depicted kitsch images of totem pole imagery, and this sustained an energetic conversation that brought in almost all students from the class to share important insights:

- One member of the class connected these questions to their own travels to Katchekan.
- One member connected this discussion to our earlier discussion of Street Art and asked about the important role site-specificity might play in this discussion.
- Another questioned if appropriation is simply what artists/humans always do. Humans maintain curiosity about others, and this leads us to experiment with new forms and types.
- Following this, a student connected this discussion to another in an Ancient Greek art class, where they learned the Greeks appropriated the kouros figure type from the ancient Egyptians. This is clearly in the realm of "high art," so does it matter if appropriation also happens in the realm of kitsch?
- Perhaps not, but another raised the important connection of a specific pole to a chief, family, or clan-group and asked how appropriation might actually be unethical, if we consider the source and context of the original imagery.

Overall, this was a tremendously successful lesson. The "leaders" slipped into the background, as students in the class took over the conversation, raising important points and counterpoints and connecting the day's discussion to earlier class sessions, to other class contexts, and to experiences outside the classroom. According to Roberta Matthews, in the classroom, we should aim for "people mak[ing] meaning together" as "the process enriches and enlarges them."[33]

---

[33] Roberta S. Matthews, "Collaborative Learning: Creating Knowledge with Students," in *Teaching on Solid Ground: Using Scholarship to Improve Practice,* eds. Robert J. Mendes, Maryellen Weimer, and Assoc. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996), 101.

Perhaps the most invigorated session was dedicated to Kara Walker's recent installation *A Subtlety…* which appeared at the former Domino's Sugar refinery in Brooklyn in the summer of 2014. The group opened with a call for basic observations about the work to give us a starting point. This was fruitful, as students identified some of the more "obvious" features—in so doing, outlining those that would become pivotal to understanding the work's meaning later on: scale, color (a student described the Sphinx as "white all over,") pose, site, and the enlargement of sexual organs and overemphasis on stereotypical features. They showed the Creative Time video documenting the project, thus enabling everyone to consider the "official" thinking about the work—what it means and why it is important according to the project's director, curator and the artist herself. They then posed questions throughout the remaining session, asking if the work is as successful at achieving what its creators said it did. With considerable skill—not dictating or lecturing—they were able to get us all talking about the incredibly dense and multi-layered questions and issues the work raises. Among the questions and topics raised by group members and those in the class:

- Ephemerality and the role decay plays, particularly with the smaller figurines of boys that accompany the Sphinx who melted away, connecting this to questions of presence and absence, visibility and invisibility. Does the work make present the invisible forces and labor that make consumption and luxury possible and reveal the violence and "stickiness" of this?
- The labor involved in the sugar cane fields, the kitchens, the Domino Sugar factory itself, etc., *but also* the labor involved in the manufacture of this work—the video featuring predominantly others *making* the work with Walker as a director, her name attached to the work as a single artist.
- The complicated role that the Domino Sugar company itself played—as conspirator in and benefactor of the oppressive and violent forces that characterized this history—while now serving, in part, as patron for the work who provides the material.
- The role of the real estate developers in sponsoring the work and the perhaps hypocritical way in which Walker is now perpetuating the capitalist forces that sustain a luxury class.
- The site's relationship to its neighborhood, which is now "post-industrial" and undergoing gentrification—and the work's relatively mute stance on this.
- Censorship: the difficult relationship Walker had with other "African-American" artists in past decades, the attempts to prevent her works from being shown early in her career, and her subsequent rise to art "stardom."
- The pose, monumentality, and historical reference the work makes to the mythical sphinx—the work's relationship to art history and mythology and whether these references were effective. What does it mean to align the "mammy" figure with a pharaoh or supernatural being, turning the oppressed into a figure of significant power? But also, the sphinx in Ancient Greece—gendered as female—often produced racist and sexist anxiety. She was a creature often considered "monstrous," a hybrid woman/beast, a bringer of death to be feared and ultimately

conquered by the male hero (Oedipus). Is the pose of the work powerful or is it submissive? There was much debate about this.

- Audience response on site: what to make of the excessive selfies, but more importantly, the crude sexual gestures that were posted on social media?

Connective energy was evident throughout the conversation. Students linked our concerns to those that have been featured in other classes (an art history class on Public Murals for one student, and for another, a class on the Anthropology of Race). A student raised a compelling question about whether the fact that the work is rendered in pure white sugar actually reveals the artifice of race itself. Almost all commentators discuss this work as a depiction of a "black" woman, but is she? The work could reveal how "race" itself is a construct, in some respects. This led to a fruitful discussion of appropriation—is it effective for oppressed groups to embrace stereotypes and labels that others use to disparage them as a means of empowerment? Here, students were referring back to our earlier reading of Mary Louise Pratt's thinking about autoethnographic texts in her essay on "contact zones."[34] The class did not agree on this point. Finally, the group leaders juxtaposed this work to *Bullets Revisited #3* (2012) by Lalla Essaydi, a work we had discussed earlier in the semester, and asked us to think about Orientalism and the sexualizing of the "exotic" female body.[35] This was personalized when two members of the group spoke as individuals who have been linked to stereotypical associations and assumptions in their own lives.

The session concluded with this main question: does the work compel viewers to practice and thus recognize their own racism in ways that are de-stabilizing *productively*—revealing the operations, heaviness, violence, and long history of racism and sexism? Or does it reside in the zone of spectacle in which people engage in a performance that does not result in "ripples" (to use Marsha Meskimmon's term) that have real impact?[36] One group member offered that "white America sees black people between laughter and tears"—as spoof or goofy stereotype or as violently tragic—arguing further that Walker's work does not ultimately break free from this structure.

I have documented the long conversation that ensued concerning this work, because I wanted to trace the various twists and turns, the main features, and the complexity of the questions that were addressed. Of the twenty-two students in attendance on that day, eighteen engaged actively with multiple contributions to the day's conversation, one that connected an important art historical "monument" to real, lived tensions and experiences which shape our world. This is the work that art history can do.

---

[34] Mary Louise Pratt, "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* (1991), 33-40. This essay was pivotal for the course, as students easily connected with her definition of "contact zones" and applied it often throughout the semester, particularly in their research papers.

[35] I invited Dan Leers, Curator of Photography for the Carnegie Museum of Art to come and speak with the class about the recent exhibition *She Who Tells a Story: Women Photographers from Iran and the Arab World*. This exhibition originated at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston and was curated by Kristen Gresh. Essaydi's work was featured in the exhibition. Although it had closed before our class commenced, many students in the class had seen it.

[36] Marsha Meskimmon, "Making Worlds, Making Subjects: Contemporary Art and the Affective Dimension of Global Ethics," *World Art* 1/2 (2011), 189-96. This essay was assigned to students in the class when we considered the particular capacity of the art encounter to function on an affective level, and why this is important and meaningful. See her discussion of "response-ability," connecting the realm of the imagination with material change.

Student response to these conversations and the collaborative teaching assignment was overwhelmingly positive. One student, in a course evaluation did bemoan the fact that "[the professor] didn't really teach the class most days," as there were guest lecturers, and the students themselves taught the sessions. Yet several other students countered that this should be perceived as positive, and that the conversations and open format made the class more enjoyable and effective. In the evaluations, twelve comments were made regarding what was most beneficial about the class and six specifically mention class conversations as most important, that they were "interesting to listen to and participate in," "very helpful," "a good way to get used to speaking in front of people and to learn how to get others involved in the conversation," and that they enabled one to "learn from other students" and "what others had to think." One respondent described the collaborative teaching assignment as "student-driven teaching." This class has thus reinforced my belief that "stepping to the side" is often one of the most effective means of teaching. One should not always occupy center stage.[37] Ultimately, the aim of collaborative learning is for students to become "deeply engaged in context, thinking critically about evidence from various perspectives, [and] distinguishing among shades of meaning, consequences, and implications."[38]

One aspect of the collaborative teaching assignment that students in the focus group identified as particularly successful, which I did not foresee, was the fact that—in most groups—advanced majors were matched with novice non-majors. Both student groups found this particularly rewarding. The non-majors felt they were learning effectively from their group peers and were more secure in tackling the demands of the assignment with majors as their guides, while the majors argued that seeing the artworks (many of which were familiar to them) through the eyes of others outside the discipline actually enhanced their understanding and presented new perspectives. One student indicated that, unlike most of her other advanced art history seminars that are fairly homogenous in terms of enrollment, this class enabled her to connect with a more diverse group of her peers. Yet the focus group discussion also revealed that, just because one is a major, that does not mean that the critical terms and concepts covered by the class are easily comprehensible. Non-majors were pleased to learn that their difficulties in wading through some of the texts were shared by those they presumed would be fluent in this discourse. In future iterations of the seminar, efforts will be made to inculcate moments of contact and reciprocity between majors and non-majors, realizing the full potential of this interweaving.

Not Knowing: The Role of Research in an "Introductory Seminar"

Discussed above is the concept of "fragility," maintaining humility when teaching an introductory art history class that aspires to some global reach. Connected to this is

[37] These sentiments were underscored by Tania Romero, "Media Arts Education as an Open Field of Educational Practices," in a paper presented at the annual SECAC conference in Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015 in a panel moderated by Jason Hoelscher, "Art and Indeterminacy: Tactical Ambiguity in the Era of Standardized Testing." "Stepping to the side," and "center stage" were her terms.

[38] Michael Sweet and Larry K. Michaelsen, *Team-based Learning in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Group Work that Works to Generate Critical Thinking and Engagement* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publications, 2012), 6.

the opening up of learning. Gaining more knowledge about particular works almost always leads to further questions. One of the main assignments for the class was a scaffolded research project, the main point of which was to invite students into art historical inquiry, gaining knowledge in so doing, but also posing informed questions. According to Sweet and Michaelsen, one should consider an apprenticeship model when teaching. Effective learning is more likely to occur if it is achieved when "students are engaged in exploring the intellectual and emotional terrain that has so shaped our own lives" as practitioners of our discipline.[39] Research—launched by curiosity and discovery and driven by evidence and the formulation of questions—lies at the heart of art historical practice. Foremost, the assignment sought to encourage such curiosity, providing students considerable freedom to select works of art that engaged them, and see what they could discover rather than foreclose on a set of ideas, facts or neat summary conclusions. In the end, the assignment compelled students to recognize what they do not know and thus how much more there is to learn.

The process began in the first week of the semester with an activity where students were given a map of the world and asked to identity locations that were considered to be home territories; areas to which they had travelled that were familiar; areas where students had never been but still felt comfortable knowing something about the region, its history, and culture; and those parts of the world about which the students knew very little or nothing. These maps were not shared among students but submitted to me. They were then informed that they would be required to select an artwork from a part of the world in this latter category for their projects. To assist with this challenge, we engaged in an in-class short-research activity. To begin, no students in the class identified central Asia as a region of familiarity. In class, I showed them a dish, covered in white slip and painted in brown Kufic inscription that has been identified as deriving from Samarqand in the 9th-10th centuries CE. Of course, students were initially able to contribute very little beyond descriptive analysis and bald conjecture when first shown this object. I then divided them into groups and gave each a rudimentary research source, pages from textbooks or links to websites that provided fuller historical information about the plate, its mode of production, a translation of the script, and initial interpretations about its function, context, and why the object is distinctive.[40] By the end of the session, students were surprised at how much they were able to garner from this quick exercise and felt more confident going into the project as a whole.[41]

Next came the challenge of helping students locate an artwork that solicited curiosity. For this, I collaborated with the director of our fine arts library on a "curated

[39] Sweet and Michaelsen, 10.

[40] Robert Hillenbrand, *Islamic Art and Architecture* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999), 54-56, illustration 39; Richard Ettinghausen, Oleg Grabar, and Marilyn Jenkins-Madina, *Islamic Art and Architecture 650-1250* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001), 118-20, illustration 188; and two links to the Ashmoleon Collection website: http://islamicceramics.ashmolean.org/Samanids/intro.htm; and http://islamicceramics.ashmolean.org/Samanids/oya-part-one.htm. The work in question also dovetailed with themes of the course as it derives from a "contact zone"—Samarqand — located at the eastern edge of the Islamic world at that time where a newer "outside" Muslim culture was shifting the local religious and political landscape.

[41] Students in the focus group identified this activity as particularly helpful in giving them a start on their projects.

browsing" session.[42] In partnership with me, she identified regions of the world about which the majority of students indicated they felt less familiar and then selected a series of texts, journals, and catalogues that feature, with good colorful illustrations, artworks that span historical breadth from diverse regions. She pulled around thirty texts from the shelves, and students engaged in old-fashioned leafing and perusing. This provided some limits on what students could select (as opposed to the infinite possibilities a Google search would have garnered), and hence gave them an ability to hone more quickly. While students were browsing, I circulated among them and asked questions about what was of interest and then provided other suggestions. They also began sharing what they were discovering with each other. After the session, these resources were placed on a reserve shelf, so students could return to browse or consult a work they had selected on their own time.

Short writing assignments required students to draft portions of their final paper in stages throughout the semester, and we cancelled class at two midway points so that students could meet with me individually to discuss their project, ask questions, and receive guidance on how to move forward. With the final submission, students were asked to include a section that reflected on the process of encountering a strange art object and pose a series of questions about what they were not able to learn and what more they wanted to know.

All of the six majors in the class selected a work by a recent or contemporary artist and wrote predictably competent papers. They exhibited sharper visual analysis skills and engaged in the properties of the works themselves in fuller detail than their peers and demonstrated greater ease in locating appropriate bibliographic sources (although each still needed some assistance here). Each was able to connect their work with content knowledge or art historical methodologies they had gleaned from other departmental classes. The majors who participated in the focus group indicated that they were unaccustomed to thinking at a meta- and reflexive level about the research process itself and had never been asked to conclude a paper before with new, open questions. They appreciated this opportunity and found it valuable. But non-majors enrolled in the class also submitted sophisticated work, three of the strongest papers, in fact. The most impressively crafted papers—written with compelling fluency and insight, those that leaned on the critical concepts inherent to the course with advanced understanding—did not necessarily come from the group of majors. (See Appendix C for research paper learning outcomes.)

I will focus on three papers produced by non-majors who demonstrated considerable growth to reflect on what we can ask a "general education" student to achieve in a class such as this. All three students located their work of choice through the curated browsing session. The first was produced by a sophomore Biology major, the second a junior Computer Science major, and the third an undeclared first-year student. Completely new to art and its history, the Biology major had never seen nor heard of the *Nike of Samothrace*. Stumbling upon the work in a textbook, the student thought it represented an angel and was "exceptionally aesthetically appealing." That constituted

[42] Kathryn Joranson, Director of the Frick Fine Arts Library, and Kiana Jones masterfully curated a productive set of sources for my students which kept them completely rapt and drawn to the printed page and lush illustrations, spending over an hour pouring through books and eagerly showing each other what they were finding.

the entirety of the student's knowledge about the work and the Hellenistic world. The student learned only through subsequent research that the work is enshrined prominently in the Louvre as a "masterpiece" of Western civilization. By the end of the semester, the student was able to provide close attention to observable detail and also examine the original historical and religious context by engaging prominent scholars of Hellenistic sculpture. The paper considered the precise location of the sculpture within the sacred complex and how an original viewer might have approached and experienced it, concluding with how this experience contrasts with a contemporary observer's encounter with the work in the museum setting—how the work's meaning and function has shifted over time.

The other two students discovered works that were far less known or studied than the *Nike*. The Computer Science major selected a relief carving representing Narasimha located at the Hoysaleswara Temple in Karnataka, India (1120–1150 CE). Sources in English were not plentiful for a consideration of this work, but the student was nevertheless able to provide a close-grained iconographic analysis of the work's features and think about variations in this iconography as they appear in diverse representations of Narasimha from different regions and time periods. Of interest to this student was how Narasimha's exploits, powers, and mythic narrative are conveyed in compact and economical visual form, and what it means when representations of divine figures change across time. Finally, the freshman student, an avid sports-fisherman, was drawn to a Malagan wood carving, a columnar figure grouping, that represents a human figure being devoured by or expunged from the mouth of a large fish. This work is dated to the late 19th or early 20th century and was created in Papua New Guinea, New Ireland. Having had little to no experience undertaking sustained research or writing an extensive paper and no prior contact with art history, the freshman was eventually able to learn and convey much about the complex ritual practices to which Malagan carvings are inextricably bound. In addition, the student underscored the finite "life" of these works in their original context, as they were created for the specific event, having no use-value following the ritual itself. This, he pointed out, contrasts significantly from the work's current appearance as an "art" object in a museum setting that has collected and preserved it (The Metropolitan Museum of Art).[43]

Back to the Auditorium

Student work in the seminar demonstrated far more intellectual engagement and growth, independent thinking, and awareness of art historical inquiry and its methods than the traditional exams submitted for the large-lecture version, most of which repeated content knowledge in a rote and unimaginative manner, even with the best students. To conclude, I briefly describe revisions I have made to the large-lecture introductory version of World Art. While space prohibits me from providing a close-grained assessment here (the subject of a future study), I want to outline what changes the department has made to that format. Over the past several years, we have remodeled the weekly recitation session that breaks out the 200 enrolled students into smaller sections of 25. Formerly regarded as review sessions where questions about lecture content were

[43] See Appendix for an assessment of how research papers produced in the class met departmental and course learning objectives.

answered, these Art Lab sessions now engage students in short-research activities before actual works of art *in situ*. These sessions are also used to generate reflective conversations about controversies inherent to works of art, particularly those that generate multiple and conflicting interpretations. Following the seminar experiment, we were also able to use the Art Lab sessions as a space in which the Collaborative Teaching assignment could unfold. Very few modifications were needed to have it operate on a broader scale for 200 students, since it transpired entirely within the weekly 25-seat lab sections. Because those sessions were devoted, in part, to collaborative teaching, conversation flowed far more easily, as students were accustomed to the instructor stepping to the side and giving students the opportunity to share their ideas and questions in a space that was clearly designated for experimentation and thinking through encounters with art. Innovation was undertaken in the large lecture hall, too. Much time was devoted to flipping the classroom. Years of lecture notes and instructor research were synthesized into succinct yet thorough illustrated handouts, or guides, which accompanied each lecture. (See Appendix D) Students thus had access to content knowledge on their own, relieving us of the stress to make sure we “covered” everything in the limited time we spent in the classroom each week. The handouts also prepared students for the broader questions and more difficult critical material that could then be addressed in the large lecture hall as a result of this liberation. Finally, we eliminated the exams. The scaffolded research project was modified slightly and replaced the hour-long midterm and final (which, after years of assessment, revealed only that students were either better or less able to memorize detailed content information and provide thesis arguments in their essays that were either simplistic and vague or echoed that of other students). To ensure that students were keeping up with the material covered in each unit, we simply gave more quick quizzes that required short answers and occasionally multiple-choice responses.

Hence it is feasible to take lessons learned and methods tested in a seminar format and apply them to the large-lecture survey, whose constraints and limitations challenge pedagogical innovation. Beyond teaching process, however, the World Art experiment also afforded us, as a department, the opportunity to think carefully and broadly about our fundamental disciplinary learning objectives, articulating what art history can and should do in a world too often contending violently with difference.

Bibliography

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2006.

Barkley, Elizabeth F. Claire Howell Major, and K. Patricia Cross, eds. *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty*, 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014.

Bennett, Tony. "The Exhibitionary Complex," in *Thinking About Exhibitions.* Edited by Reesa Greenberg, Bruce Ferguson, and Sandy Nairn. London: Routledge, 1996.

Bogues. Anthony. "The Humanities and Social Sciences: Knowledge, Change, and the Human Today," Keynote address, Brown International Advanced Research Institutes, June 14, 2012.

Bruffee, Kenneth A. *Collaborative Learning: Higher Education, Interdependence, and the Authority of Knowledge,* 2nd ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Carrier, David. *A World Art History and its Objects*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008.

de Dios, Berzal. "Slow Teaching," Art History Teaching Resources, September 11, 2015 http://arthistoryteachingresources.org/2015/09/slow-teaching/. Accessed June 22, 2016.

Duncan, Carol. "The Art Museum as Ritual," in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Eisenman, Stephen. "Three Criteria for Inclusion in, or Exclusion from a World Art History," *World Art* 1/2 (2011): 281 – 298.

Ellenbogen, Josh and Aaron Tugendhaft, eds. *Idol Anxiety.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Flood, Finbarr Barry. "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum," *Art Bulletin* 84/4 (Dec. 2002): 241- 259.

Fox, Tamara. "Aesthetics, Teaching and the Indefinite," Southeast College Art Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015. (Panel moderated by Jason Hoelscher, "Art and Indeterminacy: Tactical Ambiguity in the Era of Standardized Testing.")

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *An Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Graham, Mark Miller. "The Future of Art History and the Undoing of the Survey," *Art Journal* 54/3 (Autumn, 1995): 32-33.

Holzman, Laura. "Beyond the Exhibition? Art History as Public Scholarship," Southeast College Art Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015. (Panel chaired by Cindy Persinger and Azar Rejaie, "Socially Engaged Art History.")

Hicks, Carola. *The Bayeux Tapestry: The Life Story of a Masterpiece*. London: Vintage Books, 2006.

Hulks, David. "World Art Studies: A Radical Proposition," *World Art* 3/2 (2013): 189-200.

Jonaitis, Aldona, and Aaron Glass. *The Totem Pole: An Intercultural History*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.

Lagamma, Alisa. "Kongo: Power and Majesty," in *Kongo: Power and Majesty*, exh. cat. New York and New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art and Yale University Press, 2015.

Lendon, Nigel. "Beauty and Horror: Identity in the War Carpets of Afghanistan," in Jaynie Anderson, ed. *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*. Carlton, VIC: Miegunyah Press and Melbourne University Publishing, 2009.

Levell, Nicola. *Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas, The Seriousness of Play*. London: Black Dog Publishing, 2016.

Matthews, Roberta S. "Collaborative Learning: Creating Knowledge with Students," in Robert J. Mendes, Maryellen Weimer, and Assoc., eds. *Teaching on Solid Ground: Using Scholarship to Improve Practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Mawurndjul, John. "I'm a Chemist Man, Myself," in *Crossing Country: The Alchemy of Western Arnhem Land Art*, exh. cat. Edited by Hetti Kemerre Perkins. Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 2004.

McLean, Ian. "The World Art Artworld," *World Art* 1/2 (2011): 161 – 169.

Meskimmon, Marsha. "Making Worlds, Making Subjects: Contemporary Art and the Affective Dimension of Global Ethics," *World Art* 1:2 (Sept. 2011): 189-196.

Nelson, Robert. "The Map of Art History," *Art Bulletin* 79/1 (March 1997): 28-40.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* (1991): 33 – 40.

Pollock, Griselda. "Whither Art History?" *Art Bulletin* 96/1 (March 2014): 9-23.

Rajagopalan, Mrinalini. *Building Histories: The Archival and Affective Lives of Five Monuments in Modern Delhi.* Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Romero, Tania. "Media Arts Education as an Open Field of Educational Practices," Southeast College Art Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, October 2015. (Panel moderated by Jason Hoelscher, "Art and Indeterminacy: Tactical Ambiguity in the Era of Standardized Testing.")

Smith, Terry. "Worlds Pictured in Contemporary Art: Planes and Connectivities" *Humanities Research* 19/2 (2013): 11 – 25.

Stewart, Hilary, and Norman Tait. *Looking at Totem Poles*. Vancouver and Seattle: Douglas & McIntyre, and University of Washington Press, 1993.

Sweet, Michael, and Larry K. Michaelsen. *Team-based Learning in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Group Work that Works to Generate Critical Thinking and Engagement*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publications, 2012.

Summers, David. *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism.* London: Phaidon, 2003.

Wang, Eugene Y. "The Winking Owl: Visual Effect and its Art Historical Thick Description," *Critical Inquiry* 26/3 (Spring 2000): 435 – 473.

Wilkins, David G., Bernard Schultz, and Katheryn M. Linduff. *Art Past Art Present*, 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2009.

Yahgulanaas, Michael Nicoll. "Art Opens Windows to the Space Between Ourselves," TED talk, November 14, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u1R_-3wzYEQ.

Appendix A

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">

World Art: Contact and Conflict

COURSE OUTLINE

Note: For the Key Works that appear below, students are provided with detailed and illustrated handouts that were developed from the instructor's research and lecture notes. This enables them to gain content knowledge prior to coming to class. These are required reading in addition to the critical texts listed below. A full course bibliography appears at the end. Some of these works/units may be omitted in a given semester, with others circulated in. Visits to local sites and collections may also vary depending on exhibition schedules and the opportunities they pose.
</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Introduction
Weeks 1 – 2</td><td>Introduction to course and getting acquainted with each other. Map and Webs of Significance assignments distributed and introduced.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Critical Terms: conversation, cosmopolitanism, culture, thick description, webs of significance
Readings: Appiah Introduction, Geertz
Key Work and Activities: Reading discussion, Webs of Significance interviews, visit to Gu Wenda, the poem of the university of Pittsburgh (2004) in the Frick Fine Arts building https://uag.pitt.edu/Detail/objects/9994</td></tr>
<tr><td>Activity/Key Work: "Researching" a white-slip painted earthenware dish made in Samarqand, 9th-10th c. CE
Students are given only minimal identifying information and asked to begin to describe, identify, and interpret a ceramic dish painted in white slip and decorated in black script. Next, excerpts from Islamic Art survey textbooks and links to a website produced by the Ashmolean Museum on Islamic ceramics are distributed. Working in teams, students are tasked with seeing what they can learn about the dish (and others like it) in the brief time they are given (30 to 40 minutes).
Objectives: The class is intended to engage in art-historical "research" and determine what kinds of information art historians gather to provide explications and interpretations of artworks. Which initial observations or suppositions were proved incorrect? Which were substantiated? Students are asked to identify information these sources are not able to provide, listing questions we still cannot answer. Conclude with a discussion of the Map Assignment and the course Research Project.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Work: Bayeux "Tapestry—What does art history do? What questions does it ask?
Reading: Hicks, chap. 1-3. Students are prompted to come to class prepared to discuss the types of evidence the author provides to explain the meaning, content, visual characteristics, material, facture, and historical context of this object.
Objectives: The class is devoted to a close analysis of this single artwork not only to learn about the work itself, but to engage in and reflect upon art historical method. Groups of students report on particular chapters of Hick's essay and develop a "toolbox" for art historical analysis—listing the types of questions they may apply to other works of art</td></tr>
</table>

Contact Zones Weeks 3 - 5	**Critical Terms**: contact zone, autoethnographic texts, transculturation, imagined communities, nationalism **Readings: Pratt, Anderson** **Activity:** Title: "The Structure of Art History" Students are divided into groups. Some will look at the floorplan of the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C., while others will look at canonical art history survey textbooks (from different eras), paying close attention to the Table of Contents and how the texts are subdivided and present material geographically.
	Critical Terms: World Art, World Art Studies, World Art History **Readings: McLean, Hulks, Eisenman** **Objectives and Activity:** Students read three essays from the relatively newer journal *World Art* each of which attempts to define this sub-discipline from different methodological approaches. Some authors are advocates for a "World Art" practice while others are more cautious. Using Eisenman's criteria for Inclusion in or exclusion from a World Art History, we discuss the works already studied—Gu Wenda's *poem*, the ceramic dish from Samarqand, the *Bayeux "Tapestry"*—and attempt to determine whether they would be included or excluded. How would Hulks respond to Eisenman's thesis? To the objects we have studied?
	Launch Research Project. Visit the Frick Fine Arts Library for a **Curated Browsing** session. Librarians pull a variety of texts, exhibition catalogues, survey textbooks, illustrated journals, and more, which, together, are meant to draw the curiosity of students who will be asked to identify a work of art from a region and/or historical period about which they know very little to nothing (as indicated on the earlier Map Assignment). Students record what they discover and use this (with other resources provided to them) to select the work that will become the focus of their final project. These library resources are placed on reserve for the remainder of the semester, so the students can return on their own.
	Key Work: War Carpets from Afghanistan – Group Teaching Session 1 **Readings: Lendon, Carrier** **Objectives and Activity:** This is the first of several class meetings where students are tasked with directing the day's discussion and designing an activity for their peers. For this assignment, groups are provided with the instructor's lecture notes, web and text resources, and a PowerPoint presentation containing key images and supporting material.
	Key Works: Visit to Carnegie Museum of Art. *Nkisi Nkondi,* and Benin Plaque **Readings: Lagamma** **Objectives:** If possible, students meet with the curator who oversees the African Collection and discuss Pratt's definition of a "contact zone" and how this term applies to these particular works and their contexts as described in the assigned readings. Further discussion will include museum display, curatorial decision-making, and the relationship of African Collection to the CMOA's broader collection.
	Critical Terms: facture, material, refinement, arbitrariness, wonder, personal space, social space, second nature **Key Work: Jade Axe,** British Museum, 4000-2000 BCE **Readings: MacGregor, Summers** **Objectives:** Building on the "toolbox" for art historical analysis that we launched with the *Bayeux "Tapestry,"* we turn specifically to terminology employed by David Summers, who outlined a method for encountering works of art (from a World Art perspective) that extends beyond visual analysis and aesthetics. A handout that includes key excerpts from his Introduction and first chapter ("Facture") is provided. We work through these terms and passages while considering the Neolithic artifact from the British Museum. This activity is specifically connected to the broader research project on which students are beginning to engage. They will select the work, artifact, or

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>site which they wish to research this semester and provide an initial bibliography and analysis, using terminology we have been defining in class.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Place
Weeks 5 - 7</td><td>Critical Terms: center, periphery, liminality, path, boundary, precinct, alignment, orientation, extra-ordinary
Key Works: Ancient Rome – Column of Trajan, Arch of Titus and Flavian Amphitheater
Readings: Summers
Objectives: We shift to a new unit today that focuses on “Place” as a critical concept and begin studying built environments. Similar to the class above, students develop site analysis skills by applying Summers’s terminology (in his chapter, “Place”) to key monuments that demarcate the central political, public and ceremonial center of ancient Rome.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Work: Mosque at Córdoba – Group 2 Teaching Session.
Objectives and Activity: Students read handout and consider how this site is treated in standard survey texts. They test the applicability of Summers’s terminology pertaining to “Place” and consider in what ways the site might be regarded as a contact zone.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Work: The Red Fort, Delhi
Reading: Rajagopalan
Objectives and Activity: Mrinalini Rajagopalan will visit the class and discuss this site and her methodological approach to contested sites broadly, considering them from a diachronic approach that investigates multiple audiences and stakeholders. We contrast this to the standard survey approach, which tends to isolate key monuments and sites at particular historical moments.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Key Works: Jacob Lawrence, Migration series and Ji Yun-Fei, Last Days of Village Wen – Group 3 Teaching Session.
Objectives and Activity: Students engage in an activity central to introductory surveys in the discipline: comparing and contrasting different works of art from distinct historical moments and/or geographic regions. What is the value in this approach? What does it enable us to understand about the works in question? What are its limitations? In this instance, Lawrence’s canonical work is compared to a much more recent scroll by the Chinese artist Ji Yun-Fei (Cleveland Museum of Art), both of which contend with human migration, a subject of keen and urgent significance in today’s world. In addition, both works of art compel us to think about the relationship between urban and rural, agrarian and industrial modes of work. We use this class to wrap up our unit on “Place” by turning our attention from specific sites to the concepts of mobility and exchange.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Paper 1 Due – students demonstrate what they have learned about their selected work of art through their initial research and apply these contexts to the critical terminology and concepts we have been employing in class. They put forward an initial argument about their work of art that relies on and builds from a thorough material and visual analysis using skills we have been developing. This paper is a draft that is then revised based on instructor feedback and peer-review workshops.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Museums and Cultural Property
Week 8</td><td>Critical Terms: ritual and ritual space, performance, liminal experience, surveillance, exhibitionary complex, cultural property
Readings: Duncan, Bennett, Appiah, chaps. 7 & 8
Objectives and Activity: We engage in a close reading of Duncan and Bennett’s approach to the Museum and begin to define cultural property using Appiah’s text. Having already visited the adjacent Carnegie Museum of Art on an earlier class visit, students will be asked to begin to connect and/or test their theoretical approaches to their own experience in this specific institutional setting.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Visit to the Carnegie Museums of Art and Natural History
Objectives and Activity: During this visit, we focus on two of the main ceremonial spaces of the Museum, the Grand Staircase and Hall</td></tr>
</table>

	of Architecture, and discuss several works and displays that are contained there, testing the theoretical arguments put forth by Duncan, Bennett, and Appiah at this local site and thinking about the designations "Art" and "Natural History" and how those are institutionally and spatially demarcated. Works we discuss include: **Lothar Baumgarten, *The Tongue of the Cherokee,* 1985-1988; Tommy Joseph, *The Hunt*, 2013; Diorama, *Lion Attacking a Dromedary* (Formerly titled "Arab Courier"); John White Alexander, *The Crowning of Labor*, 1905-1908**.
Indigeneity Weeks 9 - 10	**Key Work: "Totem Poles" – Group 4 Teaching Session.** **Readings: Jonaitis & Glass, Stewart & Tait** **Objectives and Activity:** After having been briefly introduced to a "Totem Pole" in person at the Carnegie Museum of Natural History (Tommy Joseph), students read texts by the art historians, anthropologists, and artists listed above and discuss how their understanding of these artifacts has been advanced and shifted. Jonaitis and Glass put forth an "intercultural" history. We examine what this term means. What does it mean to provide a "biography" of an object? Students connect this historical context to the postcolonial and anti-imperialist approach to Museums and collecting taken by Duncan and Bennett, and Appiah's thinking about the fraught ethical questions that arise in regard to cultural property.
	Critical Terms: indigeneity, cultural hybridity **Key Works: Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas, *Red: A Haida Manga* (2009)** and ***Coopers from the Hood Series*, (2007-2014)** **Readings: Levell, Yahgulanaas** **Objectives and Activities:** Yahgulanaas, a contemporary artist from Haida Gwaii, engages purposefully in hybridity as a way of articulating his thinking about indigeneity. We compare and contrast his approach to tradition, innovation, and identity with that of his contemporary, the Tlinglit artist Tommy Joseph, whose carving we visited at the Carnegie Museum.
	Key Works John Mawurndjul, *Mardayin Ceremony* (2000) and *Mardayin at Mumeka* (1999) – Group 5 Teaching Session. **Readings**: **Mawurndjul** Students are asked to consider indigeneity, tradition, innovation, cultural identity, and hybridity in a different context by considering the work produced by the Australian Aboriginal artist John Mawurndjul. They are provided with detailed and illustrated notes that were developed in partnership with the art historian Henry Skerritt.
Identity and Resistance Weeks 10 - 11	**Visit to the Carnegie Museum of Art. Special Exhibition *20/20: The Studio Museum in Harlem and the Carnegie Museum of Art*.** According to the CMOA, the exhibition was designed to respond to "a tumultuous and deeply divided moment in our nation's history" and "provides a critical opportunity to prompt conversations about the necessity of art during times of social and political transformation" and the role art plays in the interface between political and personal expression. The majority of artists featured in the exhibition, which gathers together works from both museums, are "of African descent." (Note: in a prior year, we visited the special travelling exhibition *She Who Tells a Story: Women Photographers from Iran and the Arab World.*)
	Key Works: Emory Douglas, *The Black Panther Newspaper*. **Visit to Special Collections, Hillman Library, University of Pittsburgh.** In partnership with the librarians of this archival collection, an activity was developed where students, in small groups, engaged with a number of original editions of the *Black Panther Newspaper* that were designed and contain backcover illustrations by the artist Emory Douglas.

Iconoclasm, Affect and the Power of the Image Weeks 12 - 13	**Critical Terms:** iconoclasm **Readings: Assmann, Fumaroli and Natif** **Objectives:** We make a crucial pivot at this juncture in the semester. Prior weeks have been devoted to thinking about the agency of those who make art and the institutions that frame and define it. We begin to think about the agency of the material object (art/image/ artifact) by considering iconoclasm and the significant role it has played in the history of three of the world's major religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.
	Key Works: The Bamiyan Buddhas and **Dresden's Frauenkirche** **Readings: Flood** and **Janowski** **Objectives:** After considering the long history of religious iconoclasm in the prior class, we turn to two recent examples, one motivated by religious fundamentalism, the other by the violence of war. Students will be asked to undertake a close reading of Flood's thesis to think more carefully about the motivating factors that led to the destruction of the Bamiyan Buddhas by the Taliban, the broader historical, cultural, and geographic contexts that frame this event, and the role that Western civilization and the museum impulse played. Janowski compels us to think about the ethics of preservation. When and why does one reconstruct damaged or even destroyed artifacts and monuments? Should the Bamiyan Buddhas be reconstructed? Why or why not? If so, how?
	Critical Terms: multivalence, untranslatability, "art historical thick description" – What do artworks say? **Readings: Wang, Appiah**, chap. 5 **Key Works: Huang Yongyu's *The Winking Owl* (1973, 1978)** and **Xu Bing, *Celestial Book: Mirror for Analyzing the World* (1988)** **Objectives:** Wang's text plays an instrumental role in the course at this juncture, as it returns us to the beginning of the semester, with an application of Geertz's definition of "thick description" specifically to works of art and the methodological practices of the discipline of art history. This class is meant to engage students to think on a more critical level about the acts of interpretation and explanation. Where is meaning produced in the art encounter? What role is played by the interpreter/observer? What role does the image itself play? Do artworks "speak," and, if so, what do they say? How do we contend with multiple and sometimes conflicting explanations? Can artworks simply mean whatever we want them to say? What role does affect play in the interpretation of a work of art? To help us work through this difficult theoretical material, we will look at a more recent work produced by the Chinese artist Xu Bing. **Group 6 will lead discussion** on his *Celestial Book,* thinking about multivalence and untranslatability and how the artist addresses these issues explicitly in his famous installation. We will also return again to the very first work we examined this semester, **Wenda Gu's *poem*.** Together, the two can initiate discussion about the relationship between text and image.
Conclusion: A critical scaffold for what's happening now Weeks 14-15	**Critical Terms:** making worlds, making subjects, response-ability, globalization, disjunctive diversity, contemporaneous natures, contemporaneity, world-picturing, connectivity, planetarity, planetary consciousness **Readings: Meskimmon, Smith, Pollock** **Key Work: Kara Walker, *A Subtlety…* (2014)** **Objectives:** In the last class sessions, we will read essays by Marsha Meskimmon, Terry Smith, and Griselda Pollock, each of whom attempts to describe our own contemporary moment, provide a critical framework for understanding the experience of what it means to live in the world today, and to ask how artists, artworks, and art historians can play a vital role in addressing the urgent and critical crises faced by intense division and strife, and environmental collapse. Their project is akin to that offered by Appiah's *Cosmopolitanism,* which opened the class, but offers a far more complex set of critical terms with which to contend. In these sessions, I work to demonstrate that

	some of the debates, questions, concepts, and issues that have arisen from the semester's key works themselves have already prepared us for a fuller understanding of the critical scaffolding provided by these authors. We also test their ideas by looking at one last work, Kara Walker's installation *A Subtlety…* which appeared for several weeks at the Domino Sugar Refinery in Brooklyn, N.Y. before the site was demolished for redevelopment. **Group 7 will lead this last teaching session** and consider the work's efficacy. Is the work a radical intervention that successfully compels us to consider race, sexism, and economic inequality in productive ways? Finally, students return to their own "Webs of Significance" which they crafted at the very beginning of the semester and attempt to think about whether the exercise could be reimagined following Smith's concept of "connectivities."
Paper 2 Due. Students submit revisions to their midterm paper. The final paper should demonstrate that their critical thinking about their selected work —their argument—has been honed based on instructor and peer feedback, further reading, and a more nuanced material and visual analysis that grapples successfully with some of the critical themes, questions, and/or critical terminology employed by the class.	

Course Bibliography

Appiah, Kwame Anthony, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2006).

Assmann, Jan, "What's Wrong with Images?" in Josh Ellenbogen and Aaron Tugendhaft, eds. *Idol Anxiety* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011): 19-31.

Bennett, Tony, "The Exhibitionary Complex," in Reesa Greenberg, Bruce Ferguson, and Sandy Nairn, eds., *Thinking About Exhibitions* (London: Routledge, 1996): 81-112.

Carrier, David, "Overture: Islamic Carpets in European Paintings," in *A World Art History and its Objects* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008): 1-19.

Duncan, Carol, "The Art Museum as Ritual," in *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995): 7–20.

Eisenman, Stephen, "Three Criteria for Inclusion in, or Exclusion from a World Art History," *World Art* 1/2 (2011): 281–98.

Flood, Finbarr Barry, "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum," *Art Bulletin* 84/4 (Dec. 2002): 241-59.

Fumaroli, Marc, "The Christian Critique of Idolatry," in Josh Ellenbogen and Aaron Tugendhaft, eds. *Idol Anxiety* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011): 32-40.

Geertz, Clifford, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," in *An Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973): 3–10.

Hulks, David, "World Art Studies: A Radical Proposition," *World Art* 3/2 (2013): 189-200.

Jonaitis, Aldona, and Aaron Glass, *The Totem Pole: An Intercultural History* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002): 3–12.

Lagamma, Alisa, "Kongo: Power and Majesty," in *Kongo: Power and Majesty*, exh. cat. (New York and New Haven: Metropolitan Museum of Art and Yale University Press, 2015): 17-45.

Lendon, Nigel, "Beauty and Horror: Identity in the War Carpets of Afghanistan," in Jaynie Anderson, ed., *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence* (Carlton, VIC: Miegunyah Press and Melbourne University Publishing, 2009): 78-83.

Levell, Nicola, *Michael Nicoll Yahgulanaas, The Seriousness of Play* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2016).

Mawurndjul, John. "I'm a Chemist Man, Myself," in *Crossing Country: The Alchemy of Western Arnhem Land Art,* ed. Hetti Kemerre Perkins, exh. cat. (Sydney: Art Gallery of New South Wales, 2004).

McLean, Ian, "The World Art Artworld," *World Art* 1/2 (2011): 161–69.

Meskimmon, Marsha, "Making Worlds, Making Subjects: Contemporary Art and the Affective Dimension of Global Ethics," *World Art* 1:2 (Sept. 2011): 189-96.

Natif, Mika, "The Painter's Breath and Concepts of Idol Anxiety in Islamic Art," in Josh Ellenbogen and Aaron Tugendhaft, eds. *Idol Anxiety* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011): 41-55.

Pratt, Mary Louise, "Arts of the Contact Zone," *Profession* (1991): 33–40.

Rajagopalan, Mrinalini, *Building Histories: The Archival and Affective Lives of Five Monuments in Modern Delhi* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2016): 27-57.

Smith, Terry, "Worlds Pictured in Contemporary Art: Planes and Connectivities," *Humanities Research* 19/2 (2013): 11–25.

Stewart, Hilary, *Looking at Totem Poles* (Vancouver and Seattle: Douglas & McIntyre, and University of Washington Press, 1993): foreword by Norman Tait, and 16–44.

Summers, David, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London: Phaidon, 2003).

Wang, Eugene Y., "The Winking Owl: Visual Effect and its Art Historical Thick Description," *Critical Inquiry* 26/3 (Spring 2000): 435 – 473.

Yahgulanaas, Michael Nicoll. "Art Opens Windows to the Space Between Ourselves," TED talk, November 14, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u1R_-3wzYEQ.

Appendix B

HAA 1050 World Art: Contact and Conflict
Fall 2017, Prof. Gretchen Bender

Collaborative Teaching Assignment

In groups, students enrolled in the class will be responsible for “teaching” the key works of art we cover throughout the semester. Primarily, each group will be responsible for:

- linking the key work to relevant assigned critical texts
- offering an interpretation of what they feel are the most significant and cogent features and issues pertaining to each work, and
- generating class discussion and activities that enable your peers to connect with the ideas you feel are most cogent when approaching the work.

Note that we are employing the term “teaching” here instead of “presenting.” When asked to *teach* material, one must approach it in a different way that compels you to engage your audience actively in the learning process. As a result, you become a more astute critical reader, and become more skilled at making broad connections, a fundamental goal for the seminar. For example, did all members of your group reach a consensus about an interpretation? What were your points of disagreement? What other approaches could you have taken to this material? What did you choose to emphasize and why? What aspects of the work did you decide were less important?

Lesson Date	**Key Work(s)**	**Adjacent Texts – others are possible!**
Tues. 9/19	War Rugs from Afghanistan	Lendon, Pratt and Carrier
Tues. 10/3	The Mosque at Córdoba	Summers, Pratt
Th. 10/12	Ji Yun-Fei, *Last Days of Village Wen*	Summers, Handout on Jacob Lawrence
Tues. 10/24	Totem Poles of the Pacific Northwest	Appiah (Chap. 8), Jonaitis/Glass, Stewart
Tues. 10/31	John Mawurndjul	Mawurndjul, Appiah
Tues. 11/28	Xu Bing, *Celestial Book*	Appiah (Chap. 5), Wang
Thurs. 4/14	Kara Walker, *A Subtlety…*	Appiah (Chap. 5), Meskimmon

Each group assigned to teach one of these lessons should meet to devise a plan at least two weeks prior to the day their topic is scheduled to be covered. It is advised that your group establish a regular meeting time outside of class that works with the busy schedules of each of your team members, so that you can progress smoothly through the following milestones:

1. Each team member carefully reads the assigned texts two weeks ahead of when the work(s) are scheduled to be discussed in class.
2. One week before the class meeting session, the team meets to strategize about how best to design their lesson (see suggestions below). What visual material will be necessary and how will this be presented? (Note: I have already provided

you with a fully-stocked .ppt file of images which you can use.) Multiple meetings the week prior to your lesson may be needed.

Pointers:

- Narrate the lesson. Anchor your teaching in evocative stories that help you work up to key points you want to get across. *You must deliver your ideas through the act of telling – verbal delivery – and showing and generating conversation.*
- *Do Not Spend Your Time Lecturing or Presenting Material to your Peers!* Engage the group in conversation or an activity that gets them to formulate questions about the material on their own. It's boring to simply listen to someone read notes from notecards. Don't do this.
- Relate the content to everyday life. Illustrate theoretical concepts with concrete examples.
- Think about what you want your classmates to do during your session. What might productively enable them to understand the key work in a new way?
- Distribute labor thoughtfully. Everyone on the team need not do the same thing; construct your teaching plan in a way that plays to the strengths of each member of the group.
- Don't be afraid to think on an elemental level. Basic concerns, themes, issues and questions often lead to or inspire complex ideas and complicated perspectives.
- Remember to always keep the main questions of the course that pertain to agency (actors making decisions, presenting themselves, producing objects or spaces, formulating ideas), and identity – individual as well as group and cultural – and contact zones.

For the collaborative teaching assignment, you will be graded as follows (this assignment is worth 15% of your grade for the course):

9.5 – 10/10 = The lesson demonstrated exemplary critical reading and analytical skills and highly compelling and creative adaptation of the material. The group conveyed thorough understanding of the key work and was able to initiate hearty and engaged discussion among students, providing activities and/or questions that stimulated thought and enthusiasm. In this exercise, it was evident that the group worked effectively as a team, relying on the strengths of each member who played a vital role. Strong and productive group dynamics were clearly in evidence.

8 – 9/10 = The lesson demonstrated satisfactory critical reading and analytical skills and adaptation of the material. The group was able to initiate some discussion among students, providing activities and/or questions that stimulated thought but enthusiasm could have been maintained more effectively throughout. Solid understanding of the key work was demonstrated. In this exercise, it was evident that the group worked effectively as a team, relying on the strengths of each member who played a role. Productive group dynamics were mostly in evidence.

7 – 7.5/10 = The group needs to improve their critical reading and/or analytical skills. The exercise was conducted more like a presentation that summarized assigned texts and key issues about the work, rather than an engaging lesson. Little effort was made to connect the key work to broader course topics. Students receiving the lesson generally remained passive as an audience; the group was unable to initiate productive

discussion. The group may also suffer from some lack of cohesion and organization and could work more productively together as a team.

0 – 6.5/10 = The group needs to improve their critical reading skills. The lesson was only partially complete, too hastily executed, demonstrating little care or minimal degree of engagement with the assigned texts and minimal understanding of the key work. The group also suffers from a lack of cohesion and organization. It is not evident they are working productively together as a team.

Collaboration points (0-5)

In addition to the content and delivery of the lesson itself, each group member will be evaluated on their own contribution to the project and willingness and ability to collaborate effectively with the other members of their team. Students will need to complete the Self-Assessment/Collaboration Report that documents their own activities and contributions to the assignment. It is possible that not all team members will receive the same number of points for collaboration based on a cumulative reading of each team member's report.

Appendix C: Outcomes Demonstrated in Final Student Research Papers

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">DEPARTMENTAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR UNDERGRADUATE HISTORY OF ART MAJORS:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Visual Analysis:
Able to make precise, accurate and comprehensive observations about an image, object, or site that supports an argument or interpretation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 16 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 22 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Global Understanding:
1) Able to address how cultures vary in terms of social, political, and religious contexts and value systems.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 17 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 23 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2) Able to identify that cultures can be defined in varying scales and that boundaries between groups of people are porous, with ideas exchanged through the mobility of groups, individuals,
and objects, with cultural contact a zone of potential productive collaboration but also power inequity and conflict.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 17 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 23 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">ADDITIONAL COURSE OUTCOMES:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Able to define critical terminology that emerged as central to the course through assigned readings and apply these ideas to a work of art of the student’s own choosing.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 15 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 21 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Able to situate the work within a broader context (art-historical, historical, social, economic, political, and/or religious) in order to convey a fuller interpretation of its purpose, function, and/or
meaning.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 16 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 22 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Able to think about the work diachronically, recognizing its shifting meanings and changing socio-historical and cultural contexts.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 9 /18</td><td>Majors: 2 /6</td><td>Total: 11 /24 (Note: several students in the class wrote about contemporary works which did not lend themselves as effectively to this type of analysis)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Recognizes scholarly debate pertaining to the work of art and is able to outline it, positioning oneself in the discourse</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 5 /18</td><td>Majors: 4 /6</td><td>Total: 9 /24</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Grapples with the act of interpretation, cognizant of the work’s ‘intended meaning’ (authorial or ‘original’ purpose) and/or the agency of the artwork along with the situated perspectives of subsequent observers</td></tr>
<tr><td>Non-Majors: 16 /18</td><td>Majors: 6 /6</td><td>Total: 22 /24</td></tr>
</table>