

Pedagogic Projects: ‘How do you bring a classroom to life as if it were a work of art?’

This chapter of this book has been the most difficult to write, because pedagogic art projects touch most closely my own professional field of activity: teaching and research. When artistic practice claims to be pedagogic, it immediately creates conflicting criteria in my mind: art is given to be seen by others, while education has no image. Viewers are not students, and students are not viewers, although their respective relationships to the artist and teacher have a certain dynamic overlap. The history of participatory art nevertheless incites us to think of these categories more elastically. For many decades, artists have attempted to forge a closer connection between art and life, referring to their interventions into social processes as art; most recently this includes educational experiments. As I have indicated throughout this book, such categorical expansions place considerable pressure on spectatorship as conventionally understood. Indeed, in its strictest sense, participation forecloses the traditional idea of spectatorship and suggests a new understanding of art without audiences, one in which everyone is a producer. At the same time, the existence of an audience is ineliminable, since it is impossible for everyone in the world to participate in every project.

The 2000s saw a marked rise of pedagogic projects undertaken by contemporary artists and curators. The cancellation of Manifesta 6 (2006), an attempt to re-organise the itinerant European biennial as an art school in Nicosia, was the moment when this trend began to accelerate. There was a conspicuous surge of interest in examining the relationship between art and pedagogy, dually motivated by artistic concerns (a desire to augment the intellectual content of relational conviviality) and developments in higher education (the rise of academic capitalism, discussed below).¹ Since then, both artists and curators have become increasingly engaged in projects that appropriate the tropes of education as both a method and a form: lectures, seminars, libraries, reading-rooms, publications, workshops and even full-blown schools.² This has paralleled the growth of museum education departments, whose activities are no longer restricted to classes and

workshops to enhance the viewer's understanding of a particular exhibition or collection, but can now include research networks with universities, symposia reflecting upon their practice, and interdisciplinary conferences whose scope extends far beyond the enhancement of a museum's exhibition programme.³ In museums and art schools throughout Europe (and increasingly the US), conferences have been held to re-examine the politics and potentialities of art education, while numerous art magazines have produced special issues examining the intersection of art, education and performance.⁴ The most recent developments have been institutional and corporate variants on the self-organised model, such as the Serpentine Gallery's off-site education base in London (*The Centre for Possible Studies*, 2009 onwards), Bruno Latour's interdisciplinary *School of Political Arts* at Université Sciences-Po (Paris, 2010 onwards), but also Nike's collaboration with Cooper Hewitt to produce art and design workshops for teenagers (*Make Something*, New York, 2010). It should be stressed, however, that pedagogic projects are still marginal in relation to the ongoing business of the art market, even though they are increasingly influential in the European public sector.⁵

The first thing that seems important to note in this efflorescence of artistic interest in education is its indication of a changing relationship between art and the academy. If in the past, academia was perceived as a dry and elitist institution (an association that persists in the use of 'academic' as a derogatory adjective), today education is figured as art's potential ally in an age of ever-decreasing public space, rampant privatisation and instrumentalised bureaucracy. At the same time, as Irit Rogoff notes, there is a certain slippage between terms like 'education', 'self-organised pedagogies', 'research' and 'knowledge production', so that the radical strands of the intersection between art and pedagogy blur easily with the neoliberal impetus to render education a product or tool in the 'knowledge economy'.⁶ So how can we tell the difference between 'pedagogical aesthetics' and more generative intersections of art and education?⁷ The current literature on art and pedagogy (of which Irit Rogoff's contribution is frequently cited) tends not to deal with specific modes of this intersection and the differences between art and education as discourses. For Rogoff, both art and education revolve around Foucault's notion of 'parrhesia' or 'free, blatant public speech': an educational turn in art and curating, she argues, might be 'the moment when we attend to the production and articulation of truths – not truth as correct, as provable, as fact, but truth as that which collects around it subjectivities that are neither gathered nor reflected by other utterances'. Rogoff's theory has been influential, but has the drawback of being rather general: no specific examples are given or analysed. The artist Luis Camnitzer is more to the point when he surveys the history of Latin American conceptual art, and notes that art and alternative pedagogy shared a project in resisting abuses of power by the state in the 1960s. In the

southern hemisphere, educational upheavals were premised on increasing access to education and equipping people with new creative tools; in the US and Europe, by contrast, the oppressed were equated with students, leading to changes only in the content of education, premised on freeing individuality with the assumption that democracy would follow.⁸

The history that Camnitzer outlines is formative for the one I am tracing, since the moment of institutional critique in art arrived at the same time as education's own self-examination, most notably in Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968), which I will return to below. These ruptures resulted in similar moves away from authoritarian models of transferring knowledge and towards the goal of empowerment through collective (class) awareness. Camnitzer – along with Joseph Beuys, Lygia Clark, Jef Geys and Tim Rollins (to name just a handful of figures) – is one of the most important precursors for contemporary artists working at the interface of art and pedagogy. For all of these artists, education was – and continues to be – a central concern in their work.

It is Joseph Beuys, however, who remains the best-known point of reference for contemporary artists' engagement with experimental pedagogy; in 1969 he claimed that 'to be a teacher is my greatest work of art'.⁹ Ten years after he began working in the sculpture department of the Düsseldorf Kunstakademie, Beuys protested against admission restrictions and in August 1971 accepted 142 students onto his course.¹⁰ This attempt to synchronise a professional position with his credo that 'everyone is an artist' (or at least, an art student) led to his expulsion from the Kunstakademie just over a year later, and to the formation, in 1973, of his own institution, the Free International University for Creativity and Interdisciplinary Research (still operational in the mid 1990s). Dedicated to realising the capacity of each person to be a creative being, this free, non-competitive, open academy offered an interdisciplinary curriculum in which culture, sociology and economics were integrated as the foundations of an all-encompassing creative programme. The Free International University sought to implement Beuys's belief that economics should not be restricted to a question of money but should include alternative forms of capital, such as people's creativity.¹¹ Prior to founding the FIU, Beuys's performances had, from 1971 onwards, already turned away from symbolic, quasi-shamanic actions towards a pedagogic format – most notably lectures and seminars on social and political structures. In February 1972, for example, he held two lecture-actions on consecutive days at Tate and the Whitechapel Art Gallery, the former lasting a marathon six and a half hours. During that Summer, he set up the *Bureau for Direct Democracy* at Documenta 5 (1972) and engaged in debate with the casual public about electoral reform. As the '70s progressed, the blackboards bearing traces of these performance-discussions became installations, occupying the space for the remainder of the exhibition as a trace of social and intellectual exchange.¹²

From a contemporary perspective, one of Beuys's most salient later projects is *100 Days of the Free International University*, organised for Documenta 6 (1977). Thirteen interdisciplinary workshops, open to the public, featured trade unionists, lawyers, economists, politicians, journalists, community workers, educationalists and sociologists speaking alongside actors, musicians and young artists.¹³ In moving beyond the humanities to embrace the social sciences, Beuys prefigures an important strand of recent curatorial and artistic activity.¹⁴ However, there are important differences between Beuys and artists working today: Beuys's commitment to free education was for the most part dependent on his own charismatic leadership, rendering unclear the line between education and one-man performance; today's artists, by contrast, are less likely to present themselves as the central pedagogic figure. They outsource the work of lecturing and teaching to specialists in the field – in line with the broader tendency in recent performance art to delegate performance to other people (as discussed in the previous chapter). Very little attention has been paid in Anglophone art history to Beuys's activities of the 1970s, despite the fact that they form the most central precursor of contemporary socially engaged art, intersecting artistic goals with social, political and pedagogic ambitions. Only Jan Verwoert provides a nuanced reading of Beuys's persona as a teacher in the 1970s (and it is telling that his parents were both students of the artist). He argues that Beuys's output should be characterised as a hyper-intensity of pedagogic and political commitment – an excess that both reinforced and undermined his institutional position. Beuys was both 'too progressive and too provocative': rejecting a



Joseph Beuys, Free International University seminar, 1977

curriculum, offering day-long critiques of student work, but also physically attacking the student's art if a point needed to be made.¹⁵ During an official matriculation ceremony at the Kunstakademie, for example, he greeted the new students by carrying an axe and uttering inarticulate barking sounds into a microphone for ten minutes (*ÖÖ-Programm*, 1967). For Verwoert, the humour and excess of this gesture does not easily fit into his critics' narratives of mystical creativity, and seems to open up a parodic, more subversive aspect to Beuys's work as an artist and professor.

Furthermore, Verwoert also argues that Beuys's practice of speaking publicly 'should be treated not as a metadiscourse *on* his art but as an artistic medium *sui generis*'.¹⁶ As seen in the reception of APG's activities (see Chapter 6), in the 1970s it was not yet possible to conceptualise public discussion as an artistic activity.¹⁷ Beuys himself seemed to reinforce this impression that discussion was not a didactic medium, but a more immediate, quasi-spiritual mode of communication: 'I want to get to the origin of the matter, to the thought behind it . . . In the simplest terms, I am trying to reaffirm the concept of art and creativity in the face of Marxist doctrine.'¹⁸ Today, we can recognise not just speech, but also teaching as an artistic medium. If Beuys drew a conceptual line between his output as a sculptor and his discursive/pedagogic work, many contemporary artists see no fundamental distinction between these categories. Programming events, seminars and discussions (and the alternative institutions that might result from these) can all be regarded as artistic outcomes in exactly the same way as the production of discrete objects, performances and projects. At the same time, pedagogic art raises a persistent set of epistemological problems for the art historian and critic: What does it mean to do education (and programming) *as art*? How do we judge these experiences? What kind of efficacy do they seek? Do we need to experience them first hand in order to comment on them?

Such questions can also be asked of most long-term art projects with activist or therapeutic goals, but the ambiguous status of pedagogic projects seems even more pressing for those of us already engaged in institutional education. I began writing this chapter when working at Warwick University, where the question of criteria of judgement in relation to academic activities had become crushingly remote from the motivations that first led me into this profession.¹⁹ When I encountered artists speaking of education in creative and liberatory terms, it seemed perplexing, if not wilfully misguided: for me, the university was one of the most bureaucratic and stiflingly uncreative environments I had ever encountered. At the same time, I was sympathetic towards the disciplinary reorientation I was witnessing: artists seemed to be moving a 'relational' practice (in which open-ended conviviality was sufficient evidence of social engagement) towards discursive situations with high-level intellectual content. As an outsider, however, I was often dissatisfied with the visual and conceptual

rewards of these projects. When I found projects I liked and respected, I had no idea how to communicate them to others: their dominant goal seemed to be the production of a dynamic experience for participants, rather than the production of complex artistic forms. The spectatorial implications of art becoming education are therefore a recurrent theme in the following case studies I have chosen to focus on: Tania Bruguera, Paul Chan, Paweł Althamer and Thomas Hirschhorn. Each presents a different approach to this problem of spectatorship in relation to the pedagogic task, and show the advances that have taken place in both project-based work and its documentation since ‘Culture in Action’ (1993, discussed in Chapter 7). I have necessarily presented these projects in a more narrative, subjective voice than my examples in previous chapters.

I. Useful Art

The first, and perhaps longest running, pedagogic project of the 2000s was *Cátedra Arte de Conducta* (2002–9): an art school conceived as a work of art by Cuban artist Tania Bruguera (b.1968). Based at her home in Havana Vieja and run with the help of two staff, it was dedicated to providing a training in political and contextual art for art students in Cuba. Bruguera established *Arte de Conducta* (or ‘behaviour art’) at the end of 2002, after returning to her country from participating in Documenta 11 with a sense of dissatisfaction at the limitations of creating artistic experiences for viewers. Instead she wished to make a concrete contribution to the art scene in Cuba, partly in response to its lack of institutional facilities and exhibition infrastructure, and partly in response to ongoing state restrictions on Cuban citizens’ travel and access to information. A third factor was the recent and rapid consumption of Cuban art by US tourists in the wake of the 2000 Havana Biennial, in which young artists had found their work bought up wholesale and rapidly integrated into a Western market over which they had no control.²⁰ One of the aims of Bruguera’s project was therefore to train a new generation of artists to deal self-reflexively with this situation, mindful of a global market while producing art that addressed their local context.

Strictly speaking, *Arte de Conducta* is best understood as a two-year course rather than as an art school proper: it was a semi-autonomous module under the auspices of the Instituto Superior de Arte (ISA) in Havana. Students didn’t get credits for attending it, but the institutional affiliation was necessary in order for Bruguera to secure visas for visiting lecturers. In the early years, many of these visitors were funded by Bruguera herself, through a teaching position at the University of Chicago (2004–9).²¹ *Conducta* or ‘behaviour’ is Bruguera’s alternative to the Western term ‘performance art’, but it also evokes the *Escuela de Conducta*, a school for juvenile delinquents where Bruguera used to teach art. *Arte de Conducta*,

however, was not concerned with enforcing disciplinary norms but with the opposite: its focus was art that engages with reality, particularly at the interface of usefulness and illegality – since ethics and the law are, for Bruguera, domains that need continually to be tested. One of the archetypal works produced at the school (and the first one I was exposed to in a crit) is *El Escandalo de lo Real* (2007) by Susana Delahante. When the student showed me the photograph of this work I had no idea what I was looking at; she explained that it was an image showing herself being impregnated, via a speculum, with the semen of a recently deceased man.²² A less visceral example would be Celia and Yunior's *Registro de Población* (2004), in which the artists took advantage of the legal loophole by which it is possible to repeatedly apply for identity cards: accumulated sequentially, the dated cards evoke a work by On Kawara, while also undermining the authenticated uniqueness we associate with proofs of identity.

One of the first questions that tends to be raised in relation to pedagogic art projects concerns the composition of the student body. In the case of *Arte de Conducta*, this was both rigid and very fluid. Bruguera took on eight students each year, plus an art historian, who was expected to make art (like the other students) as well as producing a continual report of the project over that year, thereby guaranteeing that *Arte de Conducta* formed a historical account of itself from within. Beyond this official intake, the workshops were also open to everyone interested: previous students, their partners, and the general public (mainly professional artists and critics). This openness is an important difference between *Arte de Conducta* and other artist's schools, such as the Kuitca programme in Buenos Aires.²³ As such, the structure of Bruguera's school is both official and informal:

The symbolic structure is the one where I'm reproducing the recognizable elements of an educational program, one that I install but do not respect. For example to enter the project one has to go through a selection process in front of an international jury who chooses the 'best' candidates. But once the workshops start I let in anybody who wants to attend even if they didn't make it through the selection committee.²⁴

Some aspects of the course are more or less conventional: teaching, for example, is structured around one-week workshops that always include a public talk and crits of the students' work. Invited artists assign the students a specific project: Dan Perjovschi asked the students to make a newspaper, while Artur Żmijewski assigned the task of making a 'non-literal adaptation' of a communist propaganda film from Poland. Most of the visiting artists are engaged in performance in some way, and many are from former socialist countries, in order to help the Cuban students understand the transition their own society will inevitably be going through. There have also been curators and theorists (including myself), who together with the

artists amount to an imported exhibition culture: bringing images and ideas to the island that do not otherwise circulate there due to severe restrictions on internet usage. Bruguera has also invited a lawyer and a journalist (to advise students on the legal and press implications of undertaking performance in the public sphere), as well as historians, sociologists and mathematicians. Teachers were encouraged to regard *Arte de Conducta* as a ‘mobile school’ and to use the whole city as a base for operations; during my time there, the Kosovan artist Sislej Xhafa asked students to make actions in a hotel (which Cubans are forbidden from entering), outside the Museum of the Revolution, and at a barber’s shop. Each workshop ends with a Friday night fiesta at Bruguera’s home. The aim is to produce a space of free speech in opposition to dominant authority (not unlike Freire’s aims in Brazil) and to train students not just to make art but to experience and formulate a civil society.

If the question of representation is an ongoing theme in most art classes, the question of how to communicate this school-as-art to an external audience is an ongoing problem. It is telling that Bruguera did not attempt to do this for the first five years of the project. When invited to participate in the 2008 Gwangju Biennial, however, Bruguera decided to show *Arte de Conducta*; rather than exhibiting documentation, she made the decision to show a representative sample of the students’ work, albeit in a rather conventional and unsatisfying installation. A more dynamic solution was found to mark the end of the school during the 2009 Havana Biennial. Entitled *Estado de Excepción*, it comprised nine group shows over as many days, open to the public between 5 and 9 p.m., de-installed every night and



Tania Bruguera, *Cátedra Arte de Conducta*, 2002–9. Workshop with Elvia Rosa Castro.

re-installed every morning, thereby aiming to capture the urgency and intensity of the school as a whole. Each day was organised around themes such as ‘Jurisdiction’, ‘Useful Art’, and ‘Trafficking Information’, and presented a selection of work from the school alongside work by visiting lecturers (often sent as instructions), including Thomas Hirschhorn and Elmgreen & Dragset. Each night the space looked completely different, while the students’ short, sharp interventions often outstripped everything else in the biennial in terms of their subversive wit and direct engagement with the Cuban situation. Many works dealt with issues of censorship, internet restrictions and social taboos; Alejandro Ulloa, for example, simply placed the most expensive piece of computer equipment in Cuba on a plinth – an anonymous grey cable for connecting a data projector.

The question remains, however, as to why *Arte de Conducta* needs to be called a work of art, rather than simply an educational project that Bruguera undertook in her home city. One possible answer invokes her authorial identity as an artist. The school, like many of the student projects it produced, can be described as a variation on what Bruguera has designated as ‘useful art’ (*arte util*) – in other words, art that is both symbolic and useful, refuting the traditional Western assumption that art is useless or without function. This concept allows us to view *Arte de Conducta* as inscribed within an ongoing practice that straddles the domains of art and social utility. Presenting *Arte de Conducta* at the Havana biennial was ‘useful’ in that it allowed Bruguera to expose to an international audience a younger generation who would never otherwise be chosen by the Biennial committee. During the same Havana Biennial, Bruguera presented *Tatlin’s Whisper #6*, a controversial performance in which the Cuban public were offered one minute of free speech on a podium inside the Centro Wilfredo Lam.²⁵ While both of these projects could fall under the category of ‘doing good’ (as in the recent proliferation of NGO-style art projects), Bruguera defines useful art more broadly as a performative gesture that affects social reality, be this civil liberties or cultural politics, and which is not necessarily tied to morality or legality (as seen for example, in Susana Delahante’s *El Escandalo do Real*, or in Bruguera’s own *Tatlin’s Whisper #6*).

Bruguera’s practice, aiming to impact on both art and reality, requires that we grow accustomed to making double judgements, and to considering the impact of her actions in both domains. In the case of *Arte de Conducta*, it’s necessary to apply the criteria of experimental education and of artistic project. From the former perspective, the conceptual framework devised for the school testifies to a rethinking of both art-school education and the genres being taught. For example, she refers not only to *conducta* or ‘behaviour’ instead of performance, and to ‘guests’ and ‘members’ rather than teachers and students, but membership of the school is both controlled (by applications and a jury) and open to all. Her own home is the school’s headquarters and library, and she has an informal relationship with the

students (who frequently stay overnight at her house, even in her bed, when she is away). As an artwork, the dynamic time-based solution that she eventually found for the project – a rapidly changing exhibition of the students' works alongside those of previous teachers – was exhilaratingly intense, sociable and artistically rewarding, widely agreed to be one of the best contributions to an otherwise ideologically leaden Havana Biennial.

However, one drawback of making these divisions between art and education, and their attendant disciplinary criteria, is the assumption that the way we judge respective disciplines is fixed (rather than mutable); it risks foreclosing the emergence of new criteria from their intersection. Although Bruguera views the project as a work of art, she does not address what might be artistic in *Arte de Conducta*. Her criterion is the production of a new generation of socially and politically engaged artists in Cuba, but also the exposure of visiting lecturers to new ways of thinking about teaching in context. Both of these goals are long-term and unrepresentable. Rhetorically, Bruguera always privileges the social over the artistic, but I would argue that her entire shaping of *Arte de Conducta* is reliant on an artistic imagination (an ability to deal with form, experience and meaning). Rather than perceiving art as something separate (and subordinate) to a 'real social process', art is in fact integral to her conception of each project. Equally, her artistic imagination was manifest in the method she devised to display this project to the viewers of the Havana Biennial. Both art and education can have long-term goals, and they can be equally dematerialised, but imagination and daring are crucial to both.

II. A Project in Three Parts

If Bruguera attempts to merge art and education, then the US artist Paul Chan (b.1973) keeps them at one remove. Best known for highly aestheticised animated video installations, such as *The 7 Eights* (2005–7), and for his works on paper, Chan is an eloquent artist who has frequently defended an Adornian understanding of art as a language that cannot be subject to instrumentalised rationality, and whose political potency lies in this very exceptionalism. This is important to bear in mind when considering his *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans* (2007), a project premised on a clear division between process and outcome. As with many works in the public sphere, some preamble is needed to set the scene. Chan always recounts the story in the same way: in October 2006 he visited New Orleans to install one of his works and give a talk at Tulane University. There he first saw the impact of Hurricane Katrina, which one year earlier had ravaged the poorest areas of the city and left certain districts, such as the Lower Ninth Ward, in a state of apocalyptic devastation. Entire houses were washed away, leaving only the ghostly remainder of concrete steps leading to what was once a home. Chan recalls how, standing in this landscape, he had an

uncanny sense of déjà-vu: 'it had the feel of every production of *Godot* I'd ever seen'.²⁶ Shortly afterwards, he made a drawing of this landscape as a stage set which, with the assistance of New York-based commissioning agency Creative Time, was realised during November 2007 as five performances of Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* staged by the Classical Theatre of Harlem.²⁷ The choice of Beckett's bleak high modernist play seemed painfully appropriate to New Orleans, since the central political scandal of the US government's response to the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina had been one of chronic delay.

Chan is at pains to state, however, that *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans* did not solely comprise the theatrical production:

[T]o imagine that the play was the thing is to miss the thing. We didn't simply want to stage a site-specific performance of *Godot*. We wanted to create, in the process of staging the play, an image of art as a form of reason. What I mean is that we wanted to use the idea of doing the play as the departure point for inaugurating a series of causes and effects that would bind the artists, the people in New Orleans, and the city together in a relationship that would make each responsible for the other. The project, in other words, was an experiment in using art to organize a new image of life in the city two years after the storm.²⁸

To reflect this, the production's subtitle was 'A tragicomedy in two acts, a project in three parts'. The former self-evidently refers to Beckett's play, while the latter alludes to a 'DIY residency' comprising eight months of workshops and teaching; to the open-air performances in the Lower Ninth Ward and Gentilly areas of New Orleans; and to a 'shadow fund' in which money was raised and left behind for local organisations engaged in rebuilding the city.²⁹ In effect, however, despite the clarity of Chan's tripartite conceptualisation, in which the three elements are theoretically equal, the main focus of critical attention to date has always focused on the play.³⁰ In reading this project through the lens of art and education I therefore want to cut against the grain of *Godot's* reception to date and take seriously the artist's claim that all three aspects of the project were equally weighted.

Given the almost fail-proof combination of a canonical modernist play, a well-established theatre company, a hauntingly bleak location, and the backdrop of a natural disaster and unquestionable political injustice, one may well wonder why the artist went to such lengths to pave the way for this production in the form of eight months' residency and teaching. The artist has explained this situation in terms that are part ethical (not imposing one's vision on a population, responding to its needs) and part strategic (generating a body of supporters to realise his vision and protect it). According to Chan's narrative, he met with great opposition and resistance in New Orleans; the suggestion to work with schools and produce a shadow

fund came out of his conversations with residents, who were sick of being a backdrop to catastrophe tourism. They didn't want art, but concrete help. Chan moved to the city in August 2007 and began teaching for free at New Orleans University (which needed a contemporary art history class, since their teacher had perished in Katrina) and at Xavier University (which needed studio classes on how to do a resumé and portfolios). This teaching helped him to build up a base of volunteers and to spread news of the project by word of mouth. At the same time, he sought to establish relationships with key activists and organisers through potluck dinners (Chan refers to this as 'the political work of disarming'). The Classical Theatre of Harlem, meanwhile, also relocated to New Orleans, and began rehearsing in an abandoned Catholic school, where they held workshops for community theatre groups if requested.

It is significant that Chan's educational work was not an interrogation into the uses of education in and of itself, but the means to an end: using the skills he had in order to integrate himself into the city, build up alliances, and realise his vision. Competencies were maximised: unlike Bruguera outsourcing teaching to others, Chan used his own expertise. His weekly art history seminars were themed around artists he admired (plus 'Theodor Adorno on the occasion of his birthday'), while the studio classes – 'Directed Reading, or Art Practicum' – offered a guide to the art world: how to write artists' statements, get funding, compose press releases, and so on.³¹ The play's production and theatre workshops, meanwhile, were handed over to the Classical Theatre of Harlem, for whom residencies and workshops are already a regular part of their practice. In other words, skills were carefully parcelled out to maximise efficacy. The strength of this approach could be said to reside in precisely such a clear division between the domains of education, art and performance: Chan reminds us that his organisational techniques are learnt from activism, and describes the project as a 'campaign'. On the other hand, this division between organisation, fundraising and final production maintains a clear separation between the managerial and creative aspects of the project in a way that could be seen as artistically conservative; Bruguera, for instance, would insist on viewing all parts of such a process as art. It is telling that on Chan's website we can find the syllabi for his courses, but no images of the classes. Likewise, no official footage of the performance exists, only a bootleg video. The visual images that do circulate around the project always revolve around the carefully wrought production: Chan's initial drawing (available as a free download), production stills, and photographs of the signage advertising *Godot* – unforgettable shots of a desolate New Orleans landscape punctuated by a white sign with black text, bearing Beckett's opening stage directions: 'A country road. A tree. Evening.'

Chan has recently sold the *Godot* archive to MoMA, where it has been displayed as three walls of papers pasted onto blown-up photographs of the



Paul Chan, *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans*, 2007. The artist teaching at Lusher High School.



Paul Chan, *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans*, 2007. Robert Green and production signage.



Paul Chan, *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans Archive*, 2010, installation view at MoMA

Lower Ninth Ward (working notes, maps, the seminar syllabi, Susan Sontag's essay on her production of *Waiting for Godot in Sarajevo*), radical pamphlets framed behind glass, three blue plastic sheets, three 'sculptures' used as props in the performances, and a small plasma screen showing the 'bootleg video' (which makes its unofficial status questionable). Unlike Jeremy Deller's archive of *The Battle of Orgreave* (discussed in Chapter 1), the selection of objects in Chan's display is geared towards representing the theatrical production rather than to the social and political events occasioning this work. He has also edited a book documenting the project, which is comprehensive but classical in format, including a careful selection of images charting the work's process, press clippings about Katrina, reprinted essays (Sontag once more, plus Alain Badiou and Terry Eagleton), the school syllabi, and Chan's interviews with key participants. The overall impression is one of order, rather than the chaotic polyvocality and dissent that mark the publications of, say, Thomas Hirschhorn.

Listening to Chan speak about the process of realising *Godot*, one realises that the best documentation of this project is neither the archive nor the book, but the performative medium of the lecture accompanied by a powerpoint: live, narrative and time-based. To my knowledge, Chan has given this talk three times in New York City; I have heard it twice and both times the audience were gripped. The story he tells is a meditation on art, politics and community-building – in short, everything that is glossed over in the archival presentation at MoMA. Even though *Waiting for Godot in New Orleans* was not participatory in any conventional sense,

Chan identifies two types of social and political work that took place in relation to realising the project: before the event (which was ‘painfully conventional – like any politics’) and during the event (‘which makes possible a place where these things [i.e. politics] don’t matter any more’).³² In other words, Chan sustains simultaneously two different registers of the political: as instrumentalised diplomacy, and as the suspension of this instrumentalisation in the autonomy of the work of art. This Adornian inclination towards art as a sanctuary where means-ends rationality is set aside makes Chan an unusual figure among artists today: rather than using art to bring about social change, he uses activist strategies to realise a work of art. The more common tendency for socially engaged artists is to adopt a paradoxical position in which art as a category is both rejected and reclaimed: they object to their project being called art because it is also a real social process, while at the same time claiming that this whole process is art.

III. Common Tasks

Chan’s articulate understanding of the dual nature of art’s politics could not be further from the intuitive operations of Polish artist Paweł Althamer (b.1967), who also works across sculpture (invariably a form of self-portraiture) and collaborative projects, but who views all parts of this process as an artistic adventure. His longest-running collaboration is with the Nowolipie Group, an organisation in Warsaw for adults with mental or physical disabilities, to whom he has been teaching a Friday night ceramics class since the early 1990s. Although these began in a conventional pedagogic mode – each week he sets the group an assignment; when I visited, they were building castles – increasingly, the class leads Althamer: the experience of teaching provides a rich source of ideas for him, for whom the educational process cuts two ways (‘They teach me to be more mad’).³³ For example, one of the group, Rafał Kalinowski, always builds clay biplanes regardless of the week’s set theme. In 2008 Althamer arranged for the group to wear matching overalls and take a trip on a biplane, which became the subject of a short film by Althamer’s frequent collaborator, Artur Żmijewski (*Winged*, 2008). This long-term collaboration recently led to a series of works called *Common Task* (2009), a ‘science fiction film in real time’, in which Althamer took the Nowolipie Group and his neighbours in the Bródno district of Warsaw (residents of a socialist-era housing estate), all dressed in gold jumpsuits, to visit the Atomium in Brussels. Subsequent voyages, with a smaller team of travellers, were then made to Niemeyer’s architecture in Brasília, and to the Dogon people in Mali.³⁴

Since 2000, Althamer’s work has moved in an increasingly unexhibitable direction, a shift that has coincided with an extension of his interest in education. In 2005 he was commissioned by a German institution to make a work

celebrating the centenary of Albert Einstein. Rather than producing a portable sculpture, Althamer developed *Einstein Class*, a six-month project to teach physics to a group of seven juvenile delinquents in Warsaw, most of whom had been expelled from school. The tutor he selected for this task was a maverick science teacher who had recently lost his job due to his unconventional teaching style. The male pupils, who all came from the run-down Praga district of Warsaw, were taught playful science experiments in a number of locations: in the teacher's garden, in a field, on a beach and in Althamer's studio (also in Praga). The boys then demonstrated these experiments to their neighbours. The whole project was documented on video by the Polish filmmaker Krzysztof Visconti (*Einstein Class*, 2006), who interspersed it with interviews with Althamer, the children and their parents. As documentation, the video is unremarkable, and bears no relation to the chaotic intensity of the project; it seems at pains to normalise Althamer's initiative and prove its positive effect upon the students. The dynamic of *Einstein Class* was, in my experience, far more vivid and demanding. One evening I accompanied Althamer to the science teacher's house, where he wanted to show the first edit of the documentary to the boys. When we arrived, full-scale mayhem was underway: the boys were playing gabba music at full blast, surfing the internet, smoking, throwing fruit around, fighting and threatening to push each other into the garden pond. In the middle of this frenzy stood an oasis of calm: the science teacher and Althamer, utterly oblivious to the chaos around them. Only a handful of the boys watched the video (which depicted nothing of this bedlam); the rest were more interested in trying to steal my mobile phone or surf the net. As the evening progressed, it became clear that Althamer had placed two groups of outsiders together – the



Paweł Althamer, *Einstein Class*, 2005

kids and the science teacher – and this social relationship operated as a belated corrective to his own experience of feeling disengaged at school. *Einstein Class*, like many of Althamer's works, is typical of his identification with marginal subjects, and his use of them to realise a situation through which he can retroactively rehabilitate his own past.

In exhibition, Althamer has attempted to deal with the problem of documentation performatively: when the Einstein exhibition opened in Berlin, the teacher and kids all travelled to Germany for the opening as a continuation of their education.³⁵ When the film was screened in London in 2006, Althamer insisted that the Polish boys be invited to the opening, and their local equivalents hired to supply a dubbed translation for the film. As in many of Althamer's projects, altruism is inseparable from institutional inconvenience and upheaval (which the London exhibition made explicit in its title, 'What Have I Done to Deserve This?').³⁶ Althamer's subsequent projects with students, such as *Au Centre Pompidou* (2006), attempted to visualise an educational process through a collectively produced puppet show. And yet, for both this project and *Einstein Class*, one feels as if the visual outcome was forced, produced as a result of institutional pressure for visibility. At their best, the eccentricity of Althamer's ideas are self-sufficient and need no visual documentation.

Althamer's own academic formation is worth attending to, since it underlies many of his more vivid projects. Althamer was part of the so-called Kowalski Studio at the Warsaw Academy of Fine Arts, along with many of today's leading generation of Polish artists, including Artur Żmijewski and Katarzyna Kozyra. Professor Grzegorz Kowalski rejected the traditional model of 'master' to 'apprentice' in favour of 'visual games' – open-ended tasks that also functioned as a form of collective analysis, both critical and therapeutic. Under the working title 'Common Space – Private Space', Kowalski foregrounded the work of art as an effect of complex non-verbal communication performed by artists in interaction with each other, neutralising individualism.³⁷ Kowalski derived this technique from the architectural theory of his teacher, Oskar Hansen, who in 1959 had proposed 'open form', in which a structure can be added to, encouraging participation and a more vital relationship with reality, in contrast to 'closed form', to which it is impossible to incorporate additions.³⁸ One of the basic tenets of open form is that 'no artistic expression is complete until it has been appropriated by its users or beholders', whereas closed form reduces subjectivity to a passive element within a larger hierarchical structure.³⁹ As the curator Łukasz Ronduda has argued, when Hansen's idea of open form is translated into art, it brings about a 'death of the author', opening the way towards 'experimentation and highly complex (trans-individual) collective projects'.⁴⁰ Kowalski adopted Hansen's ideas as a pedagogic principle, but differs from his teacher's austere rationalism in encouraging a more subjective, poetic and quasi-Surrealist approach.



Paweł Althamer and Artur Żmijewski, *[S]election.pl*, 2005. The Nowolipie Group at work in the gallery.



Paweł Althamer and Artur Żmijewski, *[S]election.pl*, 2005

In 2005, Żmijewski and Althamer revisited Kowalski's pedagogic method in a project called *Wybory.pl* ([S]election.pl). When CCA Ujazdowski Castle offered the two artists solo shows, they decided to collaborate on a process-based exhibition with their former colleagues from the Kowalski Studio. Constantly mutating and entirely chaotic, the exhibition was spread through several galleries of the CCA but defiantly broke both educational and exhibition conventions by subjecting individual contributions to one rule: anyone could adapt or amend or improve or destroy anyone else's work. Unlike 'Interpol' and the other performative exhibitions discussed in Chapter 7, *[S]election.pl* was open to the public during this process, who could observe the changes taking place as they happened. Żmijewski produced a fifty-minute video of the experience, showing its various phases over several weeks: from the artists making works, and gradually altering each other's pieces, to Althamer introducing other people into the process, such as children, the Nowolipie Group, and (most controversially) some prostitutes. A revealing sequence occurs when Althamer takes his daughter Veronika around the museum in a shopping trolley, encouraging her to interact with the objects, until he is brought to a cursory halt by a gallery invigilator. In this juxtaposition of the girl's tactile curiosity and museum prohibition, the viewer sees yet another indictment of the museum as mausoleum, but this time staged as a confrontation between a child's enthusiasm and the deadening interdictions of the institution. Żmijewski's careful editing of this incident allows the relationship of artist/teacher and viewer/student to come into particularly sharp focus. Throughout the video we see two divergent impulses at work. On the one hand, Althamer's urge to bring diverse constituencies into the museum and his Beuysian request that they see themselves as contemporary artists.⁴¹ On the other hand, Żmijewski's interest in antagonism and destruction, continually setting fire to other people's politely crafted objects as if to assert that artistic creation can only occur *ex nihilo*, by erasing such conventional forms. It is as if Althamer and Żmijewski want to honour their former teacher by rewriting his pedagogic methods more trenchantly, encouraging their colleagues *and* the museum's employees to reflect more acutely on the meaning of art and why it comes to be exhibited.

As an exhibition, *[S]election.pl* was critically panned as incomprehensible, and even Kowalski sought to distance himself from what was being done in his honour.⁴² Like *Einstein Class*, *[S]election.pl* suggests that experimental art-as-pedagogy doesn't necessarily lead to a cohesive and completed work of art or exhibition at the time of its making. Moreover, it is telling that the best documentation of *[S]election.pl* is time-based, like Chan's lectures, or Bruguera's *Estado de Excepción*. Through Żmijewski's video, we understand that while the show can be seen in the tradition of institutional critique (*qua* an analysis of institutional functions and conventions), it is also a series of vignettes documenting an education – for the children who painted

on the floor, for the artists' former colleagues who watched their efforts cruelly incinerated, and for the museum itself, as seen in Żmijewski's curt exchange with one of the lady invigilators. Yet at the same time it also suggests that education is a closed process of social exchange, undertaken with mutual commitment, over a long duration, rather the performance of acts to be observed by others. It takes an artist with an eye for painfully telling detail to give a compelling structure and narrative to such a formless and invisible exchange.⁴³

IV. What Functions, Produces

My final example is the Paris-based sculptor Thomas Hirschhorn (b.1957), who at regular intervals in the last decade has organised large-scale social projects in the form of a 'monument', often dedicated to a philosopher and produced in collaboration with residents who live near the site of its making, usually on the outskirts of a city. Since 2004, a pedagogic component has become increasingly important to these works. *Musée Précaire Albinet* (2004), located in the Aubervilliers district of north-east Paris near Hirschhorn's studio, involved the collaboration and training of local residents to install seven weekly exhibitions of works loaned from the Pompidou Centre collection (Beuys, Warhol, Duchamp, Malevich, Léger, Mondrian and Dalí). These were supported by a weekly timetable of events: an *atelier pour enfants* on Wednesdays, a writing workshop for adults on Thursdays, a general debate on Fridays, and a discussion with an art historian or critic on Saturdays. This timetable continued with a dinner, made by a family or group (using funds from the project) on Sundays; the de-installation and installation of work on Mondays; and the *vernissage* and party on Tuesdays.

As can be imagined, the primary audience for the *Musée Précaire Albinet* was the local and regularly returning inhabitants, rather than a general public of art enthusiasts. In 2009 Hirschhorn addressed the problem of this division in a large-scale project located in a suburb of Amsterdam called the Bijlmer. Its title, *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival*, was deliberately misleading: the project was not so much a festival as a large installation environment for hosting a programme of daily lectures and workshops. The construction was topped with an oversized sculpture of a book (Spinoza's *Ethics*), decorated with bunting, and framed by the residential tower blocks, a running track and an elevated railway line. A noticeboard and pile of free newspapers were positioned by the nearest path to entice passers-by, along with a car covered in brightly coloured votive objects for Spinoza. Entering the structure, one passed an unlicensed bar. The rest of the installation took its layout from the aerial view of an open book: the 'pages' were walls, and the spaces in between were rooms with different functions: a library of books by and about Spinoza, a newspaper office, an archival display about

the history of Bijlmer (including footage of the plane crash that decimated one of the buildings in 1992), an internet room (hogged by children), and a workspace for the ‘Ambassador’, an art historian in residence. Some of these components gently parodied conventional methods of didactic display, such as a plinth showing enlarged photographs of ‘book covers of important books from Spinoza’s lifetime’, and an empty vitrine bearing the sign ‘Here was exhibited from the 2nd to the 10th May a copy of the “Tractatus Theologico-Politicus” of B.de Spinoza.’

However didactic these library/archive areas, they were less notable in this context than the planned schedule of workshops and lectures. Every day the same timetable was followed: ‘Child’s Play’ at 4.30 p.m., a workshop in which local children learnt to re-enact classic works of body art from the 1970s (culminating in a performance on Saturdays); at 5.30 p.m. a lecture by philosopher Marcus Steinweg; and at 7 p.m. a play written by Steinweg, directed by Hirschhorn, and performed by local residents. On the first day I attended, adults drank, talked and smoked marijuana at the bar while the children (aged between six and twelve) were absorbed in the ‘Child’s Play’ workshop, repeatedly shouting the word ‘Abramovic’ and doing lots of screaming.⁴⁴ After the workshop, the children hung around and played on various pieces of gym equipment while Steinweg gave his daily lecture – a largely improvised philosophical ramble delivered in English, and without notes, to an audience of around ten people seated on plastic chairs. The topic was ‘Does Autonomy Exist?’ None of us were taking notes, but this seemed fine since Steinweg didn’t really deliver an argument so much as a stream of philosophical consciousness. The most enjoyable aspect of the lecture was the montage effect produced by the kids on running machines and general activity around the bar while Steinweg earnestly bumbled on. The unfurling of these juxtapositions was more poignant and meaningful than the supposedly academic content of the lecture.

After precisely half an hour, Steinweg stopped talking and people drifted towards the bar. During this interlude, Hirschhorn set up the scenery for the 7 p.m. play by moving the gym equipment to the front of the stage – along with microphones, speakers and a human-sized box slathered in brown tape – and surrounded the whole ensemble with a wonky yellow ‘brick wall’ on a sheet of fabric. What proceeded is hard to describe as a play. Even though it was all in Dutch, I could still tell that there was no characterisation, no plot and no narrative. There were seven performers – although this varied from night to night, depending on how many decided to turn up. All of them read from a hand-held script, and took turns to speak their lines falteringly while engaged in various physical tasks: working on the treadmill, boxing a punchbag, weightlifting an oversized cardboard copy of the *Ethics*, or retreating to the tall box to announce the edict that banished Spinoza from Amsterdam in 1656. I won’t dwell on the



Thomas Hirschhorn, *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival*, 2009, 'Child's Play' workshops



Thomas Hirschhorn, *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival*, 2009, Marcus Steinweg lecturing

play, only note my amused frustration at its impenetrability (to me, but also to the performers I spoke to).⁴⁵ Looking at the audience, I could not understand why such a mixed bag of people kept coming to hear these obscure lectures and watch these opaque – almost gruelling – performances. However, going through the whole experience again the following day, I realised that this random collective presence was the point. Rain was drizzling so there was less peripheral action; listening to Steinweg and watching the audience I understood the function of the lecture not to be one of information transfer, but of a shared experience in which many different sectors of society were brought together. You didn't need to follow the content, just give yourself over to a quiet meditative space (not unlike being in an open air, non-denominational church) and use this as a time for pondering whatever came to mind.

During the play, the drizzle became torrential rain. For the first time during *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival*, the performance had to stop and be relocated inside, in a cramped space under the plastic sheeting. The bedraggled audience surrounded the cast, while rain thrashed onto the plastic roof, occasionally leaking torrents, and rendering the performers' voices near inaudible. The finale of this insanely abstract quasi-Dadaist play was a sequence in which two of the speakers alternated the lines 'Wat functioneert, dat produceert' (what functions, produces) for two minutes (which felt more like ten); this now became an incantation in the face of the most unsympathetic and least functioning of environments. It was both bathetically funny and extremely poignant. Everyone was there for no reason other than the desire to see and do the same thing: to share a play initiated by an artist, whose singular energy propelled a self-selecting, entirely disparate bunch of people to show up every night and perform or watch an abstract play that nobody fully understood. The core of *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival* seemed to be this juxtaposition of social types around a series of mediating objects that were never quite what they seemed. The philosopher's lectures were not arguments to be understood or disputed, but were performances of philosophy; they were the spoken equivalent of the piles of photocopied Steinweg essays that form a sculptural presence in other Hirschhorn installations (for example, *U-Lounge*, 2003). The meaning of the theatre production also lay in the fact of its dogged performance, relentlessly taking place every day, regardless of the weather or number of performers who showed up. Like the lectures, it is pointless to analyse the specific content of this shambling spectacle; more important is to pay attention to its ongoing existence, willed into being by the artist, who managed to motivate people into performing something strange enough to continually captivate an audience. Similarly, the newspaper must be produced each day, regardless of the availability of news, or images, or relevant stories. At no point in *The*



Thomas Hirschhorn, *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival*, 2009, The Spinoza Play

Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival was the ostensible content given to us to be analysed in a straightforward manner. The project was more akin to a machine, whose meaning lay in everyone's continual production and collective presence, and only secondarily in the content of what was being produced; it was not unlike endurance-based performance art – which is why the 'Child's Play' workshops seemed so apt an inclusion.

Hirschhorn frequently asserts that he is not interested in 'participation' or 'community art' or 'relational aesthetics' as labels for his work, preferring the phrase 'Presence and Production' to describe his approach to public space:

I want to work out an alternative to this lazy, lousy 'democratic' and demagogic term 'Participation'. I am not for 'Participative-art', it's so stupid because every old painting makes you more 'participating' than today's 'Participative-art', because first of all real participation is the participation of thinking! Participation is only another word for 'Consumption'!⁴⁶

Hirschhorn's conjunction of art, theatre and education in *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival* was so memorable because it avoided the pitfalls of so much participatory art, in which there is no space for critical reflection, nor for a spectatorial position. Several audiences were addressed simultaneously and equally: both visitors to the 'Straat van Sculpturen' exhibition

into which the project was integrated, and local residents who ran and used the site. Like Chan in his account of *Godot*, Hirschhorn gives an impressively polished lecture about the project, articulating its four phases (preparation, set up, exhibition, dismantling) and sixteen ‘beams’ of activity, but this structural overview fails to convey the unpredictable social mix that was magnetised by his idiosyncratic celebration of Spinoza. In the past, Hirschhorn has produced documentation of his ‘monuments’ in the form of a book gathering together all the correspondence, images, press coverage and audience feedback into one overwhelmingly dense publication that serves as a textual analogue for the event’s social and organisational complexity. Unlike Chan’s clearly structured rationale, however, there is an overt contradiction between Hirschhorn’s words and his methods: he makes claims for art as a powerful, autonomous, almost transcendent force of non-alienation, but through projects that spill into the complexity of social antagonisms and deluge us with extra-artistic questions. Underlining this is a montage principle of co-existing incompatibilities: if Hirschhorn’s gallery-based installations juxtapose horrific images of violence with high culture and philosophy (e.g. *Concretion-Re*, 2007), and (at their best) throb with social pessimism and anger, his public projects juxtapose different social classes, races and ages with a fearless defence of art and philosophy, and pulsate with eccentric optimism. It has become fashionable for contemporary artists to adopt the role of programming lectures and seminars, often as a substitute for research; in Hirschhorn’s case, these events stand *in toto* as a form of artistic research and social experimentation. *The Bijlmer-Spinoza Festival* brought together a series of supposedly incompatible montage elements to prompt unforeseen collective and durational encounters; these experiences can in part be submitted to artistic criteria we have inherited from performance art, even while they also demand that we stretch these criteria in new directions.

V. Education, in Theory

Hirschhorn is a tricky character to end this chapter on, since he unabashedly maintains that art is the central motivation of his work, and that he is more interested in viewers than in students.⁴⁷ His contemporaries have tended to engage with this question by combining the production of students and viewers in different ways: Bruguera’s *Arte de Conducta*, and Anton Vidokle’s *unitednationsplaza* (2007–8) and *Night School* (2008–9) all unite an application procedure and an openness to all comers.⁴⁸ But in all of these contemporary examples, the artist operates from a position of amateur enthusiast rather than informed expert, and delegates the work of lecturing to others. It is as if the artist wants to be a student once more, but does this by setting up their own school from which to learn,

combining the student/teacher position. The most celebrated theoretical model for this is Jacques Rancière's *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* (1987), in which he examines the case of maverick nineteenth-century teacher Joseph Jacotot, who is French, but finds himself teaching a class that speaks exclusively Flemish.⁴⁹ They have no language in common, rendering impossible a straightforward transmission of knowledge; Jacotot resolves this by reading a bilingual book with the class, painstakingly comparing the French and Flemish texts. What interests Rancière is not the successful outcome of this task (the students learning to speak French, or their understanding of the content of the book) but Jacotot's presumption of an *equality of intelligence* between himself and his students. The point, for Rancière, is not to prove that all intelligence is equal, but to see what can be achieved under that supposition. For Rancière, equality is a method or working principle, rather than a goal: equality is continually verified by being put into practice. *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* was written against the backdrop of educational changes taking place in France during the 1980s, but it is also, like much of Rancière's writing, a rejection of his own former teacher, Louis Althusser, who understood education to be a transmission of knowledge to subjects who do not have this knowledge.⁵⁰

Rancière's book has been frequently cited in recent discussions of art and pedagogy – albeit more for its catchy title and case-study of Jacotot than for its theorisation of equality – but it is striking that his polemic makes no reference to the emergence of critical pedagogy in the late 1960s, which attempted to empower subjects through very similar means.⁵¹ One of the foundational texts of critical pedagogy, Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968), calls into question the 'banking' model of education, by which teachers deposit information into pupils to produce manageable subjects under a paternalistic social apparatus – a technique that reinforces oppression rather than granting the students consciousness of their position as historical subjects capable of producing change. Freire in Latin America, like Henry Giroux in the US, proposes the teacher as a co-producer of knowledge, facilitating the student's empowerment through collective and non-authoritarian collaboration. Unlike Rancière, it is significant that Freire maintains that hierarchy can never be entirely erased: 'Dialogue does not exist in a political vacuum. It is not a "free space" where you say what you want. Dialogue takes place inside some programme and content. These conditioning factors create tension in achieving goals that we set for dialogic education.' In other words, critical pedagogy retains authority, but not authoritarianism: 'Dialogue means a permanent tension between authority and liberty. But, in this tension, authority continues to be because it has authority vis-à-vis permitting student freedoms which emerge, which grow and mature precisely because authority and freedom learn self-discipline.'⁵² Freire's

framework applies equally to the history of participatory art I have been tracing through this book: a single artist (teacher) allows the viewer (student) freedom within a newly self-disciplined form of authority. Tellingly, the best examples provide ‘programme and content’ (Spinoza, for example, or Beckett), rather than a utopian space of undirected, open collaboration.

Critical pedagogy can therefore be seen as a rupture in the history of education that is contemporaneous with upheavals in art’s own history circa 1968: its insistence on the breakdown of teacher/pupil hierarchy and participation as a route to empowerment finds its direct correlate in the breakdown of medium-specificity and a heightened attention to the viewer’s role and presence in art. Continuing this analogue, we could even say that education has its own historic avant-garde in the experimental school Summerhill, founded by A. S. Neill in 1921, near Dresden, and relocated to the UK two years later. Neill maintained that in starting the school he had left education and taken up child psychology (indeed, he later pursued his own analysis with Wilhelm Reich). The first pupils were initially problem children who had been expelled from other institutions, rather like Althamer’s *Einstein Class*; Neill reportedly dealt with them by subverting his authority – encouraging the vandals to smash more windows, and so on.⁵³ Summerhill continues to operate on the basis of self-organised anarchy, with voluntary attendance at classes, no punishment for swearing, and rules established in collaboration with the pupils at a weekly meeting. As A. S. Neill writes:

You cannot make children learn music or anything else without to some degree converting them into will-less adults. You fashion them into accepters of the *status quo* – a good thing for a society that needs obedient sitters at dreary desks, standers in shops, mechanical catchers of the 8.30 suburban train – a society, in short, that is carried on the shabby shoulders of the scared little man – the scared-to-death conformist . . . Summerhill is a self-governing school, democratic in form. Everything connected with social, or group, life, including punishment for social offences, is settled by vote at the Saturday night General School Meetings.⁵⁴

Summerhill continues to be a focus of controversy in the UK due to its regular battles with OFSTED (the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills), most recently in 2007, yet its reputation for anarchy is misplaced: as in Freire (and in the best examples of participatory art), its organisation dialectically sustains a tension between freedom and structure, control and agency. But if both critical pedagogy and participatory art effectively produce a form of institutional critique within their respective disciplines in the 1960s, what does it mean for these two modes to converge so frequently today, as they do in projects of the past decade?

V. Academic Capitalism

Anton Vidokle, the artist-curator of *unitednationsplaza* and *Night School*, recently observed that

Schools are one of the few places left where experimentation is to some degree encouraged, where emphasis is supposedly on process and learning rather than product. Schools are also multidisciplinary institutions by nature, where discourse, practice and presentation can co-exist without privileging one over the other.⁵⁵

From a position internal to the academy, however, this emphasis on free experimentation can seem somewhat idealised. Professional academia in the UK, and increasingly in Europe, has since the 1980s become increasingly subject to the continual withdrawal of government subsidies, leading higher education to operate within a business framework.⁵⁶ Entrepreneurial research activities, encouraging partnerships with industry, increased student participation at lower national cost, and incentivising the recruitment of high-fee-paying overseas students all led to the encroachment of the profit motive into the university and to what has been called ‘academic capitalism’.⁵⁷ As such, the ethos of education has shifted accordingly. In *The University in Ruins* (1996), Bill Readings argues that the university was once ‘linked to the destiny of the nation-state by virtue of its role as producer, protector and inculcator of an idea of national culture’.⁵⁸ Under economic globalisation this situation has changed: the university’s function is no longer tied to the self-reproduction of the nation-state. Instead, the key currency of today’s university, Readings argues, is no longer culture or moral values but the de-referentialised concept of ‘excellence’: it doesn’t matter *what* is being taught or researched, only that it is being done ‘excellently’. Recently this situation has changed once more. Since the financial crash of 2008, the benchmark is no longer excellence, but market success: if the content attracts students, and therefore income, it is justified.⁵⁹

Academic capitalism leads to changes in the roles of both students and teachers, and affects both the aesthetic and ethos of an educational experience. Today the administrator rather than the professor is the central figure of the university.⁶⁰ Learning outcomes, assessment criteria, quality assurance, surveys, reports, and a comprehensive paper trail (to combat potentially litigious students) are all more important than experimental content and delivery. Assessment must fit standardised procedures that allow credit points to be comparable across all subjects in the university – and with the introduction of the Bologna Process (1999), to be equivalent across Europe.⁶¹ In the UK, the introduction of tuition fees in the early 1990s and the replacement of student grants by loans has rapidly turned students into consumers. Education is increasingly a financial investment,

rather than a creative space of freedom and discovery; a career move, rather than a place of epistemological inquiry for its own sake. Ostensibly in the name of protecting students' rights, laborious measures of control have been introduced that submit students and teachers to an exhaustive training in bureaucracy: all students in UK universities today (including art students) have to fill in compulsory 'Personal Development Plans' to address their career development – a mechanism to ensure that emerging artists and scholars always keep an eye on developing 'transferable skills' for a future in the 'knowledge economy'. In other words, the contemporary university seems increasingly to train subjects for life under global capitalism, initiating students into a lifetime of debt, while coercing staff into ever more burdensome forms of administrative accountability and disciplinary monitoring. More than ever, education is a core 'ideological state apparatus' through which lives are shaped and managed to dance in step with the dominant tune.

It's clear that a *curatorial* interest in education is a conscious reaction to these trends. In 2006, the Van Abbe Museum in Eindhoven, the Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst in Antwerp, and the Hamburg Kunstverein collaborated on a conference and exhibition project called *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y* that explicitly positioned itself as a response to these ideological shifts, and specifically against the Bologna Process.⁶² For the curators of *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y*, the autonomy of the university and the museum are equally under threat, and yet both institutions offer the greatest potential for rethinking how we generate knowledge – and indeed, for understanding what type of autonomy and freedom we want to defend.⁶³ It is harder to argue that contemporary *artists* are engaging with these changes directly, even while these ideological shifts form the most compelling backdrop for the recent surge of interest in education as the site of political change. While Group Material were explicitly influenced by Paulo Freire, the formative pedagogic models for the artists discussed here seem at first glance largely idiosyncratic: their own teachers (in the case of Althamer), or Joseph Beuys (in the case of Bruguera and Hirschhorn). And yet, as Mark Dion notes, there is a general sense among artists who teach in art schools that 'education as a countercultural experience is endangered': not simply through the strict timetabling of classes (because the use of every room is costed), but through compulsory training in 'faculty sensitivity', designed to eliminate fraternising and all risk of improper conduct between students and teachers.⁶⁴

The hyper-bureaucratisation of education in the Western hemisphere does not, of course, account for artists turning to education in non-Western contexts, where their projects tend to be a compensation for more acute institutional shortcomings. This difference is evident in two contemporary library projects by artists: *Martha Rosler Library* (2006), a collection of books that this US artist has amassed since the late 1960s,



Martha Rosler Library, New York, 2006



Lia Perjovschi, Centre for Art Analysis, 1990

and Lia Perjovschi's *Contemporary Art Archive*, or *Centre for Art Analysis* (1990–) in Bucharest, an idiosyncratic collection of photocopied articles and publications accumulated since the fall of Ceaușescu's dictatorship, and housed in her studio. If Rosler's library has an interdisciplinary outlook and a double function (it's both a reading room, and overcomes her problem of no storage space in New York), then Perjovschi's room provides a resource on contemporary art that doesn't exist anywhere else in Bucharest; she particularly welcomes students from the Academy (located in the neighbourhood of her studio), where conceptual and performance practices are still not taught. In the midst of New York's cultural over-availability, there is a risk that Rosler's library ends up as a portrait of the artist, a sculpture that gains in meaning if you already know her work.⁶⁵ For Perjovschi, by contrast, the act of assembling this information is at the same time a continuation of her practice, as seen in her drawings that map ideas and references autodidactically culled from Eastern and Western European sources, and a collective resource for young artists in Bucharest. The point here is not to argue that Rosler or Perjovschi offers the better project, since the contexts are barely comparable. The point is that pedagogic projects respond to the different urgencies of their moment, even while both offer a reflection on disciplinarity, functionality, and the role of research within art.

VI. Aesthetic Education

It would be an oversight to conclude this chapter without considering art itself as a form of education, regardless of its form or medium. Friedrich Schiller's twenty-eight *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man* were published in 1795, partly in response to what Schiller perceived as the barbarisms of the French Revolution. The struggle of the French people for human rights and political freedom had led, in his eyes, not to a reign of freedom and humanity, but to violence and terror. A problem of political education became for Schiller the problem of human progress in general; caught between a 'state of nature' (physical drives) and a 'state of reason' (cool rationality), man could, he argued, find a path to moral betterment through aesthetic education. In making this argument, Schiller took issue with Kant's *Critique of Judgment* (1790), in particular with his theory of disinterested beauty removed from bodily urges and in turn submitted to the rigours of Kant's transcendental method. For Schiller, Kant's approach belied the profound connection between art and individual drives: to educate the viewer, he argued, art had to keep a connection with the bodily chaos it claimed to conquer, not remain at one remove from it. If Kant had proposed a separation of the faculties, each articulated differently according to its realm (the moral, the rational, or the aesthetic), Schiller emphasised a binary opposition (the physical and the intellectual) and turned it into

stages towards a goal: from the physical, through the aesthetic, to the moral.⁶⁶ In Schiller's *Letters*, Kant's 'free play of imagination and understanding' became the fusion of contradictory life impulses into a form of play that has its own seriousness. For Schiller, the aesthetic is fundamentally tied to education, that is, to the moral improvement of the unrefined individual.

The extent to which Schiller's *Letters* outline an ideal scenario, or are intended as a concrete pedagogic programme, remains unclear. Although the *Letters* were produced for a Danish prince, and acknowledge that social reform is the prerequisite of aesthetic education, Schiller's ideas nevertheless found practical application in their influence upon his colleague, Wilhelm von Humboldt, who integrated his notion of *Bildung* into Prussian reforms of the higher education system in 1809. The same problem of *actual* or *ideal education*, a *universal audience* or *specific students*, faces all pedagogically oriented art projects today. Very few of these projects manage to overcome the gap between a 'first audience' of student-participants and a 'second audience' of subsequent viewers. Perhaps this is because, ultimately, education has no spectators.⁶⁷ The most effective education is a closed social process: as Roland Barthes observes, 'the famous "teaching relation" is not the relation of teacher to taught, but the relation of those taught to each other'.⁶⁸ Institutional pedagogy never needs to take on board the question of its communicability to those beyond the classroom (and if it does, it only takes the form of wholly inadequate evaluative questionnaires). Yet this task is essential to projects in the artistic realm if they are to fulfil the ambitions of an aesthetic education. For all that Barthes emphasises the invisible libidinal dynamic of the seminar, he also manages to convey this to us in his mastery of language. It seems telling that when the most artistically successful instances of pedagogy-as-art today manage to communicate an educational experience to a secondary audience, it is through modes that are time-based or performative: through video (Żmijewski), the exhibition (Bruguera), the lecture (Chan) or the publication (Hirschhorn). The secondary audience is ineliminable, but also essential, since it keeps open the possibility that *everyone* can learn something from these projects: it allows specific instances to become generalisable, establishing a relationship between particular and universal that is far more generative than the model of exemplary ethical gesture.

To conclude, however, we ought to question how closely we want to remain within the terms of Schiller's project. In rejecting Kant's assertion of art's autonomy, Schiller effectively instrumentalises the aesthetic: he fuses the two opposing poles of physical sensuousness and intellectual reason in order to achieve a morality that reaches beyond the individual. In so doing, the aesthetic state is merely a path to moral education, rather than an end in itself.⁶⁹ The quote that forms the title of this chapter cues us to another framework, one that operates from a less authoritarian relationship

to morality. Near the end of his last book *Chaosmosis* (1993), Félix Guattari asks: ‘how do you bring a classroom to life as if it were a work of art?’ For Guattari, art is an endlessly renewable source of vitalist energy and creation, a constant force of mutation and subversion.⁷⁰ He lays out a tripartite schema of art’s development, arguing that we are on the brink of a new paradigm in which art is no longer beholden to Capital. In this new state of affairs, which he names the ‘ethico-aesthetic paradigm’, art should claim ‘a key position of transversality with respect to other Universes of value’, bringing about mutant forms of subjectivity and rehumanising disciplinary institutions.⁷¹ Transversality, for Guattari, denotes a ‘militant, social, undisciplined creativity’; it is a line rather than a point, a bridge or a movement, motored by group Eros.⁷² By way of illustration, one cannot help thinking of the experimental institution with which Guattari was himself involved – the psychiatric clinic at La Borde, best known for its radically dehierarchised blurring of work identities. Established by Jean Oury in the Département de Loir-et-Cher in 1953, the clinic began to employ Guattari in 1955. There, he organised patient-staff parity commissions, creative workshops, self-management (after 1968), and most famously, the *grille* (or grid) with rotating tasks and roles: doctors, nurses, caretakers, service workers and patients exchanged roles in a project of ‘disalienation’.⁷³ Influenced by Jacques Lacan, existential Marxism and structural linguistics, La Borde aimed to produce new types of singular (rather than normalised, serialised) subjectivity. Nicolas Philibert’s documentary about the clinic’s annual play, involving all patients and staff, *La Moindre des Choses* (Every Little Thing, 1996), poignantly conveys this dehierarchisation: we are often unsure if the person shown mopping the floor, answering the phone, or counting out medication is a patient or a nurse. La Borde, like Summerhill, seems to be the kind of organisational and experiential comparison we need to bring to bear on contemporary art projects that seek to create a rapprochement between art and the social field.

Significantly, however, Guattari is insistent that the ethico-aesthetic paradigm involves overthrowing current forms of art as much as current forms of social life.⁷⁴ It does not denote an aestheticisation of the social or a complete dissolution of disciplinary boundaries. Rather, the war is to be waged on two fronts: as a critique of art, and as a critique of the institutions into which it permeates, because art blurring entirely into life risks ‘the perennial possibility of eclipse’.⁷⁵ To protect against this threat of art’s self-extinction, Guattari suggests that each work of art must have a ‘double finality’: ‘[Firstly] to insert itself into a social network which will either appropriate or reject it, and [secondly] to celebrate, once again, the Universe of art as such, precisely because it is always in danger of collapsing.’⁷⁶ Guattari’s language of a double finality speaks to the double ontology of cross-disciplinary projects we are so frequently presented with today, pre-eminently among them art-as-pedagogy. Like all long-term participatory

projects, this art must tread the fine line of a dual horizon – faced towards the social field but also towards art itself, addressing both its immediate participants and subsequent audiences. It needs to be successful within both art *and* the social field, but ideally also testing and revising the criteria we apply to both domains. Without this double finality, such projects risk becoming ‘edu-tainment’ or ‘pedagogical aesthetics’. These latter will never be as compelling as Summerhill and La Borde – examples that establish their own institutional frameworks and operate in ways that continue to trouble the parameters of existing social structures. If artists ignore the double finality, viewers may rightly wonder whether Guattari’s question should in fact be reversed: how do we bring a work of art to life as though it were a classroom? Pedagogic art projects therefore foreground and crystallise one of the most central problems of all artistic practice in the social field: they require us to examine our assumptions about both fields of operation, and to ponder the productive overlaps and incompatibilities that might arise from their experimental conjunction, with the consequence of perpetually reinventing both. For secondary viewers like ourselves, perhaps the most educational aspect of these projects is their insistence that we learn to think both fields together and devise adequate new languages and criteria for communicating these transversal practices.

- 44 As Phil Collins's *Return of the Real* (2006–7) makes so abundantly clear, reality television depends upon the merciless shoehorning of participants to fit stereotypical characters in clichéd narratives whose predictability is designed to attract high viewing figures.

Chapter 9 Pedagogic Projects

- 1 In 2007 I was commissioned to write an article about this trend, focusing on an outdoor work by Maria Pask, *Beautiful City*, at Sculpture Projects Münster. Claire Bishop, 'The New Masters of the Liberal Arts: Artists Rewrite the Rules of Pedagogy', *Modern Painters*, September 2007, pp. 86–9.
- 2 A cross-section of recent projects could include: *Cybermohalla* by Sarai net in New Delhi (2001–); the School of Missing Studies (2002–); Nils Norman's *Exploding School* (integrated into the Royal Danish Academy of Art, 2007–) and *University of Trash* (Sculpture Center, New York, 2009); Vik Muniz's art school for children from the Rio favelas (*Centro Espacial Vik Muniz*, 2006–); Anton Vidokle's *unitednationsplaza*, Berlin (2007–8) and *Night School*, New York (2008–9); The Bruce High Quality Foundation University (New York, 2009–); and 16 Beaver's weekly readings and discussions (1999).
- 3 Museum education departments are, however, a notable exclusion from the recent critical discourse around contemporary art and pedagogy. Andrea Phillips is typical in arguing that the creative and affectual claims of pedagogic art differ from the educational work of museum educators. See Andrea Phillips, 'Educational Aesthetics', in Paul O'Neill and Mick Wilson (eds.), *Curating and the Educational Turn*, Amsterdam: De Appel/Open Editions, 2010, p. 93.
- 4 An incomplete list of events would include Tate Modern's conference Rethinking Arts Education for the 21st Century (July 2005); Portikus's conference Academy Remix (November 2005); the joint exhibition/publication project between the Van Abbe Museum in Eindhoven and MuHKA in Antwerp called *Academy: Learning from Art/Learning from the Museum* (Autumn 2006); SUMMIT: Academy as Potentiality, a two-day workshop in Berlin (May 2007); Transpedagogy: Contemporary Art and the Vehicles of Education (MoMA, New York, 2009); Questioning the Academy, Cooper Union, New York (Autumn 2009); Radical Education, Moderna Galerija Ljubljana (Autumn 2009); Extra-Curricular: Between Art & Pedagogy (University of Toronto, Spring 2010); Schooling and De-Schooling (Hayward Gallery, May 2010) and Beyond the Academy: Research as Exhibition (Tate Britain, May 2010). To these we could add *Frieze* magazine's special issue on art schools (September 2006); the September 2007 issue of *Modern Painters*; the March 2007 issue of *Maska* titled 'Art in the Grip of Education'; and numerous articles in

e-flux journal, especially the special issue no. 14 (March 2010) edited by Irit Rogoff and focusing on the Bologna Process. See also the publication *Art Schools*, edited by Steven H. Madoff (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009), and O'Neill and Wilson (eds.), *Curating and the Educational Turn*, and Brad Buckley and John Conomos (eds.), *Rethinking the Contemporary Art School* (Halifax: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 2010). The third of Documenta 12's leitmotifs, 'What is to be done?', focused on education, the eponymous title of the last of its three Readers.

- 5 A fuller examination of this tendency would need to take into account curatorial trends such as 'new institutionalism' and state pressure on museum education departments to involve marginalised demographics euphemistically referred to as 'new audiences', but the present chapter will leave these issues to one side in order to focus on artist-initiated projects.
- 6 Irit Rogoff, 'Turning', *e-flux journal*, 0, November 2008, available at www.e-flux.com.
- 7 For Rogoff, 'pedagogical aesthetics' refers to the way in which 'a table in the middle of the room, a set of empty bookshelves, a growing archive of assembled bits and pieces, a classroom or lecture scenario, or the promise of a conversation have taken away the burden to rethink and dislodge daily those dominant burdens ourselves'. (Ibid.)
- 8 Luis Camnitzer, 'The Input of Pedagogy', in *Conceptualism in Latin American Art: Didactics of Liberation*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007, pp. 109–15.
- 9 Beuys, interviewed by Willoughby Sharp, *Artforum*, November 1969, reprinted in Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object 1966–72*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, p. 121.
- 10 Beuys also organised an occupation of the Kunstakademie Düsseldorf offices in October 1971, with sixteen students who had been refused admission. After three days they were allowed to stay, but Beuys was dismissed in October 1972, days after he had finished the end of Documenta 5, where he had spent three months discussing direct democracy with visitors to the exhibition.
- 11 In this regard, it is important to stress Beuys's debt to Rudolf Steiner, whose holistic educational goals the artist saw as fully compatible with 'Marxist, Catholic, Evangelist, liberal, anthroposophical, and ecological concepts of the alternative'. See Joseph Beuys, 'Appeal for the Alternative', originally published in the *Frankfurter Rundschau*, 23 December 1978, reprinted in Lucrezia De Domizio, *The Felt Hat: Joseph Beuys, A Life Told*, Milan: Charta, 1997, p. 180.
- 12 *Directional Forces*, for example, is the name both of Beuys' discussion at the London ICA in 1974, and of the blackboard installation it became a year later at the Rene Block Gallery, New York.

- 13 The first workshop at Documenta 6, for example, concerned the future of small countries and their attempts to find alternatives to the hegemony of power in economically dominant countries. Caroline Tisdall notes that of the artists taking part elsewhere in Documenta, only three participated in Beuys's FIU programming: Nam June Paik, John Latham and Arnulf Rainer. See Tisdall, *Joseph Beuys*, New York: Solomon Guggenheim Museum, 1979, p. 260.
- 14 See for example the revival of the FIU's format as a series of interdisciplinary lectures organised by Catherine David in Documenta 10 (*100 Days—100 Guests*), and by Okwui Enwezor in the form of four conference 'platforms' preceding Documenta 11, 2002.
- 15 Jan Verwoert, 'Class Action', *Frieze*, September 2006, pp. 150–5.
- 16 Jan Verwoert, 'The Boss: On the Unresolved Question of Authority in Joseph Beuys' Oeuvre and Public Image', *e-flux journal*, 1, December 2008, available at www.e-flux.com.
- 17 The nearest thing to dialogue as art was the tightly structured, dematerialised but certificated 'discussions' of Ian Wilson from 1976 onwards, and to a lesser extent, Tom Marioni's free beer salons (1970–).
- 18 Beuys, interviewed by Willoughby Sharp, in Lippard, *Six Years*, pp. 121–2.
- 19 The Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) and Quality Assurance Audit (QAA) are the two central, and most burdensome, systems of evaluation for UK universities.
- 20 As Bruguera notes, 'Some artists in Cuba began to imagine what was wanted from them, from their art. Pleasing the foreigners involved another kind of process of social engagement as well as another kind of censorship.' (Tania Bruguera, interview with Tom Finkelpearl, in Finkelpearl (ed.), *Art as Social Cooperation*, forthcoming.)
- 21 Cuba's dual economy means that Bruguera could exploit the gap between *moneda nacional*, Cuban Convertibles (CUC) and US dollars. An official teaching job (at University of Chicago) therefore subsidised the experimental teaching as art (in Havana).
- 22 I was of course staggered. Delahante had miscarried, but there had been extensive discussion at the school as to whether or not the insemination had actually taken place. The documentation of this work exists as hospital records, inaccessible even to the artist.
- 23 The Kuitca programme is an independent studio programme set up by the Argentinian painter Guillermo Kuitca in 1991, to compensate for the lack of MFA courses in Buenos Aires.
- 24 Bruguera, interview with Tom Finkelpearl.
- 25 For a review of this see Claire Bishop, 'Speech Disorder', *Artforum*, Summer 2009, pp. 121–2; plus the letter by Coco Fusco and my reply, *Artforum*, October 2009, pp. 38 and 40. Other works in the *Tatlin's Whisper* series include a molotov cocktail making workshop at a Galería Juana

- de Aizpuru in Madrid (*Tatlin's Whisper #3*, 2006) and asking mounted policemen to deploy their range of crowd control techniques on visitors to Tate Modern (*Tatlin's Whisper #5*, 2008).
- 26 Paul Chan, *Night School*, Public Seminar 7, New Museum, New York, 11 September 2008. All further quotes by Chan are from this lecture unless otherwise stated.
- 27 The Classical Theatre of Harlem had already staged a production of *Godot* in 2006 in response to Hurricane Katrina, with a flooded stage and the action taking place on the roof. Wendell Pierce, the main actor in this production, who also performed for Chan, is originally from New Orleans.
- 28 Paul Chan, 'Next Day, Same Place: After Godot in New Orleans', *TDR*, Winter 2008, p. 3.
- 29 The aim had been to equal the production costs of the play, but in fact this fell short as costs ballooned. Eventually \$53,000 was raised for a selection of community organisations in the neighbourhoods in which the artist worked.
- 30 See for example Tim Griffin, 'Waiting for Godot', *Artforum*, December 2007.
- 31 Syllabi for both this and the Xavier University course are available online at Chan's website: www.nationalphilistine.com.
- 32 Chan, in conversation with the author, 22 September 2008.
- 33 Althamer, in Claire Bishop and Silvia Tramontana (eds.), *Double Agent*, London: Institute of Contemporary Arts, 2009, p.10.
- 34 See Claire Bishop, 'Something for Everyone', *Artforum*, February 2011, pp. 175–81.
- 35 This expedient approach is frequently adopted by Althamer. When he received the Vincent Prize in 2004, Althamer took his teenage son Bruno and friends to hang out in the exhibition space, ostensibly done to shift their horizons of the world by experiencing another country, while giving them a holiday he couldn't himself afford. The work is known as *Bad Kids*, 2004.
- 36 'What Have I Done to Deserve This?', Cubitt Gallery, London, 2006.
- 37 'Each of the participants had at his/her disposal "a space of their own" . . . where they could build elements of their own visual language, and the "common space" open to everyone, where they could conduct simultaneous dialogues with the other participants. All without using words.' (Grzegorz Kowalski, in Maryla Sitkowska [ed.], *Grzegorz Kowalski: Prace Dawne I Nowe*, Bydgoszcz: Muzeum Okręgowe w Bydgoszczy im. Leona Wyczółkowskiego w Bydgoszczy, 2002, p. 266.)
- 38 See Oskar Hansen, *Towards Open Form*, Warsaw: Foksal Gallery Foundation, 2004, p. 121.
- 39 Łukasz Ronduda, 'Games, Actions and Interactions: Film and the Tradition of Oskar Hansen's Open Form', in Łukasz Ronduda and Florian

- Zeyfang (eds.), 1, 2, 3... *Avant-Gardes: Film/Art between Experiment and Archive*, Warsaw and Berlin: CCA Uzajdowski Castle and Sternberg Press, 2007, p. 91. Aside from being an influential teacher in his own right, Hansen constructed one of Poland's largest social housing projects and undertook numerous 'humanisation studies' with a view to improving existing urban environments built on the principle of 'closed form'.
- 40 Ibid., p. 92.
- 41 'I would like to invite you to take part in a game that we are organising with our artist friends', says Althamer to a group of children. 'You are artists and we would also like to invite you. You are, aren't you?' Bemused, they chorus back, 'Yes' (Artur Żmijewski, */S/election.pl*, DVD, 2006).
- 42 Kowalski, invited by CCA to have a show in parallel to */S/election.pl*, preferred to represent his teaching practice through more conventional photographic documentation of his workshops, which were installed in a separate gallery.
- 43 The strength of Żmijewski's */S/election.pl* (which is clearly the precursor for his solo project *Them* [2007], discussed in Chapter 8) shows up the weak conventionality of Krzysztof Visconti's *Einstein Class*, 2006.
- 44 The 'Child's Play' workshops were devised by curator Guillaume Désanges, but led by a local teacher, Muriel Monsels. Désanges had previously used this format of re-enactment in a workshop for eight-year-olds in Iasi, Romania.
- 45 To one Surinamese performer in her twenties, I asked: 'What do you think of us, sitting there listening to this play that we don't understand?' She replied: 'I'm thinking, what do they think of us, performing this play we don't understand!'
- 46 Hirschhorn, email to the author, 7 March 2009.
- 47 "'The students are secondary?'" – Yes, absolutely, the students are secondary! The students are secondary – but not the audience – not the non-exclusive audience! . . . So this is the first distinction: "non-exclusive audience" vs "students" and following this, I do not take the non-exclusive audience for students! (my mission is to work always for the non-exclusive audience). . . . To do a lecture, a workshop or a seminar in my projects is not a gesture of education or a pedagogic-attitude, to me it's a gift – an aggressive gift. It's a Form. And it's the assertion that Art – because it's Art – can transform each human being.' (Hirschhorn, email to the author, 7 March 2009.)
- 48 Vidokle describes *Night School* as 'an informal, free university type series of seminars, conferences, lectures, film screenings and occasional performances with a focus on contemporary art, that continues for one year'. Lectures were open to the public, while at the same time a core group of twenty-five students had extra seminars with the visiting speaker. Anton Vidokle, 'Night School opening remarks, January 2008', available at www.newmuseum.org.

- 49 Jacques Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991. For a good critique of Rancière's essay see Kristin Ross, 'Rancière and the Practice of Equality', *Social Text*, 29, 1991, pp. 57–71.
- 50 In 1964, for example, Althusser wrote that 'The function of teaching is to transmit a determinate knowledge to subjects who do not possess this knowledge. The teaching situation thus rests on the absolute condition of *an inequality between a knowledge and a nonknowledge*.' See Louis Althusser, 'Problèmes Etudiants', *La Nouvelle Critique*, 152, January 1964, quoted in Kristin Ross, 'Translator's Introduction', in Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, p. xvi. Althusser would also argue that this model is essential for students to understand their class position.
- 51 Based in Marxism and Christian liberation theory, critical pedagogy regards education as a participatory, collective practice for social justice. The key theorists include Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux and Ivan Illich.
- 52 Freire, in Paulo Freire and Ira Shor, *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*, London: Macmillan, 1987, p. 102.
- 53 See Christopher Turner, 'Free-for-all', *Cabinet*, 39, Fall 2010, pp. 63–6.
- 54 A. S. Neill, *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing*, republished in William Ayers, *On the Side of the Child: Summerhill Revisited*, New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 2003, pp.79 and 90.
- 55 Anton Vidokle, 'Night School opening remarks, January 2008', available at www.newmuseum.org.
- 56 This is due to the gradual withdrawal of state funding at the same time as an increased involvement of the state in the regulation and governance of universities. See Henry Miller, *The Management of Change in Universities: Universities, State and Economy in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom*, Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995. For a chilling account of how UK academia came to be controlled by business models imported from the US, see Simon Head, 'The Grim Threat to British Universities', *New York Review of Books*, 13 January 2011.
- 57 Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997, pp. 8–9.
- 58 Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996, p. 3.
- 59 See Claire Bishop, 'Con-Demmed to the Bleakest of Futures', *e-flux journal*, 22, available at www.e-flux.com.
- 60 See Readings, *The University in Ruins*, p. 3. We could compare this shift to that of the contemporary museum director, who today is more likely to be an administrator and fundraiser than an art historian.
- 61 See Dietrich Lemkel, 'Mourning Bologna', *e-flux journal*, 14, March 2010, available at www.e-flux.com. BBC News reported that the Bologna Accord will lead to 'a bigger postgraduate market, with tens of thousands

- of new higher-level courses. The report for the business school group says these will include 12,000 new business courses' (<http://news.bbc.co.uk>, 21 January 2005). The Bologna Accord also changes the ethos of education itself. Degrees will be short-term with clear and comparable outcomes, instead of a more individual system tailored to the needs of each subject.
- 62 See Irit Rogoff, 'Academy as Potentiality', in *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y.*, Frankfurt: Revolver, 2006, pp. 13–20.
- 63 Two key words for the *A.C.A.D.E.M.Y.* project, and for Rogoff's writing on the 'educational turn' in curatorial practice, are 'potentiality' and 'actualisation'. She defines potentiality as a possibility not limited to an ability, and a possibility of failure. Actualisation refers to the potential for liberation in objects, situations, actors and spaces. (Rogoff, 'Turning'.) Rogoff's prioritisation of openness as an inherent value parallels that of many contemporary artists.
- 64 Mark Dion, conversation with the author, 25 November 2009. This is one reason why Dion (with J. Morgan Puett) has set up Mildred's Lane, a summer residency programme for art students on a farm in Pennsylvania. See www.mildredslane.com.
- 65 *Martha Rosler Library* toured from New York to Liverpool, Edinburgh, Paris, Frankfurt, Berlin and Antwerp (in other words, to European venues that could afford to cover the transportation costs).
- 66 'Man in his physical state merely suffers the dominion of nature; he emancipates himself from this dominion in the aesthetic state, and he acquires mastery over it in the moral.' (Friedrich Schiller, 'Twenty-Fourth Letter', in Walter Hinderer and Daniel Dahlstrom [eds.], *The German Library vol.17: Essays*, New York: Continuum, 1998, p. 156.)
- 67 One is reminded of the Brazilian artist Lygia Clark, who insisted upon this privacy in relation to her experiments at La Sorbonne in the early 1970s. Yve-Alain Bois recalls that when a curator asked to come along to her classes there she erupted in anger: 'It was impossible to "attend" one of these "courses", to retreat from it as a spectator. Anyone not wishing to take part in the great collective body fabricated there, each time according to a different rite, was sent packing.' (Clark, cited in Bois, 'Nostalgia of the Body', *October*, 69, Summer 1994, p. 88.)
- 68 Roland Barthes, 'To the Seminar', in *The Rustle of Language*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996, p. 333. He begins the article with a poignant observation: 'Our gathering is small, to safeguard not its intimacy but its complexity: it is necessary that the crude geometry of big public lectures give way to a subtle topology of corporeal relations, of which knowledge is only the *pre-text*' (p. 332).
- 69 Unlike the beautiful, which for Kant remains autonomous, 'purposiveness without a purpose', in distinct contrast to practical reason and morality.

- 70 'Patently, art does not have the monopoly on creation, but it takes its capacity to invent mutant coordinates to extremes: it engenders unprecedented, unforeseen and unthinkable qualities of being.' (Félix Guattari, *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-aesthetic Paradigm*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995, p. 106.)
- 71 The first paradigm described by Guattari is the 'proto-aesthetic paradigm' of primitive society, in which life and art are integrated under a transcendent principle. The second moment is the capitalist 'assemblage', in which the components of life are separated and divided but held together under master signifiers such as Truth, the Good, Law, the Beautiful, Capital and so on (see *ibid.*, p. 104). It is informative to compare this tripartite schema with that proposed by Peter Bürger in *Theory of the Avant-garde* (1974) and that of Rancière in *The Politics of Aesthetics* (2000).
- 72 Gary Genosko, 'The Life and Work of Félix Guattari: From Transversality to Ecosophy', in Félix Guattari, *The Three Ecologies*, London and New York: Continuum, 2000, pp. 151 and 155. Transversality has recently been deployed as a central term in Gerard Raunig's *Art and Revolution: Transversal Activism in the Long Twentieth Century*, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007. However, Raunig uses this term strictly in the sense of acentric lines of flight that elude fixed points and co-ordinates, without any attachment to art as a privileged category. He argues that the first wave of transversal activist groups appeared in the 1980s, such as ACT UP (1987), Women's Action Coalition (1991–97) and Wohlfahrtsausschüsse (1992–93) (pp. 205–6).
- 73 See Julian Bourg, *From Revolution to Ethics: May 1968 and Contemporary French Thought*, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2007, Chapter 10, 'Institutional Psychotherapy and the La Borde Psychiatric Clinic'. See also Guattari, 'La Borde: A Clinic Unlike Any Other', in *Chaosophy*, New York: Semiotexte, 1995, pp. 187–208.
- 74 Guattari, *Chaosmosis*, p. 134. It is thus not unlike the first model (the proto-aesthetic paradigm) in which art is fused with social praxis, the key difference being that the ethico-aesthetic paradigm is not organised around the totemic aura of myth.
- 75 *Ibid.*, p. 130.
- 76 *Ibid.*, p. 131.

Conclusion

- 1 Boris Groys, 'Comrades of Time', *e-flux journal*, 11, December 2009, available at www.e-flux.com.
- 2 Tony Bennett phrases the same problem differently: art history as a bourgeois, idealist discipline is in permanent conflict with Marxism as an anti-bourgeois, materialist revolution in existing disciplines. There is no