ACCESS △

Beyond modernism: The arts in New Zealand education

Janet Mansfield

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the arts in New Zealand education have been modernist. It begins with a discussion of modernism, in terms that recognise the moral, epistemological and aesthetic privileging of the author/artist, and is followed by a discussion of humanism/ liberalism insofar as it brings to the surface certain 'buried' assumptions concerning modernism. Through a discussion of curriculum documents, the paper establishes the senses in which modernism per se has invested itself, both implicitly and explicitly, in art education. The possibility of art education being otherwise is discussed and, in particular, the way that the ideological features of humanism/liberalism (its privileging of the individual subject) can be offset in a variety of ways. Suggestions are made for disrupting the hegemony of modernist theories or practices and for how these elements might be the basis for an alternative curriculum in art education.

Modernism

The following section consists of a definition of modernism bearing in mind Harvey's (1991: 7) warning that its 'meaning is very confused', and that it has been referred to as a very slippery topic. Harvey also makes reference to 'the conflicting meanings attributed to modernism, and the extraordinary diverse currents of artistic practice as well as the aesthetic and philosophical judgements offered up in its name' (ibid: 10). For consideration within modernism are its major values (or its aesthetic), the theoretical sources of formalism, and the ideas, and outstanding figures associated with modernism such as Immanuel Kant whose work established the notion of the aesthetic as an end in itself and the influence of Clement Greenberg.

Modernism, as a period in cultural history, according to *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (1998: 447), usually denotes advanced or avant-garde[1] European and American art and thought, though it has been used to describe more general social conditions and attitudes. 'Intense self awareness' is an 'essential value, allied to modernism's complex engagement with avant-garde status' (ibid). Underpinning modernism 'is a propensity to create 'culture shock' by abandoning traditional conventions of social behaviour, aesthetic representation, ... the celebration of elitist or revolutionary aesthetic and ethical departures; and in general, the derogation of the premise of a coherent, empirically accessible external reality (such as Nature or Providence) and the substitution of humanly devised structures or systems which are self-consciously arbitrary and transitory' (ibid).

Fowler, in the *Dictionary of Modern Critical Terms* (1987, cited in Smith, 1995: 2) states that

modernist art is ... reckoned to be the art ... of 'the tradition of the new. ' It is experimental, formally complex, elliptical, contains elements of decreation as well as creation, and tends to associate

notions of the artist's freedom from realism, materialism, traditional genre and form, with notions of cultural apocalypse and disaster.

Jameson explains the 'addiction modernism had for the new and the role of shock in modernist literature in terms of modernism's connection with consumer capitalism' (Schulte-Sasse, 1984: foreword, xxxiii). Modernism was, for Jameson, 'radical in its rejection of realistic discourse' (ibid). Vargish (1998: 447) abstracts several 'dynamic and structural' 'general values that characterise most manifestations of modernism.' *'Epistemic trauma',* he suggests

> signifies a kind of 'primary or initial difficulty, strangeness or opacity in modernist works; of laboriously achieved intuitions of reality; and an immediate counter-intuitive refusal to provide the reassuring conclusiveness of the positivist realm that preceded modernism. This traumatic otherness stems in part from a conscious refusal by modernist artists ... to give their audiences the kind of spatial and temporal orientation that art and literature had been providing since the Renaissance ... when the subject matter of most paintings was readily accessible. In a surprising and historically sudden contrast to this traditional solicitude, the cutting edge artistic culture of modernism ... offered this quality of trauma everywhere. In the painting of Picasso and Braque, in the music of Stravinsky and Schoenberg, in the fiction of Kafka and Faulkner, in the poetry of Yeats and Eliot, the immediate difficulty, the epistemic trauma, is a given of the modernist aesthetic (ibid).

'Single point perspective in painting, tonality in music ... ', qualities on which people had relied for meaning (Vargish, 1998: 448) were missed in the 'modernist breakthrough.' 'Modernism's commitment to being shocking and difficult became a major value' (ibid). Vargish continues: 'By the time Picasso had re-represented the human figure in *Les Demoiselles d' Avignon ... the* antagonistic relation of modernism to popular culture was irreversible: it gradually led to the almost complete bifurcation of serious and popular culture' (ibid).

Modernism devalued 'the premise that we occupy an "objective" reality, accessible to but independent of human perception. In traditional realism artists and critics ... were thought to make direct statements about this reality, whether it be natural, social or psychological' (ibid). Modernism 'turns away from realistic enterprise and towards discussion of and analysis of human measurement or observation' (Vargish, 1998: 448). Modernist painting 'deflects interest from the subject' to the 'problematics of representation, the aesthetics of composition, the formal language' (ibid).

Vargish suggests that the literary and artistic movements 'cited as major manifestations of modernism include Post-Impressionism, Futurism, Symbolism, Imagism, Vortism, Dadaism and Surrealism' and that a 'catalogue of movements' demonstrates the *'reflexivity:* the characteristic of self-awareness and conscious programmatic direction of modernism' (ibid). Modernism is regarded here, as an 'historical period in high culture', and a '"cultural force", but to the extent that each of the movements contained within modernism was aware of its newness and its cohesiveness, (that is of being avant-garde) it can be viewed as an "aesthetic project"; the self-conscious endeavour of a group of innovators to further certain values and achieve recognition' (ibid).

Modernism involved a positive attitude not only toward artistic and social progress[2], a traditional canon of works, and objectivity of interpretation and judgement but also toward universal values and the autonomy of art (Parsons and Blocker, cited in Smith, 1995: 3). Liberalism, referring to a 'heritage of abstract thought about human nature, agency, freedom, and value, and their bearings on the functions and origins of political and legal institutions' (Craig, 1998: 599) is the political philosophy of the Enlightenment, represented in the writings of Kant. It is deeply committed to individualism. Kant's work provided the foundations for modernist assumptions of a universalism for both artistic expression, aesthetic response, and aesthetic distance (the aesthetic disposition). Smith argues (1998) that the 'disinterested attitude' eventually became a guiding formalist aesthetic following its development by Kant (1724-1804) in his *Critique of Judgement* (1790). He recast Baumgarten and Shaftsbury:

His *critique of judgement,* the realm of the aesthetic, formed a middle term between understanding and reason. Aesthetic judgements (the judgement of taste) are to be distinguished from judgements concerning the pleasure, utility or goodness that things or actions provide. They are personal, disinterested and universal and cannot be logically refuted (Smith, 1998: 33).

The seeds of today's representation of children's artistic 'development' as universal, in conjunction with assumptions of a universal model of aesthetic value for art education, can be recognised in Kant's *Critique of Judgement* of 1790, which was, according to Goodall (1995: 3) 'the most important text in the development of modem aesthetics.' Adorno, in *The Culture Industry*[3] focuses on the autonomy of art from every day life which had flourished during the eighteenth century into a doctrine. about the essential nature of art in Kant's *Critique of Judgement.*

Modern liberalism, 'a secular tradition', is an 'attempt to establish this individualism without appealing to the idea of God' (Craig, 1998: 600). Those following the tradition of Kant, linked value analytically to the lonely individualism of will, conscience and a sense of duty, and drew the conclusion that each person, *qua* moral agent, was entitled to be regarded as an end in themselves not just a means to broader social ends (ibid).

Modernism's suggestion that truth was universal and its focus on its acceptance translated into the privileging of high art over popular taste and of art over craft (Gablik, 1987). Burger's argument that the development from the autonomy of art in the eighteenth century to the Aestheticism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is an intensification of art's separation from bourgeois society (Schulte Sasse, 1984: xiii) 'Aestheticist art' , according to Berger (1984: 20) 'severs itself from all social relevance, establishing itself as a medium of purely aesthetic experience: means become available as the category "content" withers.'

Clement Greenberg[4] assumed that judgements of taste claim a universality of agreement that makes quality in art a seemingly objective fact. He promoted superior artistic standards and 'aesthetic validity' (De Duve, 1996: 210) as not being 'arbitrary or accidental.' In his essay 'Avant-garde and Kitsch', (1939) he states:

> In turning his attention away from subject matter of common experience, the poet or artist turns it in upon the medium of his own craft. The nonrepresentational of 'abstract', if it is to have aesthetic validity, cannot be arbitrary and accidental, but stem from obedience to some worthy constraint or original (Greenberg, 1939: 8-9).

In the essay, 'Modernist Painting', written in 1960, Greenberg stated:

> I identify Modernism with the intensification, almost exacerbation, of this self-critical tendency that began with the philosopher Kant. . .I conceive of Kant as the first real Modernist... The essence of Modernism lies, as I see it, in the use of the characteristic methods of a discipline itself, not in order to subvert it but in order to entrench it more firmly in its area of competence (Greenberg, 1960: 85).

As de Duve (1996: 195) suggests, the 'ideas regulating modernism were pure painting, pure colour, and pure visibility.' For Greenberg each artistic medium was to become self-referential, divested of all extraneous elements including narrative and illusion, and able to move from abstraction to universal essence. Piper (1993: 574) distinguishes European modernism from the 'American variety of modernism known as Greenbergian formalism' which is 'characterised by its repudiation of political content in general and explicitly political subject matter in particular' (ibid). 'Abstract aesthetic theorizing' was 'projected onto art by formalist critics in the Greenbergian camp' (ibid: 575). Piper, in discussing European modernism's long tradition of combining social content and innovative form, suggests that

> Greenbergian formalism constituted a radical departure. From its status as the lynchpin of a work, social content - particularly explicit political matter - was demoted by Greenbergian formalism to irrelevance, as sullying the 'purity' or impeding the transcendence of a work. If a 'pure' work of art could have no content, then the artist could not express formally the self-consciously distanced critical stance towards content issues, events, concepts, conditions - that had characterised earlier

> Euroethnic art. So the only stance an artist could legitimately take was an unselfconsciously involved, participatory one. In this scheme, the artist's role was to 'engage' or 'grapple' wordlessly with the formal and material properties of his (almost always a 'his') medium, while the critic's role was to articulate the aesthetic rationale of the work thereby created. In abandoning content and abdicating the self-conscious stance to the critic, artists abandoned the responsibilities of conscious control over their creative efforts and their meaning. 'Action Painting', live from the Freudian unconscious, was all that was left to them (Piper's brackets) (ibid: 576).

Kosuth (1991: 17) describes formalist art (painting and sculpture) as the 'vanguard of decoration, and strictly speaking one could reasonably assert that its art condition is so minimal that for all functional purposes it is not art at all, but a pure exercise in aesthetics.' Art's conception as articulated in curriculum discourse and its location within the *Curriculum Framework* (1993) in newly reduced form, endorses 'the art-as-decorative-object' ideology. It is a breeding ground for the hegemonic view of the art historian and art critic in which the

> formalist reliance on morphology leads necessarily with a bias towards the morphology of traditional art ... Formalist criticism is no more than an analysis of the physical attributes of particular objects which happen to exist in a morphological context (Kosuth, 1991: 17).

The 'formalist/ universalist' approach, according to Hart (1991: 149) applies Western aesthetics universally as a standard against which all art forms should be compared. Productions which do not fit this aesthetic view are rejected and not considered art (Clifford, cited in Hart, 1991: 149). Within the modernist approach teachers' interest in the formal elements expressed itself in a focus upon composition, unity, lines, colours, shapes, design principles (Wolcott, 1996). They asked such questions as:

> What colours has the artist used?
>
> What shapes do you see?
>
> How is balance achieved in the work?
>
> What mood is expressed? (Wolcott, 1996: 76)

The stream of modernism which privileges the author/ artist emerges from humanism[5] and liberalism.[6] Within these traditions certain buried assumptions concerning modernism are brought to the surface, namely individualism, freedom and autonomy. In the context of his defence of bourgeois values, Albert William Levi, a philosopher of culture and the humanities, in his reading of modern cultural history exemplifies or points to the conditions privileging the author/artist. He argued that

> liberalism as the quest for freedom and realisation of the individual, humanism, as the flowering of reason in sympathy and compassion, art as the perfection of form, are all since the sixteenth century the product of the bourgeois energy and middle class culture. To them we owe Vermeer, Rembrandt, and the great Dutch painters of the seventeenth century; the Austrian school of Haydn, Mozart Beethoven and Brahms; the essays of Locke and John Stuart Mill; Milton, Wordsworth and Keats ... (Levi, cited in Smith 1995: 8).

Dewey's ideas about the social qualities of art learning and art knowledge were translated in highly individualistic ways, which were consistent with the extreme individualism that increasingly dominated the fine art community and education as the 1930s drew to a close and an emphasis on individual responsibility for social and economic conditions became part of national, political discourse (Freedman, 1999: 6). Marshall (1997: 32-33) argues that French poststructural philosophy problematises 'the individual' as the last vestige of a rational liberalism, which has not only privileged a Cartesian cogito as the self-identical, rationally autonomous and fully transparent thinking subject, but also as *the* universal subject, subject to Kantian forms of rationality (Marshall's emphasis).

Peters, Marshall & Fitzsimmons (1997, cited in Mackenzie, 1998: 144) assert the 'bankruptcy of those liberal practices' based on the paradigm of the 'philosophy of the subject.' Peters and Marshall

(1995: 50) argue that the concepts of 'homo-economicus' and of 'rational utility maximisation' involved centrally in both the notions of rationality and autonomy as a way of characterising the individual economic subject, is part of the reason that 'historically, liberal institutions ... have legitimated themselves and their practices by reference to the discourse of subject-centred reason.' They continue suggesting that 'liberal institutions, including schools have legitimated themselves in terms of wider Enlightenment values of freedom and equality' (ibid). They distinguish between market liberalism based on 'money exchange (capitalism)' and 'humanist liberalism' based on equality of opportunity and freedom (Peters & Marshall, 1993: 25) arguing that the 1960s and early 1970s saw the 'triumph of the principles of liberal humanism' (ibid) and the late 1970s and 1980s saw a 'revival of the main articles of faith of market liberalism' (ibid).

Smith (1998: 19) points to the 'homology which may be discerned from the fifteenth century onwards between the economy of merchant capital and the dynamic of the new art harnessed to science, and a new respect for the individual artist' (ibid). Science began to utilise art for its own needs; technology developed new graphic means of reproducing representations that greatly spread the use and influence of art; the market transformed art increasingly into a product to be sold rather than used directly or commissioned (ibid). All three factors privileged the need for an art that like capitalism itself, was in a constant state of change. Smith continues arguing that Post-Renaissance artists gradually internalised the social need for this new dynamic art. It eventually came to be described with an unwitting touch of innovative blasphemy- as 'creative activity.'

Peters & Marshall (1993: 26) argue that 'we are experiencing the contradiction ... between the imperatives of liberal humanism underlying the role of government and the traditional welfare state, and that of market liberalism which seeks to reduce government intervention both in the economy and in society generally.' They continue:

> ... we suggest that the discourse of liberalism is concerned with the ideological reproduction of *us* - of human beings - as 'individuals' ... historically liberal discourse since the French Revolution has shaped the concepts - the institutions and practices by which new members of Eurocentric based societies came to view and understand themselves. Liberalism, we are claiming, has shaped and determined to a very large extent self understandings of ourselves as rationally autonomous individuals. Liberalism 'manufactured' the notion of a human being as a rationally autonomous person (post Kant) and liberal discourse (and practice) has constructed us accordingly (ibid).

The privileging of the subject/author/artist is the privileging of subjectivity as a rational autonomous being from whom knowledge emanates. As Foucault (1979: 159) states 'we are accustomed ... to saying that the author is the genial creator of a work in which he deposits with infinite wealth and generosity, an inexhaustible world of significations. We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other men, and so transcendent ... that as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely.' In this vein, according to Peters & Marshall

> the Cartesian-Kantian tradition conceived of the epistemological subject as the fount of all knowledge, signification and moral action. The subject was pictured by liberal philosophers within highly individualistic assumptions as standing separate from, and logically prior to, society and culture (Peters & Marshall, 1993: 20).

A form of individualism is reified, or 'possessive individualism' has 'guided neoconservative policy arrangements to redraw the boundaries between public and private (ibid: 20). In arts education this manifests itself in a policy which forces state art and music education increasingly into the private realms as its curriculum space is diminished in favour of subjects such as science and technology which are seen as economically 'relevant' to capital accumulation.

The 'liberal intellectual authority inherited from the Enlightenment' (ibid) with its assumptions of universalism, rationalism, and individualism provided conditions for the moral, epistemological, and aesthetic privileging of the author/artist. The Enlightenment saw a growing 'confidence in human ability to make sense of the world, to grasp its regularities and fundamental principles and to manipulate its regularities for the benefit of mankind' (Craig, 1998: 601). A system of knowledge

inherited from Enlightenment/ humanism/ liberalism was predicated on binary opposites and privileged the author/artist rather than the social production of art because there is no acceptance of its being open to interpretation. Meaning was inherent in the author and the work of art and 'anything "outside" the text was viewed as an interference with its purity' (Mansfield, 1999: 4). Modernism was abusive to the discourse of otherness and difference. Stanley Fish (1980) in his poststructural reading of text - *Is There a Text in this Class: The Authority of Interpretive Communities* - attacks the notion of the autonomous text, 'wants to take the phrase "making sense" literally' (Mansfield, 1999: 12). He argues that meaning is in neither the author nor the text but is authorised through interpretation. 'Words are nothing until they are interpreted (or they are meaningless marks on a page) and interpretation takes place *in time'* (ibid: 11). Fish reverses the modernist privileging of the textual object, replacing the spatial with the temporal, the timeless with the contingent, the universal with the parochial, and the structural with the experiential' (ibid).

In sum, from 'the centre' a respectability, power and theoretical weight were given to the grounding concepts of cultural imperialism. As Smith (1998: 51) suggests, ' ... the aesthetic universalisms were shaped into powerful instruments that could be applied to the very notion of art in any part of the globe, irrespective of cultural difference, in order to separate art from craft, classical from primitive man, fine art from kitsch.' In other words, modernism underlined conditions for the spread of a neutralised, disinterested aesthetic, which, after Kant, privileged uselessness and ignored the social and cultural processes of value attribution necessary in an educational setting.

Modernism's investment in art education

While in the 1877 Education Act, art education of a stiff and technical kind was made compulsory for all in state schools, it consisted of free-hand drawing from copies, geometric drawings and perspective lessons indicating its apparent unimportant and peripheral value in education. It was not until 1945 that Clarence Beeby under Peter Fraser's government convened a conference to revise the old art and craft curriculum unaltered since 1929, and out of date. When we examine these documents, we can see the thesis of modernism being asserted, in particular, modernism's hierarchical models of culture. The most important element of the recommendations for arts education was the inclusion of 'music, craft and one of the fine arts' *(Thomas* Report, 1943: 41). While the emphasis was to be on 'crafts', the more 'talented' pupils could follow fine arts (ibid: 43). Where a fuller art education was recommended, it was in terms of 'aesthetic activities' or 'aesthetic studies' *(The Thomas Report,* 1943: 40):

> As a core subject we recommend that drawing, painting and design should develop along with the practice of a craft. Ability to visualise and record the intended plan and design of any projected piece of work in *line and colour* is as fundamental to progress in crafts as sight-reading is to progress in music (ibid: 43) (my emphasis).

Students were to get an 'aesthetic training of the highest order' (ibid: 44) to learn 'an appreciation of pictures' and, after Kantian notions of aesthetic value, they were 'to be able to distinguish and reject ugly things' (ibid: 44). In addition, influenced by a modernist canon of 'great works', students were to gain an 'appreciation of the great masters who have contributed to our common culture.' They were to 'learn by practice something of the principles of design, something of the theory of colour' (ibid: 44).

In modernism can be traced the derivation of terms such as 'aesthetic value', 'originality' 'creative self expression.' Terms such as 'individual aesthetic growth' began to appear in New Zealand curriculum documents in the 1940s.[7] It was during this time that Victor Lowenfeld's book *Creative and Mental Growth* (1947) was first published. It provided a developmental basis for the understanding of children's art and, immersed in discourses of 'growth', it referred to 'social growth', 'creative growth', and 'aesthetic growth.' While Lowenfeld's book was published after the *Thomas*

Report (1943), its apparent influence is evident in later curriculum document for art (discussed below).

Notions of 'development' through 'aesthetic training' had appeared in the *Post Primary School Curriculum* (Thomas Report 1943: 41) which also quoted the *Spens Report's* from England (1935) and its recommendation of 'music and the arts for their value in awakening and *developing aesthetic sensibility'* (my italics). Influenced by the Deweyian stance expounded in *Art as Experience* (1934) music and art were activities 'to be experienced' (Thomas Report, 1943: 42).

Assumptions of rationalism, universalism and individualism inherited from the Enlightenment/humanism/liberalism are invested in New Zealand art education curriculum policy documents. There is a tension and contradiction between individualism and collectivism in the national curriculum documents. While concessions were made in the *Curriculum Framework* (1993: 15) towards the 'creative self-expression' philosophy influenced by Bee by - Director of Education in the 1940s under Peter Fraser,[8] - the arts are seen 'to 'express and shape national identity.' Modernist art historical assumptions have been and continue to be firmly embedded within curriculum policy in the arts in New Zealand and have provided the legacy of the focus on the uniqueness of the individual work of art, along with analysis of style and evaluation.

The *Music Education: Early Childhood to Form Seven: Syllabus for Schools* (1989: 6) included the promotion of 'individual aesthetic growth and fulfilment' while through the *Curriculum Framework* (1993: 15), schools were to 'ensure that students participate in a wide range of experiences in the arts to provide for balanced learning and an *appreciation of the aesthetics of different artforms'* (my italics). With reference to music and the treating of music as an aesthetic object or 'work', which often involves 'listening' only, David Elliot reminds us that this is a far cry from 'musicianship' as 'thinking-in-action.' He emphasises that musical works are not rightly conceived of as aesthetic objects, and are not aesthetic in nature. The view of musical works as autonomous objects constructs listening for relationships between musical motifs and moral, social, religious, cultural, historical, political, as listening 'non-musically.' The aesthetic philosophy 'defines listening aesthetically via a negative norm: that is to listen "aesthetically", is not to connect musical sounds to other human concerns' (Elliot, 1995: 13). 'Aesthetic perception' and reaction to music, as the main pedagogical aim is tantamount to the indoctrination of 'the implausible and ethnocentric ideology of a bygone age' (Elliot,1995: 14). Underlining the procedural nature of education he suggests that the 'core knowledge is action-based: it is knowledge *how* to think musically in the actions of music and listening' (Elliot, 1995: 97).

The aesthetic discourse of modernism is continued in the *Music Syllabus* (1989:14) which is also beginning to be influenced by the 1989 language of 'reform.' The syllabus 'gives a framework for learning experiences which will *heighten aesthetic perception* ... ' Music is interpreted in terms of 'skills and abilities' (ibid: 14). 'Aesthetic perception' becomes conflated with psychological development. 'Aural perception, listening (to music), the use of intuition, reflection and evaluation' become 'skills and abilities' (ibid). According to Elliot (1995: 102), 'the aesthetic philosophy assumes the wrong paradigm for music education. It prepares students for what music is not: the isolated asocial consumption of aesthetic objects.' The aesthetic educationalists, asserting that the masses would be audiences or consumers, claimed that education in the arts should concentrate on developing students' expertise, skills and aesthetic knowledge needed for knowledgeable consumption of the arts. Translated into music education this meant the emergence of a raft of educational theories and research justifying and normalising practices in which children scarcely ever touch a musical instrument but busy themselves wildy *responding* and apprehending works of art. This has meant a mere official endorsement of the modernist separating out of art from life and 'art-as-commodity' approach.

Art education is still seen within a discourse of a universalising 'artistic growth and development.' (Art *Education Junior Classes to Form 7: Syllabus for Schools,* 1989: 7). This document states

> As children gain experience and control, they develop an increasingly complex repertoire of symbols and images . . . Students need to recognise that artistic growth and development requires perseverance and effort as well as imagination (ibid).

Underpinning both the music and art documents are modernist notions of 'artistic progress. ' The *Art Syllabus* (1989: 3) referred to the 1961 *Primary School Syllabus for Art and Craft* and the latter's emphasis on the 'educational advantage of art activity as an agency for students' self-expression and self-realisation' suggesting that 'this personal emphasis remains a significant feature of the syllabus.' The 1989 document retained the concept of personal expression but expanded it to include 'studies about art and ways of responding to it' (ibid).

The 1989 *Art Syllabus* signified an apparent veering away from the aesthetic doctrine towards pluralism and an acknowledgement that art is both part of social life and a social institution. The syllabus states (1989: 6):'The aim of art education is to enable students to learn to make artworks and to develop an understanding of the actions and relationships in cultures and society.' Theories of Vincent Lanier (cited in Anderson, 1998: 4) were visible in this new syllabus. Lanier challenged beliefs that art 'is of value for itself' and that '"beneficial" psychological developments are alleged to occur through art.' The advances made in the direction of pluralism, however, are somewhat hijacked by the thinly disguised modernist discourse within the 'content' section.

Art Education - Junior Classes to Form Seven: Syllabus for Schools (1989: 8) 'content' section focuses upon 'sources of motivation', 'making artworks', and 'knowing about art' all of which are directed towards the production of 'artworks.' The aesthetic philosophy appears in the 'Knowing about Art' section within the 1989 *Art Syllabus.* This became interpreted as teaching students to recognise innovations in style by 'uniquely sensitive and courageous individuals', 'celebrating individual achievement and cultivating a deep personal response' (Duncum, 1990: 48). School art interpreted as the teaching of 'how to' make 'works of art' operates as a means through which art becomes institutionalised as a medium for ideological reproduction. 'Aesthetic sensitivity' was viewed as 'concentrating on the works of art themselves' (ibid).

The central position of individual artistic authority,[9] along with the creation of unique art 'objects' became part of accepted practice in schools. 'Reaction' to art is not a main pedagogical aim. Yet the conception of art education as knowing how to make artworks, and knowing how to appreciate and understand artworks, constructs art education as unconnected to human matters such as political, moral, and religious values, its social and cultural production. This is a misguided notion of art education. 'Knowing about art' is underpinned by a modernist understanding of the history of art as a story of artistic progress predicated on its belief in a continuing artistic tradition in which artists attempt to locate themselves. In the service of 'Making artworks', much attention is given to the 'technical knowledge students will need to acquire about the materials and equipment' and the 'knowledge students will need to acquire about appropriate ways of proceeding when making particular artworks' *(Art Education: Junior Classes to Form Seven,* 1989: 9). A focus on the acquiring of technical skills and formal skills of art may facilitate the 'sanitisation' of the 'cash aesthetic' 'on its way to the classroom' (Hamblen, 1990: 224). 'Certainly', argues Hamblen, 'dealing with exemplars, formalism, and the technical properties of art does much to depoliticise content' (ibid). Lacking from the *Art Syllabus* (1989) are the explicit for critical components. Within the 'Knowing about Art' section (p. 12) 'the interaction of Maori, European, Pacific Islands, and other cultures' are acknowledged as an 'important aspect', and similarly, 'reference will also need to be made to the influence of the other cultures and art of other countries and societies.' These sections appear, however at the end of the section, assuming a neutrality, and lack of status as 'important knowledge. ' Yet there exists within such peripheral and marginalised statements, possibilities for interrogation of unequal power relations as they assert themselves within visual culture.

It is the *Curriculum Framework's* (1993) 'generic ' proposals for the 'arts' that reflect modernism hierarchical models of culture, its assumptions that few contribute to 'real culture.' The collapsing of the individual areas into one area - *The Arts,* - a 'generic arts', is ideological and indicates the

withering of the arts while language, mathematics, science and technology are full-blown areas in their own right. The following statement from the document indicates its instrumental conception of 'The Arts' and its political ideology: 'They (the arts) provide essential learning for living and develop a wide range of both general and specific skills, which are significant in many aspects of life, including employment. They are important for recreation and leisure' (Ministry of Education, 1993).

The peripheral positioning of *The Arts* in the document and the oblique reference in *Essential Skills and Generic Skills* (ibid: 17) to *creative skills* and *valuing skills* to be developed only in and through the eight *essential learning areas* within 'other groups of important skills', spells the danger of the arts becoming subsumed by other learning areas. The mythical assumption of a 'general creativity' buried within the neo-liberal *Curriculum Framework's* (1993: 15) idea of 'creative skills', is a behaviorist notion implying a neutral 'creative behaviour' unlinked to social and cultural production, and conveniently sidestepping the questions of either cultural politics or difference. Bracey (1997), Best (1997), Elliot (1995) and Drummond (1997) all point to the educational/ artistic danger of the generic contention, and that according to this, students would need to learn only one of the artforms in order to acquire this supposed general artistic understanding. It tends to assume a general 'aesthetic sensitivity' to a collection of autonomous objects (paintings, poems, a musical 'work'), a capacity that is highly doubtful.[10]

The *Curriculum Framework's* (1993) structure with the arts rationalised or reduced in terms of real practice possibilities within schools, indicates the buried assumptions of modernism in that it operates to rationalise political and difference-based content as 'incompatible with the higher purpose of art' (Piper, 1993: 575). This diminished arts proposal rests upon assumptions antagonistic to cultural diversity and in fact, contributes to a process which Rizvi (1994:55) terms 'cultural stripping' where individuals are forced to lose their culture to assume a homogenised identity. *The Arts* area of the curriculum therefore may function as a form of self-censorship for students from diverse backgrounds. In line with the Greenbergian modernism such a curriculum framework renders socially and politically impotent a powerful instrument of social change. The arts have been 'ideologically blindfolded' (Piper, 1993: 576) by their present and continued isolated situation, and their refusal of inclusion within a broader 'cultural studies' umbrella as opposed to 'the arts' umbrella.

The 'antagonistic relation of modernism to popular culture' (Vargish 1998: 448) is mirrored in the structure of the *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (1993), in the marginal, reduced position of the arts, and in the very *naming* of dance, drama, visual art and music (in fact, cultural production) as *The Arts.* While the rhetoric of art syllabus documents may deny the 'bifurcation of serious and popular culture' (ibid),[11] such modernist values underly the general conceptual framework of the document, and in fact, honour hierarchical models of culture. Fundamental to the work of F.R. Leavis is the belief in the minority nature of high culture (Goodall, 1995: 30). The view that what is valuable in a culture emerges from the *original* work of a tiny number of people and that outside that group there is another, wider although still very small group which, while not contributing in an original way to this culture, can *appreciate* the work done in it (ibid: my italics), is an assumption which underlies the *Curriculum Framework's* positioning and valuing of the arts, for their marginality will ensure the continued 'audience' nature of participation while the 'talented' few are the only real contributors.

The *Curriculum Framework* (1993) as a specific context in which authority is defined, contributes to the 'hegemonic order' (1995: 131) as scheme through which the programme of the dominant group is promoted, a site of 'repression which occurs in the service of keeping colonialist meta-narratives invisible' (McLaren, 1995: 12). It functions as one of the hidden ways we subordinate, exclude and marginalise' (Giroux, 1995: 40). It appears that the discourse within which the arts in education are located, promoted and rationalised, is one which nourishes an exclusive capitalist 'art-as-commodity' model.

In summary, modernist hierarchical models based upon the central position of individual artistic authority, the aesthetic philosophy and its severing of connection with other human concerns, its refusal of social dimensions of production, and its assumptions of the minority status of culture, are clearly inadequate for the arts in education within cultural postmodernity.

An alternative curriculum

The ideological features of humanism/ liberalism - its privileging of the individual subject, in particular - can be offset in a variety of ways through an alternative approach to art education. Re-envisioning curriculum from a postmodern perspective has been a task with which curriculum theorists have been struggling. It has become a pressing project as the security of thinking of modernistic approaches to education which represented knowledge as stable, and curriculum as reproductive, is being left behind. It acknowledges in Peter's words (1990) the poststructuralist critique of the liberal individual and of individualism.

Recent changes in contemporary life involving the multiplication and continuity of a wide range of imagery' (Freedman, 1999: 7) have meant that the importance of the visual arts has increased. Art education can no longer avoid the fuller implications of its involvement with representation. Postmodern representation is embraced in terms of a politics of representation. How the 'other' is represented in imperial and patriarchal discourses (Hutcheon, 1991: 39), how views of gender, race, class are socially organised through media representations is the domain of art education involved in a postmodern questioning. In Barbara Kruger's postmodern photography, for instance, 'subjectivity is represented as something in process, never as fixed and never as autonomous, outside history. It is always a gendered subjectivity, rooted in class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation (Hutcheon, 1991: 39). Despite the huge resourcing implications, art education requires engagement in or exploration of 'the unacknowledged politics, behind the dominant representations of the self and the other, in visual images or in narratives' (Hutcheon, 1991: 40). This involves engaging students in 'questioning how we/they represent and in acknowledging that representation has a politics' (ibid: 42).

If ideology is a product of representation, (Althusser, cited in Hutcheon, 1991: 33), how and what does the politics of representation mean for the role of art educator? That school art has been represented within curriculum as 'knowing about art', 'responding to artworks ', that is, in largely modernist terms, is the result of ideology. Art education's involvement in the deconstruction of representation in order to understand the way ideology about art develops and conversely, the way representation or art develops ideology,[12] is imperative. Students' comprehension of the need to be 'active decoders of messages as opposed to 'the passive consumer or contemplator of aesthetic beauty' (Foster, cited in Hutcheon, 1991: 45) and the need to understand that postmodern photography, for example, in visual culture, is 'the manipulator of signs' is imperative. According to Hutcheon (1991: 46) 'art overlaps and interacts with the social system of the present and the past' and 'all representations have a politics and a history.' She asks students to

> question the processes by which we represent ourselves and our world to ourselves and to become aware of the *means* by which we *make* sense of and construct order out of experience in our particular culture. We cannot avoid representation. We *can* try to avoid fixing our notion of it and assuming it to be transhistorical and transcultural. We can also study how representation legitimises and privileges certain kinds of knowledges - including certain kinds of historical knowledge. Our access through narrative to the world of experience - past or present - is always mediated by the powers and limits of our representations of it (Hutcheon, 1991: 53).

The role of art teacher and students would be to illuminate within a critical connective aesthetic, the signs of the artwork's 'having been produced', its 'historical (and cultural) specificity as production' (Pollock, 1992: 27). Meanings, are considered as being generated through social and historically variable signifying systems (ibid: 160). Instead of 'utopian claims for personal expression and universal understanding by means of the power of material or medium of artforms typical of

modernist theory' (ibid) art education needs now to recognise a 'textual politics - an interrogation of representation as a site of ideological activity.'

Freedman (1994: 158) suggests that the broad definition of art education as teaching visual culture will 'enable an analysis of the relationship between, for example, gender identity and curriculum.' She focuses on three aspects of teaching visual culture related to gender: (a) females as the subject of various forms of visual culture; (b) females as respondents to visual culture; (c) the gendered characteristics of cultural production by students. Understanding these aspects of identity, she continues, requires 'attention to the gendered (male and female) character of imagery and response, the power of representation through imagery, and the visual construction of stereotypes and other forms of gender definition that become reified in visual culture' (ibid: 158).

Art education can help to reveal the politics of the act of representation. We need to ask what contributions art education can make to 'a new awareness of both contexts and particularities of gendered experience' (Hutcheon, 1991: 143). How can it 'reveal the semiotic mechanisms of gender positioning?' (ibid). The task of unmasking and challenging 'through ordering and positioning, the capitalist and patriarchal politics of mass-media presentations' (Hutcheon, 1991: 143-144) provides art education with opportunities to resist its complicity in 'systems of power that authorise some representations while suppressing others.' The politics of representation is an important element. Gendered, class and racialised images are 'constructed', according to Hutcheon (1991: 144) 'within a range of signifying practices ... they are not natural or innate. Produced by discourses which often sustain male privilege, feminine desire - its satisfactions, its objects - may need rethinking, especially to consider what Catherine Stimpson (1988: sited in Hutcheon, 1991: 241) calls its 'heterogeneity.'

Contemporary artists such as Adrian Piper, confront us with difficult and sometimes incomprehensible issues. If such works are selected for study Wolcott (1996: 75) argues, they must be presented in a studied context. They will require 'knowledge about the history of art, about the artworld and art theories in order to be able to teach about and from contemporary works of art.' Adrian Piper's work includes installations, photographs, charts, phototext-collage, drawing, mixed media and descriptive language. According to Wolcott (1996), her work emphasises concepts rather than media and is political, conceptual and moral, primarily focusing on issues of racism, sexism, xenophobia and racial stereotyping. Piper's art pushes the 'boundaries of content and form ... reinventing the relationship between viewers and art' (Szakacs, cited in Wolcott, 1996: 75). She attempts to involve the viewer in the 'indexical present', the 'here and now' of the artwork. Wolcott points to Berger's (1990) view that 'she has shifted the involvement of the spectator; neither artist or (sic) viewer is permitted the usual defensive rationalisations that exempt us from the political responsibility of examining our own racism' (ibid: 75). In this sense, the viewer is not the contemplator of the aesthetic, but an active participant in constructing and interpreting the work's message.

Implicit within the 'aesthetic disposition' was an acknowledgment of the authority of the author/artist. Foucault, in his essay 'What is an Author' (1979:150)[13] suggested that the individual artist was discerned to have a '"deep motive", a "creative" power, or a "design".' Foucault laments the notion of the notion of the 'work' for its refusal to replace the privileged position of the author. He wants to examine 'how the author/artist became individualised in a culture like ours, what status he has been given, at what moment studies of authenticity and attribution began, in what kind of system of valorisation' (Foucault, 1979: 141). The processes of conferring value on art on this view becomes the domain or art education.

A number of art educators draw attention to the way in which 'formal innovation in Euroethnic art' is 'rooted in cross-cultural appropriation' (Piper, 1993: 576; Rizvi, 1994; Lippard, 1990). According to Piper (1993: 575) 'The postwar American America strategy of importing back to Europe the artistic embodiment of unself-conscious social ineffectuality under the guise of an abstracted essence of critically sophisticated formal appropriation was perfectly suited to its Marshall Plan agenda of cultural and political imperialism.'

Critical art pedagogy focussing upon the social and cultural production of art would respond to notions of such cultural appropriation. and would heed Piper's (1993: 576) call for an aesthetic vocabulary of social resistance and engagement.' In making a real space for difference to flourish, art education needs to recognise its role in providing a forum for a political critique of historical and contemporary systems which have 'an overdetermined effect in the social production of sexual, racial and class differences and their related hierarchies' (Pollock, 1992: 15). It ought to be concerned with 'disrupting the dance of ideology which engages us on behalf of the oppressive regimes of class, sexist, heterosexist and racist classifications and placements' (Pollock, 1992: 158).

The emergence of *Postcolonialism* which describes 'a range of theories and commentaries which question and often oppose the standard accounts of imperial histories' (Reeder, 1996: 7) has gone largely unnoticed by art educators. Encouraging a revisitation of colonial visual representations through the stories and mythologies, postcolonialism, provides a forum for an understanding of this 'interdependent dialogue with the past' (ibid). Photographs may comment on the 'anthropological stereotype [then] of interest to a dominant society' (ibid: my brackets) while the 'weaving together between floral and fauna, and the *constructed* sites of landscape and identity' (ibid) is part of the recognition of the way in which our colonial situation has been orchestrated through various fashions of representation - through historical narratives which have resulted in particular kinds of depiction through image. The way in which consumption of this imaging has taken place by an imperial audience is indeed the domain of a critical arts pedagogy attempting to move beyond a mode-locked hegemonic inheritance dominated by 'grand-narratives.'[14]

As art educators, we ought to consider how visual representations (photographs, paintings, decorative art and antiquarian books through a 'colonial corridor') have been 'framed', tidied and pruned by 'history' and how and what these processes of framing exclude or entrap. The 'concocted imaging of places and people through the imaginary collage of exotic items' (Engberg, 1996: 22) demand deconstruction leaving behind a fairly bankrupt pedagogy which relies merely on helping students to 'make paintings' as 'works of art.'

Images used as a form of story-telling, as ethnographic evidence, ought to be questioned within a cultural investigations approach to art education, allowing students to appreciate the way this 'colonial corridor' in which we walk might have adjusted our sense of the construction of history through images. Their discovery of a 'slippage between reality and fiction which occurs in the representation process' (Engberg, 1996: 10) is indeed the domain of a critical pedagogy for art education.[15]

The 'colonial corridor' created by these artists reveals the relevance of art education to a 'critical 'post-colonial pedagogy.' According to Engberg (1996: 12), paintings such as the one entitled *Terra Australis Incognita* in the exhibition 'Colonial Postcolonial' suggest 'the inevitability of a European blindness to what was already (here) in Australia. Australia was considered a *terra nullius* awaiting cultivation and fulfilment when the British eventually claimed its space. In order to 'see' this empty place the British began to 'image' Australia through a European visual projection; overmapping and painting into a cultivated scenery. Re-naming and organising its spaces into tidy European schema. Engberg (ibid) points to Said's suggestion that 'representations involve consumption [and] are put to use in the domestic economy of an imperial society' arguing that we must begin to consider the landscapes, still life pictures, decorative arts and photographs in the colonial corridor as documents of this colonial process.

Engberg (1996:13) uses the *Panoramic view of King George's Sound, part of the colony of Swan River 1834* by Robert Havell, after Robert Dale, 'with its attention to minute detail and meticulously drawn topography' offering an 'apparently accurate image of place' to illuminate the fact that it is 'a carefully constructed site of political and economic narrative created with particular outcomes in mind. ' Engberg shows how, Dale, a topographical artist, was harnessed in the interests of identifying cultivable tracts of land as for the attention and commitment of 'gentlemen' investors and settlers. Engberg (ibid: 16) points to artists Narelle Jubelin and Ian Norths', comment on the construction of

the panorama as a tool of narrated nationhood. If art education is to identify with its role of critical cultural investigations, it must encourage in students, a 'retracing, re-locating representations and technologies of the past and present' in short, an historical engagement which is participatory and self-conscious, archival and analytical' (Delany, 1996: 45).

It is the domain of art education to, for example, interrogate artistic conventions in which 'motifs of "Aborigines" have been used to decorate plates and gardens, fabric and porcelain.' (Healy, 1996: 50). It ought to be able to encourage students to challenge images which may be, as Donna Lee Brian points out, 'abstractions from the "truth" manipulated through series of reproductions and translations to serve their patrons pictorial, aesthetic, scientific, colonial imperial desires' (Brian, cited in Smith, 1996: 52). In this vein, for example, within the decorative arts there are 'some of the finest examples of the miniaturisation, and therefore the violent diminution, of indigenous people' (Engberg, 1996: 20). The stylised Aborigine as a decorative symbol was repeated over wallpaper, fabric, place-mats; while the bodies of Aborigines became ash-trays, can-openers, wall stands, garden decorations, bric-a-brac and nick-nacks (Engberg, 1996: 21).

Art as a concept of knowledge may be *celebrated* as we consider the way in which images whether in painting, decorative arts etc. provide complex historical references and construct sometimes questionable narratives about our history. The historical narratives within which identities are moulded affect the nature of representations, but art education within 'border pedagogy' would address the important question of 'how representations and practices that name and marginalise, and define difference as the devalued Other are actively learned, interiorised, challenged and transformed' (Giroux, 1995:55). Art education ought to provide opportunities for investigating hegemonic accounts of New Zealand, through the 'interrogation of these narratives not only as a matter of intellectuality but also as a moral imperative' (Rizvi, 1996: 26).

The lessons for New Zealand art education within a postcolonial critical pedagogy of resistance can be gleaned from Fazal Rizvi's (1996) establishment of the importance of Gordon Bennet as an artist of history, a history which 'has the capacity to both reveal and obscure - often simultaneously. Bennet shows through his paintings, 'how history has been an instrument with which Aboriginal dispossession has been carried out - by marginalising, if not silencing the voices of indigenous Australians. '(ibid). Rizvi continues:

> Stories are told, through Bennet's history paintings, of Australia's colonial construction, and the 'brutal violence that accompanied it. They present narratives of exploitation and injustice seldom found in school textbooks ... Bennet juxtaposes the prescribed images found in history books against those images of violence and brutality often hidden away' (Rizvi, 1996: 26).

The historical grand narrative that helped them rationalise their violence rendered mute those they constructed as the 'Others.' Aborigines could thus be treated as objects of both personal pleasure and economic exploitation' (ibid). Such paintings 'question this historical narrative - rupturing the philosophical assumptions on which it is based' (ibid). An art education which provided opportunities to study or interrogate such 'texts' as Bennett's *alongside* colonial images would be part of a 'border pedagogy' which underlines art as a concept of knowledge.

David Cross (1996) through an examination of the paintings of Stephen Bush *(no Title* 1989) points to the way in which artists may displace characters from one location into another substituting new information. 'Colonial discourse', according to Cross (1996: 28) 'compartmentalises the Aborigine as half-aquiescent, half oppositional, always untrustworthy.' Homi Bhaba (1994, cited in Cross, 1996: 28) has suggested 'this fixing of identity is essential for the practice of constructing otherness. ' In Cross's words, 'the visual stereotype is revealed as a device that fixes a representation while remaining ambivalent to the identity of the subject' (ibid). An examination of the 'colonial corridor' of images may alert students to the 'processes by which colonial imagery sought to construct, and thus "control" the Aboriginal "problem"' (Cross, 1996: 29). Art's contribution to both the construction of marginality and its deconstructive potentiality is clarified through an understanding of the way in which an artist may 'disrupt secure points of historical reference by

changing the location of the quoted image as well as the picturesque ambience of the landscape' (Cross, 1996: 28). This implicates art education in crucial ways.

What can art education contribute to an indication of 'how the present and past live in each other' (Lingard, 1996: 32) through the 'reconstitution and rereading of history?' 'Re-reading the cultural archives contrapuntally' must be part of the hope of constituting future possibilities. We must provide the forum for students to 'reinvent' and 'refigure' and 'recast' heroines, in order to 'reclaim the spaces of history and genealogy' - that is we must encourage, particular kinds of 'perverse re-enactments.' We must encourage and allow 'other non-linear times and disparate histories to surface' (Stanhope, 1996: 36) in artistic renderings. In our examining of the present and rethinking of the past we must 'open up the existence and content of historical photographs (and paintings) to negotiation' in order to reveal the 'instability of meaning' in •'official" history and the difficulty of delivering a communal past' (ibid).

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to establish that modernist assumptions have underpinned the arts in education policy in New Zealand. The privileging of the individualist author/ artist and the aesthetic doctrine defined in Western high cultural terms has been challenged. It has been argued that the singular knowledge of the modernist approach is alienated from an approach which understands its engagement in cultural politics, cultural investigation and cultural production based on difference. The fertile ground of border culture is celebrated for the conditions it provides for the flourishing of artistic social engagement, resistance and dissonance in terms of knowledge and aesthetic qualities. Influenced by postmodern and postcolonial interpretation and discourse, aesthetic issues must be examined on the basis of difference, while the imagery of mass production and visual culture generally, must be examined on the basis of a politics of representation.

Art education informed by postcolonialism must encourage students to 'image the ongoing processes involved in the construction of history' and to image 'the power to know and remember, that provides the opportunity to revisit or critique such accounts' (Stanhope,1996: 36). An alternative curriculum informed by postmodern and postcolonial insights encourages from students 'caustic commentary' on the major issues of our time - cultural diversity, feminism, environmental problems' (Gates, 1996: 49). It illuminates the absence in art education, of the identification of what is that has contributed to 'processes of subjectification' (Peters and Marshall, 1993: 33) and marginality (ie. through which kinds of content knowledge we have ensured allegiance to the reproduction of oppressive conditions for the flourishing of difference). Art teachers who identify strongly with the conception of arts in the Western 'high temple' alone, have serviced 'practices of power/knowledge' (Peters and Marshall, 1993: 34) and are unlikely to be in a position which is sufficiently informed to be able to encourage students to be either critical or to make 'caustic commentary' upon anything much at all. Present curriculum structure appears to want to preserve this state of affairs.

Notes

1. The avant-garde, according to Smith (1998:20) is a term normally used to describe the innovative artists of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

2. The idea of progress (within Enlightenment thought), meant a break with history and tradition which modernity espouses (Harvey, 1991).

3. See Horkheimer, M. and Adorno, T.W. (1972) *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* Trans. J. Cumming. New York: Herder and Herder.

4. Clement Greenberg, according to O'Brian (1993) is widely recognised as the most influential champion of modernism during its American ascendancy after World War II (Editorial).

5. *Humanism,* according to Bullock et al. (1988: 396), is a term invented by a German educator to describe the study of Greek and Latin classics *literae humaniores,* 'human letters', Classical studies, as part of the 'New Learning', was attractive in that were 'Man - rather than God-centred studying the works of and thought of Man as revealed in history literature and art.' Human experience was taken 'as a starting point for man's knowledge of himself and the work of God and Nature' (ibid). An important assumption of humanism is the 'belief that human beings have a potential value in themselves, and that is the respect for this which is the source of all other human values and rights. This value is based upon the possibility, which human beings possess to a unique extent, to create and communicate (language, human relations, the arts, science, institutions) - latent powers which, once liberated (eg. by education), enable men and women to exercise a degree of freedom of choice and action in shaping their lives' (ibid: 397).

6. *Liberalism,* a political philosophy whose origins lie in the Renaissance and Reformation achieved its greatest coherence in the nineteenth century remaining a massive influence on the values of democratic societies. Liberalism springs from a vision of society composed of individuals (rather than for instances, classes) and of their liberty as the primary social good. This liberty is to be defended in such rights as those to free political institutions, religious practice, intellectual and artistic expression. Government is to be limited to those activities which preserve rather than inhibit individual freedom (Bullock et al. 1988: 475).

7. See V. Lowenfeld (1957), Third edition. New York: Macmillan Company, pp.57-59. Lowenfeld introduced the notions of 'stages': 'scribbling stage', the 'preschematic', and 'schematic' stages etc. (p.505). John Dewey's *Art as Experience* had been published in 1934.

8. In the 1940s and 1950s, Gordon Tovey developed the 'creative self-expression' philosophy influenced by Herbert Read's psychological theories. Beeby promoted and shared Tovey's vision for a child-centred pedagogy founded on psychological/humanistic approaches which focused on personal growth, self-esteem and art appreciation.

9. In this connection, see M. Foucault's essay, 'What is an Author?' in J. Harari (1979) *Textual Strategies in Poststructural Criticism.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, pp.141-160.

10. See Best, D. (1995) for an in depth discussion of 'the confused myth of a unified aesthetic or artistic mode of experience or understanding.'

11. Ortega Y Gasset, wrote in 1925 that 'modern art [that is, modernist art] 'will always have the masses against it. It is essentially unpopular' (Vargish, T., 1998: 447).

12. See Pollock, G. (1992) *Vision and Difference: Femininity, Feminism and the Histories of Art.* Pollock discusses here, ways in which art 'is constitutive of ideology' (p.30).

13. See Foucault, M. (1979) 'What is an Author?', in J. Harari, *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Poststructural Criticism.* Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, pp. 141- 160.

14. See Lyotard, J. (1979) In *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* Lyotard dismisses what he called metanarratives: 'The Grand Narrative has lost its credibility, regardless of what mode of unification it uses, regardless of whether it is a speculative narrative or a narrative of emancipation' (p.37).

15. Engberg (1996) shows the way in which visual image of flora and fauna, has been used symbolically by artists to 'signal a colonial transposition of place' (p. 10).

Bibliography

ANDERSON, C. (1998) 'A Summary of Policy Specifications for National Curriculum Statements in Nga Toi/The Arts Essential Learning Area', *Aotearoa New Zealand Association of Art Educators: News Letter,* November, pp. 2-4.

BERGER, P. (1984) *Theory of the Avant-garde.* Minneapolis. Manchester University Press.

BEST, D. (1997) 'Collective, Integrated Arts: The Expedient, Generic Myth', *Arts Policy Review,* 97 (1), pp. 32-39.

BRACEY, T. (1997) 'The New Zealand Curriculum Framework and the Notion of Arts Education', *Sound Ideas: Canterbury Studies in Music Education,* I (1) pp. 31-35.

BULLOCK, A., STALLYBRASS, O., & TROMBLEY, S. (Eds.) (1988) *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought.* London: Fontana Press.

CRAIG, P. (1998) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* London and New York.: Routledge.

CROSS, D. (1996) 'Irony's Edge - Stephen Bush's *No Title',* in *Colonial Postcolonial,* Victoria: Museum of Modern Art at Heide.

DE DUVE, T. (1996) *Kant After Duchamp.* Cambridge: Mass.: MIT Press.

Department of Education (1943) *Post Primary School Curriculum Report of the Committee Appointed by the Ministry of Education* (The Thomas Report), Wellington.

DELANY, M. (1996) 'Fabrication and Frame: Narelle Jubelin and the Colonial Panorama', in *Colonial Postcolonial,* Victoria: Museum of Modern Art at Heide, pp. 44-45.

DRUMMOND, J. (1997) 'Training Our School Music Teachers', *Sound Ideas: Canterbury Studies in Music Education,* l (1) pp. 22-30.

DUNCUM, P. (1990) 'Knowing About Art: Framing or Being Framed', *Australian Art Education,* 14(2), pp. 48-55.

ELLIOT, D. (1995) *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education.* New York: Oxford University Press.

ENGBERG, J. (1996) 'Colonial Corridor', in Museum of Modern Art at Heide: *Colonial Postcolonial,* pp. 9-24.

FOUCAULT, M. (1979) 'What is an Author?', in J. Harari, *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Poststructural Criticism.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, pp. 141-160.

FREEDMAN, K. (1994) 'Interpreting Gender in Visual Culture in Art Classrooms', *Studies in Art Education,* Spring 1994, 35(3), pp. 157-170.

FREEDMAN, K. (1999) 'Aesthetics and the Problem of Meaning in Curriculum', Paper Presented at the New Zealand Association of Art Educators, January 1999, Christchurch.

GATES. M. (1996) 'Tower Hill/ Tower Hill 1855/ Tower Hill 1984', in *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria: Museum of Modern Art at Heide, pp. 48-49.

GIROUX, H. (1995) 'Border Pedagogy and the Politics of Postmodernism', in P. McLaren (ed.) *Postmodernism, Postcolonialism and Pedagogy.* Albert Park, Vic.: James Nicholas Publishers.

GOODALL, P. (1995) *High Culture, Popular Culture: The Long Debate.* St Leonards, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.

GREENBERG, C. (1939) 'Avant-garde and Kitsch', *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume 1, Perceptions and Judgements, 1939-1944.* J. O'Brian (ed.), (1986) London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

GREENBERG, C. (1960) 'Modernist Painting', *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume 4, Modernism with a Vengeance 1957-1969.* J. O'Brian (ed.), (1993) London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HAMBLEN, K. (1990) 'Beyond the Cash Aesthetic of Cultural Literacy', *Studies in Art Education,* 31,4, pp. 218-227.

HART, L. (1991) 'Aesthetic Pluralism and Multicultural Art Education', *Studies in Art Education.* 33(3), pp. 145-159.

HARVEY, D. (1991) *The Condition of Postmodernity.* Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

HEALY, C. (1996) 'Remembering Postcolonialism - Ross Moore's *Dear Primitive',* in *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria: Museum of Modern Art at Heide, pp. 50-51.

HORKHEIMER, M. & ADORNO, T. W. (1972) *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* Trans. J. Cumming. New York: Herder and Herder.

HUTCHEON, L. (1991) *The Politics of Postmodernism.* London and New York: Routledge.

KOSUTH, J. (1991) *Art After Philosophy and After Collected Writings,* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

LINGARD, B. (1996) 'Markets of Meaning: Meanings of Markets', in *Colonial Postcolonial,* Victoria: Museum of Modern Art at Heide, pp. 32-33.

LIPPARD, L. (1990) *Mixed Blessing: New Art in a Multicultural America.* N.Y.: Pantheon Books.

LOWENFELD, V. (1957) *Creative and Mental Growth.* Third edition, New York: MacMillan Company.

LYOTARD, J. (1979) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,* trans.

G.BENNINGTON & B. BASSUMI (1984), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

MACKENZIE, J. (1998) 'The Philosophy of the Subject: Back to the Future', *Educational Philosophy,* 30(2) 1998, pp. 135-162.

MANSFIELD, A. (1999) 'Reading the Law of the Jungle: Stanley Fish's 'Interpretive Community' in Literary and Legal Interpretation.' A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the Degree of Master of Arts in English, University of Auckland.

MARSHALL, J. (1997) 'Michel Foucault: Problematising the Individual and Constituting 'the' Self', *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 29, pp. 32-49.

McLAREN, P. (ed.) (1995) *Postmodernism, Postcolonialism and Pedagogy.* Albert Park, Vic.: James Nicholas Publishers.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1993) *New Zealand Curriculum Framework.* Wellington: Learning Media.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1989) *Art Education - Junior Classes to Form Seven: Syllabus for Schools.* Wellington: Learning Media.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (1989) *Music Education: Early Childhood to Form Seven.* Wellington: Learning Media.

O'BRIAN, J. (1993) *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticisms, Volume 4: Modernism with a Vengeance 1957-1969. London: University of Chicago Press.*

PETERS, M. (1990) 'PostMODERNISM(s): 'The Critique of Reason.' Paper Presented at the M.A. graduate seminar programme, Social Policy group, Department of Education, University of Auckland, 11th April.

PETERS, M. & MARSHALL, J. (1993) 'Beyond the Philosophy of the Subject: Liberalism, Education and the Critique of Individualism', *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 25, 19-39.

PETERS, M. & MARSHALL, J. (1995) 'After the Subject: A Response to McKenzie', *Journal of Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 27 (1), pp. 41-54.

PIPER, A. (1993) 'The Logic of Modernism', *Calloo, Summer,* 16(3), pp. 574-6.

POLLOCK, G. (1992) *Vision and Difference.* London and New York: Routledge.

REEDER, W. (1996) Foreword, *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria:. Museum of Modern Art at Heide.

RIZVI, F. (1994) 'The Arts, Education and the Politics of Multiculturalism', in S. Gunew & F. Rizvi (eds.) *Culture, Difference, and the Arts.* N.S.W.: Allen and Unwin.

RIZVI, F. (1996) 'Bennet and the Art of History', in *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria: Museum of Modem Art at Heide, pp. 26-27.

SCHULTE-SASSE, (1984) Foreword, *Theory of the Avant-garde,* in P. Berger, (1984) *Theory of the Avant-garde,* Minneapolis, Manchester University Press.

SMITH, B. (1998) Modernism's history: A study in twentieth century art and ideas. UNSW Press: Sydney.

SMITH, R. (1995) 'The Question of Modernism and Postmodernism', *Art Education Policy Review,* July-August 1995, 96(6), pp. 2(11) Article Al 7612893

SMITH, T. (1996) 'Shadowing the Colonial', in *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria: Museum of Modem Art at Heide, 52-53.

STANHOPE, Z. (1996) 'Recovering Lost Ground Sue Ford's *Shadow Portraits',* in *Colonial Postcolonial.* Victoria: Museum of Modem Art at Heide, pp. 36-37.

STIMPSON, C.R. (1988) 'Nancy Reagan wears a hat: Feminism and its cultural consensus', *Critical Enquiry,* 14(2), pp. 223-243.

VARGISH, T. (1998) 'Modernism', in E. Craig (ed.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* Vol 6, London & NY: Routledge, pp. 447-449.

WHITSON, J. (1995) 'Poststructuralist Pedagogy as Counter-hegemonic Praxis (Can we Find the Baby in the Bathwater?)', in P. McLaren (ed.), *Postmodernism, Postcolonialism and Pedagogy.* Albert Park, Vic.: James Nicholas Publishers, pp. 121-144.

WOLCOTT, A. (1996) 'Is What You See What You Get? A Postmodern Approach to Understanding Works of Art', *Studies in Art Education,* 37(2), pp. 69-79.