



Mini-themed issue (Volume 34, 2014) on

Space, Place, and (or) Time in Art and Visual Culture Education

Preferred deadline: 1 November, 2013

The *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education* invites submissions for a mini-themed issue on **Space, Place, and (or) Time in Art and Visual Culture Education**, to be published Summer 2014.

How does culture affect the way people feel and think about place, how they form attachments to home and nation? Is place security, something we are attached to, and space freedom, something we long for, as geographer Yi-Fu Tuan (1977) suggests? How does culture affect a sense of time, and as DeCerteau (1984) suggests, articulate itself on space? Geographer Doreen Massey (1994) argues that space and time are integrally intertwined, constructed out of social relations that are always in flux. She draws her premises from Mae-Won Ho in biology that “form is dynamic through and through” and any concept of time as process or spatial as form-not-process is limited only when we hold them fast, and then only for a second, for “there is no holding nature still” (p. 3).¹ Experimental physics holds that space and time are united. Viewing space and time as configurations of dynamic social relations “inherently implies the existence in the lived world of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces” (p. 3). This dimension of space-time as a dynamic social relationship is particularly interesting for cultural studies and art education: what are we holding onto as truth? As universal? Within multi-cultural and diversity studies in our field, how are space-place-and time interrelated? What dynamics do they suggest for teaching in ways that promote cultural understanding and self-reflection?

In Western Enlightenment and Modernist categorizations and polarizations of people and concepts, woman is culturally associated with place, often connoting the specific, the local and home, the concrete, and the descriptive. Man is reversely associated with the universal, the abstract and conceptual, the public, and the general (Massey, 1994). While we largely eschew these divisions in our postmodern western society, how are they hidden in today’s cultural institutions and teaching practices? In how we formulate curriculum? Write our conceptual papers? How do what art historian Irit Rogoff (2000) proposes as “unhomed geographies” help

¹ Massey cites Mae-Wan Ho, *Reanimating nature: The integration of science with human experience*. Beshara, 1988, p. 19).

us redefine place, space, and time “away from concrete coercions of belonging and not belonging” (p. 4)—for ourselves and our students, and help us look at how culture and social relations incline our ways of seeing? How has the conceptualization of the place of women and men as art teachers changed over the last 20 or 30 years relative to specific geographic locations and cultures (if they have changed)? How are the spaces of teaching gendered (if they are)?

Rogoff defines space in terms of “inhabiting a location through subjectivity and representation . . . power produces a space which then gets materialized as place” (2000, p. 22). A meaning of place (for example, a school or community center) is not, according to this, a description of how it looks or what goes on there (e.g., a sunny room where art is taught), but the subjectivities and signifying practices that are elicited (or masked) there. What do places and spaces signify in terms of power? Subjectivity? Representation?

Roland Barthes, sitting in a bar in Tangiers, famously reflected on listening to fragments of conversations in different languages, music, chairs scraping against the floor, glasses clinking, opening for him a space “outside the sentence” that is full of ambiguities. Meaning and agency are negotiated, he proposed, through a time-lag that occurs in between the utterance of the text/ making of the sound and understanding, or its discursive eventuality. Within the space of the time-lag, negotiations of meaning and agency are possible; transnational and translational is open to revision. Time is contingent (Barthes, 1973/1975). How do place and time influence meaning making and art making in art relative to a specific culture or across cultures (even, perhaps, the culture of art at a particular point in time)? Whereas Barthes focuses on the pleasure of the text, Homi Bhabha explores the time-lag as a space of negotiation. “Is it possible,” he asks, “to conceive of historical agency in that disjunctive, indeterminate moment of discourse outside the sentence?” (1994, p. 262). He opens up the time-lag as an intersubjective realm, a contested space that is open for complex cultural negotiations. How do we guide students and groups with whom we work to make meanings that are contingent and open to negotiation across individuals and cultural ideas?

“If a work of art is successful,” posits French art critic Nicholas Bourriaud, “it will invariably set its sights beyond its mere presence in space: it will be open to dialogue, discussion, and that form of inter-human negotiation that Marcel Duchamp called ‘the coefficient of art’, which is a temporal process, being played out here and now” (1998/ 2002, p. 41). How is contemporary teaching operationalizing Bourriaud’s idea of “relational aesthetics,” Gablik’s (1991) “re-enchantment of art,” and Kester’s (2004) “dialogical aesthetics” in relationship to culture? Where it isn’t, what narratives and arguments can help us envision how this might occur?

In addition to questions embedded above, other possible lines of inquiry could entail the following:

- How do space and place affect the way we experience our diverse world and create art? How do they affect the politics of who we are and how we teach in our diverse world?
- How do space, place, and (or) time effect crossing disciplines, borders, and boundaries in teaching, making, and talking about art? How do they challenge doing so?
- How do cultural and personal positionality relative to space, place, and (or) time affect what we teach?
- How might art pedagogies of place contribute to reconsiderations of belonging, emplacement, movement, and hybrid subjectivities that live in spaces in-between?
- In what ways can visual cultural research suggest creative juxtapositions, entanglements, situatedness of no-place, displacement, and in-betweenness?

- How might interdisciplinary connections between art pedagogies of place and space within the spatial turn in the humanities and sensorial/embodied forms of visual cultural research characterize place? Space? Time?

Questions herein posed are meant as starting points; you are invited to engage your own ideas and perspectives in conceptualizing this theme. Submissions from a broad range of perspectives are encouraged. A variety of formats are also welcome—including traditional academic essays, visual essays, or alternative formats—that fit the purposes of the journal to address issues of art, education, and culture. Image-based submissions should be accompanied by explanatory text or an artist statement. Short manuscripts are generally 1,000 to 2,000 words, longer manuscripts 3,000 to 4,000 words.

Submissions on other topics are always welcome; space, place, and (or) time is a “mini-theme.”

The *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education (jCRAE)* is an annual publication of the United States Society for Education through Art (USSEA). *jCRAE* is focused on social and cultural research relevant for art and visual culture education, including cultural foundations of art education, cross-cultural and multicultural research in art education, and cultural aspects of art in education. These areas should be interpreted in a broad sense and include community arts organizations, schools, arts administration, art therapy, and other disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches that are relevant to art and visual culture education. Theoretical research and research in which qualitative and/or quantitative methods will be considered, as well as visual and other arts-based formats.

Preferred deadline: 1 November, 2013

References

- Barthes, R. (1973/1975). *The pleasure of the text*. Trans. R. Miller. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The location of culture* (2nd ed.). London & New York: Routledge.
- Bourriaud, N. (1998/ 2002). *Relational aesthetics*. Trans. S. Pleasance & F. Woods. Paris: Les Presses du Réel.
- De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Trans. S. Rendall. Berkeley: University of California.
- Gablik, S. (1991). *The reenchantment of art*. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Kester, G. (2004). *Conversation pieces: Community and communication in modern art*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place, and gender*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Rogoff, I. (2000). *Terra infirma: Geography's visual culture*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Tuan, Y-F. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.