

Richard G. Townsend

Do Politics

**“Off your duffs, you educators in the arts!
You have nothing to lose but chagrin.”**

For those who practise an art — and teaching itself is said to be one — the world of politics of education may seem peculiarly repugnant. There issues are discussed and settled in terms and by criteria that are anything but aesthetic. That the issues are also inescapable does not cut much ice with many artists and teachers, who consequently can appear indifferent to their being settled. Townsend, in all sympathy, here offers a reviving slap to their faces. He reminds them that even in their refusal to discuss their own decisions as teachers, they are taking a political stance; for these decisions affect others. Pointing out that the future of educational funding gets progressively darker as society gets predominantly older, he outlines in shrewd detail three different ways of meeting the urgent threat to art education. Two are recognizably familiar from the antics of others in the contemporary scene; the third and for him preferred scenario points the way to an unexpected and hopeful outcome both for the arts and the humanities in general education.

“How vulgar!” some will already have said about the subtitle above; the crudity about “duffs” will give them an excuse to dismiss what follows. I hope, however, that other readers are still with me, sensing that I am only trying to give violent shock to aesthetic sensibilities — something that at least one celebrated critic of Canadian writing has said we have far too little of hereabouts.¹ What’s more, my subtitle is apt, for in a sense my message *is* vulgar. It is that education for the arts, rather than being only a noble and idealistic pursuit of Truth & Beauty & Wisdom, also has a certain low underside: politics.

Politics is a world where, instead of originality and high sensitivity, there is partisanship, negotiation, and, ultimately, compromise that more or less keeps diverse interests happy. A reputation for sensitivity to Truth & Beauty & Wisdom is not a handicap in this political world, but there are situations where Group Interests, Practicality, & the Commonplace are honoured as much. Please understand that I do not so much defend this political world as accept it.

And I hold that it is important to appreciate and even on occasion to *do* politics if teachers and learners in the arts are to avoid the chagrin of cutbacks, and if they want to garner a fair share of society's scarce resources.

Politics is the art of persuasion. Humans engage in political acts whenever they seek to impose direction and form, not on private matters that affect themselves only, but on *public* matters that have impact on other persons. Through the political process, people define their positions, make claims for common action, and justify their stands. Thus politics is under way in that "other" culture, when scientists attempt to persuade federal authorities that unless more money and less accountability are forthcoming from Washington or Ottawa, education for North American science is doomed to oblivion. As it happens, at least in the U.S., science is quite well looked after by and large by federal grants; its leaders realize this, but they also realize that it would be bad politics for them to acknowledge their good fortune publicly.² Now, in education for the arts, politics may not be *the* core activity, but it still is there whenever claims are made for governmental largesse — whenever choices are made on behalf of others.

Those who claim that education for the arts is apolitical may be reacting against Plato's observation that art is of the highest value when it (politically) serves some perfect end, when in effect it shapes attitudes which legitimate society's institutions.³ Over time, this stern notion has had particular appeal to propagandists of government, church, and business; but not with artists or with art educators, who collectively and individually may reject — almost instinctively — the "appropriate" subject or the blandly "safe" style that others sanction. Indeed, as the Quebec painter Paul Emile Borduas declared in *Le Refus Global* (the 1948 manifesto which helped sow the seeds of that province's Quiet Revolution) paternalism and officialdom do constrain freedom of thought and artistic creativity.

Many educators for the arts also would reject instinctively the notion that they are using political ideologies in their decision-making. That is, these teachers prefer not to associate themselves with any single doctrine. Quite truthfully, they may see good points in a variety of opposing systems of belief. Nonetheless, there frequently may be some ideological pattern or bias in their preferences about their work. Within a single academic department different belief systems may thrive, and to the extent that they reflect on it members may be pleased that their unit encapsulates so many competing perspectives. Thus, a drama instructor may see herself in her classes as transmitting the traditional heritage of her art, the perspective of a conservative (note the small *c*). Another instructor in drama may regard himself as providing a pleasant growing experience and a self-release for his individual students, something of a liberal stance. A third member of that same theatre department may choose to work especially closely with working-class and ethnic youth; he may not exactly be a communist muttering "Workers of the World unite, you have nothing to lose

but your chains,” but with his focus he may be acting out a socialist’s notion that there is too much of a middle-class and Anglo-Saxon bias in our educational systems. To be sure, these several teachers may not permit political ideologies to determine all of their positions on issues. Yet the right-to-left frame of reference of politics may go some distance toward accounting for differences in the ways in which they make judgments concerning others.

The person who maintains that education in the arts is or ought to be strictly apolitical is forgetting that politics occurs whenever there is uncertainty or controversy over who should teach what to whom, when, and how. Thus, the following *are* political questions. Should stitchery or sculpture be introduced in Grade 4? In choosing teachers for stitchery or sculpture, which vested interests should be served — those of the teachers who are generalists, or those of the specialists? Should a new superintendent implement an arts program that he has inherited, even if he privately disagrees with it? If an arts program is endorsed by a school board, to what extent does the staff of a neighborhood school have the local discretion to determine its degree of actual implementation? How many dollars should be assigned to that program, ahead of (say) outdoor education?

When dismissing inquiry into such questions as being beyond the pale of politics, an educator may be trying (albeit unconsciously) to limit the right of others to participate in settling those matters. In effect, the pooh-pooher of politics in arts education may be saying, “*Your* views are irrelevant. Do things *my* way.” Certainly, if an expert, that educator may both be especially well-informed and have none but the highest motives. Yet, to come back to my original definition, that person *is being* political in his or her efforts to impose direction on a public matter. He or she is trying to have a particular alternative adopted as definitive for students, teaching colleagues, or institutions. Perhaps, too, in professing to have all the answers and in implying that there is little place in decision-making for others with equal standing in education for the arts, that individual is being a bit arbitrary and self-righteous.

I briefly review below the involvement of educators in political acts in the past, the present, and (brashly) the future. I do this to drive home the point that politics can enrich education for the arts. It is not simply a question of learning to live with politics as something one must tolerate but never enjoy — like the official Victorian attitude toward sex. In politics, as in sex, toleration is a less than optimal approach. One should like it too.

From Franz Cizech to John Robarts

Given our definition of politics as an activity present in situations of public choice, we can interpret as inherently political the activities of the great pioneer Franz Cizech in a free art class at Vienna in the 1890s. Up until his time, students were pretty much expected to delineate clumps of grapes, old hats, and other objects. Tradition also dictated that they copy, appreciatively, the composition schemes of the masters. Lastly, students could replicate standardized

colour charts, improve their hand-eye coordination by making industrial drawings, and devise posters. All in all, a rigid repertoire of behaviour was the norm in art class. When Cizech chose to eliminate these exercises and to invite his students to present in visual form their reactions to happenings in their own lives, he was not only championing expressionism, an historical precedent. He was making an authoritative and controversial decision about the content of his pupils' instruction, a decidedly political act.

Cizech had at his disposal the resources that teachers in democracies have today in greater or lesser degree — his own time and the time of his students.⁴ Unintimidated by the bureaucracy of his Austrian institution, and feeling confident enough about himself to exploit his discretionary powers, Cizech imposed his view that learners should be able to put their playful selves into classroom art. Later, when Richardson in England, Lismer in Canada, Dewey in the United States, and others campaigned for this same general approach, those teachers as well were offering political directions for aesthetic education. That is, they were presenting persuasive, coherent, rational, and influential arguments. Their arguments interrelated adroitly with other concerns on the intellectual landscape of their time, particularly with the conception that the *individual* is central in the learning process. For instance, to banish poster contests in schools, they reasoned that since students there were just beginning to master this form of communication, the process was more important than the product; the overall purpose was held not to be to sort winners from losers, but to ensure that each child acquired the self-confidence needed for further development in this realm. And so forth.

Even today, controversy swirls around this particular teaching mode, particularly in those colleges of art where postsecondary students find no structure to their “program” and where they have little significant contact with their instructors. Some chagrined faculty have reacted against such a milieu, taking it upon themselves to put students through their design paces. At political odds with some of their teaching peers, they have also adhered to formal and well-defined standards of evaluation: for the student who perpetually flounders with his assignments, this set of reformers will use low grades as a signal to drop out and find some career outside the arts.

Not surprisingly, educators for the arts have used points of entry outside of schools to advance their causes. To illustrate, in the 1950s a group in a certain provincial Ministry of Education developed a course of study for art in Grade 13. The Education Minister of the day summarily turned it down, with the commonplace rationale that art at that level was a frill. He had, after all, come to that post after a long career in a university, where historical investigations of aesthetic objects had been valued more than laboratory, clinical, or internship experiences.⁵ In the next decade, however, those same educators in that Ministry reached into their bottom drawers, pulled out and dusted-off their proposal for Grade 13 art, and sent it forward for quick approval and implementation. But of course the 1960s were breakthrough years for public education in

North America. And that province then had a new Minister of Education, one with a markedly different energy level, openness, and outlook from his predecessor. Arts educators in John Robarts' Ministry were quick to seize upon the shift in their political environment.

Skirmishing for literacy, arts, and music

Aware that the best political arguments are made on the basis of reason, not emotion or passion, many educators in the arts are now rather sophisticated in the briefs they offer for the content of their instruction. A case in point is that of teachers of writing who react against "textbooks and other teaching materials which contain an excessive focus" on such subskills as grammar, spelling, punctuation, and vocabulary. They do not permit themselves to be seen simply as controversial or lazy debunkers of the "mechanical" aspects of writing. To put a different face on their outlook, these teachers have become modern-day disciples of Cizek, insisting that the student is fundamentally a creative and autonomous individual whose right to self-expression, inner feeling, and personal development must be reinforced in the classroom. Accordingly, they would give comparatively little emphasis to diagramming sentences or to multiple-choice questions about literature as dimensions of the "New" English. Members of the National Council of Teachers of English in the U.S., who took such a position at their convention in 1977, argue that those who slavishly instill old-fashioned standards of writing are political handmaidens of the dominant element of society. That dominant element is seen as out to maintain its own social and political interests, by demanding that every student internalize its elitist tastes, attitudes, and conventions in verbal behaviour.⁶

Those who would rebut this essentially Marxist view realize that just because they like a different system of language, they do not have the automatic right to impose it. So they appeal to the public at large and to their colleagues, citing the benefits that are sought by their time-honoured conception of English teaching. Hence: language is a bearer of tradition; words give first principles and last essences; linguistic skills are the mark of a civilized person and are a practical asset in improving one's socio-economic destiny; verbal proficiencies are tools to extract information and to exercise the critical faculties of the mind; teachers' corrections, rather than being "encumbrances" on the students' own language, actually are guides toward sound practice in communicating effectively.

With an eye to attracting a large number of supporters, language traditionalists sometimes go on to appeal to religious fundamentalists who believe that decline in literacy is associated with society's moral decline. Or the traditionalists may frame their issue so as to sway those who are dissatisfied with educators' wages, strikes, or attitudes, blaming the decline on the incompetence and lack of dedication of teachers and their principals. That blaming is a form of pressure politics, letting educators know that they are being watched. Besieged educators then may exert their own counter-pressures, attributing the fall in literacy to permissive parents, to special-interest groups whose push for new cur-

ricula has reduced the time that can be spent on basics, to the bugaboo of television, *et al.* And so the political crossfire goes, each side trying to bring others around to its disposition or (on occasion) to darken the other's reputation.

Contemporary educators also mobilize political support in coalitions within their own professional ranks. Once in a while, they fail to choose their allies from within their systems shrewdly. In British Columbia last year, the headquarters office of a school board tapped interested teachers to serve on a consultative committee that then proposed innovations in the arts. On the surface, one would have assumed that these grassroots champions of new ideas might have been able to inspire, or at least to link, their teaching colleagues to their recommendations. As it happened, however, those innovations were stillborn: the committee members were not accepted as representative of the teacher unions and of the principals' groups, bodies which demanded to be involved. On the other hand, alliances of professional educators can carry the day, as an example from the East Coast attests. There, six principals recently decided to meet regularly over lunch to share curricular ideas for the arts, to develop workshops for their arts teachers, and to plan successful strategies for arm-twisting their central-office authorities for additional arts supplies.

These principals' success notwithstanding, coalitions are likely to have more potency when school insiders combine with outsiders. Taking the insiders' data and arguments, outsiders can be especially deft in nudging the ultimate decision-makers. Consider, for a recent example, music educators in Florida, South Carolina, and the State of Washington.⁷ They saw how many of their most promising students were migrating to the more immediately "practical" subjects that might help them find a niche in the bleak job market. Music courses were regarded as less basic there than math or reading, as classes that were ornamental and non-utilitarian. First vocal music and then instrumental music became vulnerable to cutbacks. These teachers recognized that since parents would turn to private lessons for their children as a replacement for cancelled in-school offerings, the resulting concentration on techniques of performance would displace other vital dimensions of school music — the compositional, historical, cultural, critical, and social. Dismayed by the precarious existence of their courses, educators in these three states cultivated external constituencies for their work. More specifically, they lobbied with community leaders, who pressed the courts and legislatures to define music as the basic right of every schoolchild. In this quest, teachers and school administrators worked handily with parent and citizen groups. Their arguments and pressures "connected": today music education in those states is said to be flourishing.

Facing an austere future: the Be-defensive Scenario

A youthful society needs a vigorous and extensive education sector, such as ours has had since the 1960s. But an older society prefers that its taxes be channeled into other services, and with our ever-aging population health care, social welfare, unemployment, recreation, and public transportation will all be accord-

ed higher priorities than education. On that dour assumption about the future in Canada, I sketch three political scenarios for preserving and enhancing education in the arts.

With the public mood requiring contraction in all educational institutions, John Q. Administrator will think that he must Lead by invoking the principle of pseudo-equality: All Programs Are Equally Reducible. He will slash programs across the board. But vested interest groups will then go, over the heads of such an administrator, to trustees and to boards of governors. Educators for the arts will be among the petitioners for a stay of execution of their programs, often with the commonplace argument that education in the arts is essential to provincial pride and purpose.

Still hard-pressed for savings, the authorities will ultimately turn to cost-benefit studies and other methods of program, or staff, evaluation. (I am aware that as the 1960s were drawing to a close, some educators were claiming that evaluation would come into its own during the 1970s. I hear the same claim being made now for the 1980s, but I half fear that the 1990s will be upon us before evaluation really becomes the warp and woof of our programs.) Presumably these productivity studies will provide irrefutable data for making the agonizing choices of what to trim, stabilize, or enlarge. Will educators in Canada's arts community then respond as other educators have done over the years? If so, that would mean the following:

First, they would try to get the evaluation postponed or deferred for as long as possible, the better to make improvements in operations before they are "found out." Failing at that, the arts educators can try to influence the selection of the evaluator, so that their critic will have a starting point resembling their own; after all, the evaluator who accepts the value orientation of a program usually assesses it more favourably than the critic who either is non-committal or who has a contrary perspective. Thirdly, the educators in the arts can seek to diminish the amount of money, staff, or time that the outside evaluator will have for completing the mandate. Finally, once the evaluator is on the scene, the program administrators can work at influencing the very nature of the information that the evaluator gathers. The outsider can be steered to students who give glowing testimonials. At the same time, the evaluator can be kept in the dark about those mavericks on staff who question the program's current orthodoxies.

Am I being irresponsible in herewith divulging these defensive tactics? Should the foregoing have been left unsaid, lest it only encourage more of this sort of shady behaviour? I think not. Educators in the arts might as well recognize what other educators do to deflect the pain of criticism.⁸ For what it's worth, I think this underhanded and cynical political approach only works when involved educators have such an over-investment in the status quo that they want to avoid any objective appraisal of needs and solutions.

The Business-As-Usual Scenario.

Educators for the arts will continue to search for money and justification from conventional sources. At the very least, those of a conservative persuasion will argue for local initiatives in education, such as the Banff Centre in Alberta represents. In addition, political conservatives will hope to draw greater funding from the private sector. They will urge that more businesses follow the lead of the Bank of America, which not long ago gave \$500,000 for opera in San Francisco's schools.

Educators of a more liberal stripe will maintain that the federal government has the obligation to promote the cultural welfare of its citizens. They will proclaim that education for the arts will never overcome the deprivation noticed in the OECD and Symons Reports, until Ottawa subsidizes more — more exhibition tours for schools, more wherewithal for the country's 40-odd arts and education councils, more capital improvements, more field trips to recognized arts centres, and so on.

Socialists in the arts education establishment, wanting to render private broadcasters, cable television operators, and other profitable industrialists accountable to "the people," will press provincial and federal governments to levy special taxes on those entrepreneurs, with part of those monies to go for education in the arts. They will want bold new schemes to meet systematically the challenges of the times — not a band-aid here, a placebo there.

Spokespersons for these different ideologies will come together, though, to demonstrate the value of art education to society. They will "lean" on opinion-leaders to persuade others that their cultural values have a spiritual importance beyond hockey games and Molson beers, beyond society's preoccupations with profits and efficiency. They will orate on the importance of their work — at special rallies, just as actors, filmmakers, writers, art dealers, librarians, and others did at Arts Day demonstrations across the country on October 26, 1978. They will claim that unless their sector is pumped up, it will eventually become little more than a branch-plant purveyor of U.S. products and learning. Various ideologies will also jointly advocate that marvellously Canadian approach to consciousness-raising, a Royal Commission of Enquiry.

The commission would have to have a higher national profile than the provincial commission on art education in Quebec some years back. Preferably too, the study group would generate as many new federal organizations and grants as the Massey Commission did in 1951 (with its delicious impetus for a National Arts Center and a Canadian Film Development Corporation, for instance). The appointed royal commissioners would not be educators in the arts — self-interest would not make them at all credible in this regard. Instead, these federal investigators *cum* publicists would have gained reputations for independence in other domains, as governors general, as judges, or as nuclear physicists perhaps. One of their most important staff appointments would be the statistician who

would assemble compelling computerized data on the labour-intensiveness and cost-effectiveness of education in the arts. This staff member would be able to show that for every dollar of government support for education in painting, music, and so forth, more dollars of economic activity are generated throughout the whole education-culture-communications industry.

Echoing a theme of the past, educators will also support the creation of a National Institute in Arts and Education. That organization will be established! But will it really make much difference? Not if some in the field succeed in pressuring the Institute merely to provide statistics and other ammunition on the extra-aesthetic payoffs of education in the arts. This group will want researchers to identify ways in which art cultivates the ability to learn generally: it will want findings that reading scores go up, and pupil vandalism goes down, when the arts are paramount in a curriculum; it will want evidence that lessons in the arts sharpen interpersonal skills, aid the handicapped, and build ethnic identity; it will want “hard” data on how dance helps physical fitness and how poetry promotes good citizenship. Happily, a second group will reason that the foregoing concerns are merely side issues, insufficiently aesthetic to affect the content of instruction. Once the Institute has been financed, it *will* make a difference if this second group succeeds in pushing researchers in quite different and specific directions — so as to deal squarely with creating and confronting works of art. Then churches, sensitivity trainers, families, hospitals, and other agencies may be left to do some more thinking about any extra-aesthetic dimensions of art education.⁹

The Seek-Connections Scenario.

Mindful of the multiple demands on public resources and the likelihood of continued inflation or recession, the ever-pragmatic legislator will expect educators to live with a smaller portion of the financial pie. That fiscal crunch will drive together educators for the now-fragmented arts with educators for the humanities. At first, this affiliation will exist just for the mutual support of like-minded persons. The logic will be that the arts and humanities do share a belief in the dignity of man and woman and a belief in the connectiveness of things. While each specialty may have its own particular sign system or “language,” an overarching commonality is the private imaginations of workers in these fields; these imaginations express, and teach others to express, the highest values that people can live by. A related commonality will be the different specialists’ typical commitment to lifting their audiences out of the confines of their immediate cultural environments. Speaking with one voice, these educators will try to reach lay authorities, Ministry executives, and legislatures — much as did the arts educators of my preceding examples, and much as do science educators who poormouth all the funds coming their way.

After that, small departments such as theatre, painting, and music will start gradually to align themselves formally and constitutionally with the large departments in the humanities. Even departments of music, art, and English

within faculties of education will affiliate with each other, and occasionally with specialists in those subjects elsewhere in the university. At first, these coalitions will be promulgated on the economic grounds of reducing administrative costs and of maintaining student flow. (Teachers would share "the wealth"; that is, the students.) But these mergers also will be political, in the sense that educators in the arts will contribute to the power of those with similar ideals. These enlarged academic departments will have a considerable claim on institutional resources and therefore on curricular budgets. Their heads will be able to speak as equals to the heads of large mathematics or vocational-education departments, giving the fine arts a "clout" that they seldom have had before.

As lines of communication open up, the affiliations also will have intellectual spinoffs, affecting the choice of material for teaching and the "texts" that each specialty interprets. To the extent that it is still feasible to hold onto the uniqueness of each of these specialties, some levels and some kinds of teaching in these units will be done in common through common techniques, instead of always by each specialty on its own. It is tempting to speculate how these larger zones of concern will lead to joint conferences in the member disciplines, to a journal which will exceed in scope that of any in the arts and humanities domain, to transdisciplinary materials and so forth. If it is not too much for schools to anticipate from professionals, who by their very nature are individualistic, the collaboration might even spark a productive reconceptualization of the education process in the arts.¹⁰

This is the scenario I prefer. It moves toward synergy, and toward overcoming the paralyzing barriers between specialists in kindred fields. It has the potential of high payoff, in a reformulation of the teaching-learning process that might emanate from collaborators. Its internal organizational processes of cooperation are consistent with external demands for frugality and for the elimination of overlap. It forms a larger political base for arts educators, if humanists choose to reinforce those arts educators. I must hasten to add that there is at least one quite gloomy feature in this depiction: it posits a rather major change, some parties might be hurt in the reorganization, and thus the approach may generate opposition as being too revolutionary.

While altogether ignoring many subtleties of this complex and fascinating topic, I have ranged from Plato's Greece through contemporary British Columbia to the future's shrinkage of enrolments and budgets. Between the lines, I have been implying that educators in the arts do not have to hold seats in parliaments or sit on boards to acquire political consequence. Indeed, educators in the arts may very well not have the time, inclination, or capacity to be that sort of partisan. In any event, their involvement in educational bureaucracies gives them avenues to political power. At the micro level of their classrooms, educators do have some discretion over the material that they cover. Working with attentive publics at the macro level, educators can also create favorable attitudes and raise the salience of their specialties. Certainly with their ideologies, their reasonings, their protests, their coalitions, and yes, even with their shock-

ings of aesthetic sensibilities, they cannot help but influence the ways that authorities perceive issues. Curricular changes may come and go, but politics — in the sense of an activity that affects the choices to be made on behalf of others — will continue to be a force shaping education in the arts.

NOTES

I am very much obliged to Pat Haslam and to my wife Barbara for helpful suggestions on my original manuscript.

1. E. K. Brown, "Canadian Poetry," in *Contexts of Canadian Criticism*, edited by Eli Martel (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1971). In part, Brown sees his countrymen as overly Puritan.
2. Dan Greenberg, "The Politics of American Science," *New Scientist*, January 17, 1980, pp. 149-50.
3. For an introduction to the part that modern schools play in reproducing the political order, see Landon E. Beyer, "Aesthetic Theory and the Ideology of Educational Institutions," *Curriculum Inquiry*, Spring, 1979, pp. 13-26.
4. Almost all of the literature on the politics of education attends to decision-making by legal authorities, policy boards, and administrative elites. See for instance J. H. A. Wallin, ed., *The Politics of Canadian Education, 1977 Yearbook of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education* (University of Alberta: Edmonton). In this essay, I take more of a teacher-centred approach, one which was inspired by the paper of John Schwille, Andrew Porter, and Michael Gant, "Content Decision-Making and the Politics of Education," given at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1979. To make their points, they focus on mathematics education.
5. An exception was the practical art of architecture.
6. A penetrating treatment of this particular issue appears in the explication and case study of Roger Simon and John Willensky in "Beyond a High School Literacy Policy — the Surfacing of a Hidden Curriculum," *Journal of Education*, Vol. 162, No. 1, pp. 111-121. Also see John Simon, *Paradigms Lost: Essays on Literacy and Its Decline* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1980).
7. Caesar Andrews, Jr., "Music Programs May Fade Out at Many Schools As Taxpayers Seek to Slash Education Spending," *Wall Street Journal*, July 18, 1978.
8. A most discerning overview of this subject appears in Gerald E. Sroufe, "Evaluation and Politics," *The Politics of Education, The Seventy-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part II, edited by Jay D. Scribner (University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1977), pp. 287-318.
9. On the tactics of those who sell the extra-aesthetic payoffs of art education, see the discussion of Merchants (pp. 12-15) in Vincent Lanier, "The Five Faces of Art Education," *Studies in Art Education*, 18 (3), 1977, pp. 7-21. Building on Lanier's analysis, Geoffrey S. Hodder has provocatively (and politically) suggested that art educators apply Paulo Freire's pedagogy to vitiate the Merchant and to change the existing "oppressive" system of art education to one that is more libertarian. See his "Human Praxis: A New Basic Assumption for Art Educators of the Future," *Canadian Journal of Education*, 5 (2), 1980, pp. 5-15.
10. Reconceptualizations of program also may emerge when bridges are built across institutions, e.g., when arts students at Canada's technician-oriented community colleges and at universities mingle in common classes at each others' campuses. The Erindale campus of the University of Toronto and Sheridan College's Lorne Park campus have had such a joint program for several years now.

me

