

Erlanger Beiträge zur Pädagogik

edited by
Michael Göhlich and Eckart Liebau

Vol. 17

Benjamin Jörissen, Lisa Unterberg,
Leopold Klepacki, Juliane Engel,
Viktoria Flasche, Tanja Klepacki (eds.)

Spectra of Transformation

Arts Education Research and Cultural Dynamics



Waxmann 2018

Münster · New York

Publication sponsored by VolkswagenStiftung



Bibliographic information published by die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

Print-ISBN 978-3-8309-3713-5

E-Book-ISBN 978-3-8309-8713-0

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2018

Steinfurter Straße 555, 48159 Münster, Germany

www.waxmann.com

info@waxmann.com

Cover Design: Christian Averbeck, Münster

Cover Photo: "Angel" by Ricardo Gomez

Typesetting: satz&sonders GmbH, Dülmen

Print: CPI books GmbH, Leck

Printed on age-resistant paper, acid-free as per ISO 9706



Printed in Germany

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

Contents

Preface	7
 Theoretical Perspectives	
<i>Leopold Klepacki, Tanja Klepacki</i> Processes of Cultural Tradition and Transformation from an Educational Science Perspective	11
<i>Hannelore Bublit</i> Spectra and Dynamics of Social and Cultural Transformation Transformations of Contemporary Culture, Work and Power	19
<i>Benjamin Jörissen, Lisa Unterberg</i> Digital Cultural Education The Capability of Cultural Education Facing Digital Transformation	31
<i>Marc Hill</i> Space for Visions: Urban Life as Movement	39
<i>Catarina S. Martins</i> The Alchemies of the Arts in Education Problematising some of the Ingredients of the Recipe	51
<i>Teunis IJdens</i> Studying Arts Education Policy and Governance Concepts and Perspectives	69
 Insights	
<i>Tuula Jääskeläinen</i> Plot A Space for Transformation in the Intercultural Research Process	89
<i>Zofia Matkiewicz</i> Blurred affiliations Transformation Between Fields of Art, Science and Humanities: Cases of Artistic Research and Arts-based Research	95

The Alchemies of the Arts in Education

Problematizing some of the Ingredients of the Recipe¹

Catarina S. Martins

1. Introduction

One of the most common thoughts and sayings about the arts² in education is their power to enhance creativity and motivation in children and youths. This idea is almost taken as an unquestionable evidence when discussing the purposes and the impacts of the arts in education. The arts are believed to make students more focused, problem solvers, more confident, to improve the results in tests and subjects such as mathematics or sciences, to provide them with more motivation for this subject than to the rest of curriculum, to reduce dropping out, among many other rhetorical arguments that construe the arts as inherently good, worthy and empowering (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; Winner, Goldstein & Vincent-Lancrin, 2013). Such salvific advocacy statements make the arts seem a panacea for all the wrongs in education and also in some sectors of social life. In many countries, and to address diverse situations, participation in the arts is put forward as remediation and redemption instruments of personal and social change for young people or groups of the population considered to be at risk (Heath, 2008). In this text, my aim is to problematize these blind spots of the salvific discourses on arts education.

These narratives of salvation and redemption are historically articulated with the emergence of a new system of fine arts from the 18th century onwards, its legitimation through art institutions, aesthetics and the use of art as a cultural value in the formation of a national identity. The separation between arts and crafts made the fine arts a matter of inspiration, genius and a value to be enjoyed in moments of refined pleasure. The arts were meant for a cultured elite, as an arena of spiritual investment

1 I want to thank Thomas S. Popkewitz, José Paiva, Tiago Assis and Luís Alberto Alves for their reading of previous drafts of the chapter and their insightful comments.

2 When I am mobilizing the term 'arts', I am making use of a generalization that considers the particular social construction of the concept 'arts' since modernity, in Western countries, as a particular field separated from crafts; I am not considering the distinctions, for instance, between modern art or contemporary art.

(Shiner, 2001). In a way, the arts were constructed as a special and autonomous field transformed into a cultural and symbolic capital capable of active mechanisms of social distinction. From the last decades of the 18th century on, the arts were also perceived as a field useful to the new practices of government and the making of the new modern citizen. In the eyes of the government they were used for the construction of a civilized nation and for the government of the population. The argument was that "exposure to the fine arts would be good for the people and conduce to their participation in the 'progress' of the polity to which they were being bound" (Taylor, 1999, p. xiv). Museums and schools were two out of several civilizing devices in which the new practices of government and the arts were deployed. However, arts education as a school subject, I will be arguing, is not about arts as they are practiced by artists but rather a kind of alchemy.

In the first part, based on Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality (1991) and technologies of the self (1988), I will explore the moral and civilizing argument that links the practices of government and the arts. I will do that through two different histories: the birth of the museums as a civilizing device and the presence of the arts in education as a technology of government. The second part will deal with the alchemies (Popkewitz, 2007) of the arts in education and the making up of certain kinds of people. Even if the arts as a school subject are fueled by the aura of art and the idea of individual creativity, certain translations are needed to make the arts a school subject, and these translations are not historically related to art as a practice but to practices of schooling.

My conclusion will not bring any kind of solution, but I will try to argue that these advocacy statements and rhetorical arguments in support of the arts in education rule out any other ways of thinking, doing and acting in the practices and research of arts education. Saying this also opens up the possibility of alternative ways of affirming and discussing the arts in education with a deep knowledge of how the arts have become what they are in education.

2. The moral and civilizing arguments: practices and devices of government and the arts

There are several understandings of government and the practices of governing since modernity. Here I refer to Michel Foucault's neologism of governmentality (1991) as a way of referring to a set of technologies developed in order to govern a population according to a reason of the state, but also through the conduction of the conduct by each citizen being governed. Governmentality is understood as an art of governing that includes the bio-political thought in the control of the population by help of strategies of knowledge that allow for the inscription of processes of subjectivation

in the process of being governed. This perspective considers that the power exercised by the modern state was not developed above individuals, but on the contrary "as a very sophisticated structure, in which individuals can be integrated, under one condition: that this individuality would be shaped in a new form, and submitted to a set of very specific patterns" (Foucault, 1982, p. 214). Understood as the conduct of conduct, governing is operated through the technologies of the self (Foucault, 1988) in which modes of self-regulation are part of the forms of power. It is in this sense that subjectivity is fabricated in the tension between subjection and subjectification. Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality allows for an analysis of the ways in which moral and salvific discourses were made in the arts and how those were related with the practices of government that emerged during the Enlightenment and linked scientific knowledge with calculated practices of governing and shaping the modern enlightened citizen.

Enlightenment emerged as a new style of reasoning in which man replaced God as a creator and reason replaced theological explanations of the world. As Becker argued, "the picture of salvation in the Heavenly City they toned down to a vague impressionistic image of a 'future state', 'immortality of the soul', or a more generalized earthly and social *félicité* or *perfectibilité du genre humain*" (2003 [1932], pp. 48, 49). Transferred from God to the hands of man, human history appeared separated from the theological world and was narrated through the invention of abstract concepts such as memory, society, the nation or collective history. Science was the new religion in the explanation and ordering of the world and provided redemptive narratives for the soul. Popkewitz, for instance, talks about the 'homeless mind' as providing a way of thinking about the particular capacity for making "social facts" about society and people that enters into the calculation and codification of the everyday lives of the people. The 'homeless mind', Popkewitz argues, "is the process in which one is both an object and subject of reflection" (2008, p. 11). It means that universal and abstract categories are created and define what is, for instance, to be a good citizen, what is to be a child or what is to be deviant. "That distancing through making one as an object of reflection doubles back on itself to recreate new affiliations, belonging, and 'homes'" (Popkewitz, 2008, p. 11). The abstractions that are created are external to the subject but, at the same time, are inscribed as moral 'guides'. These strategies enabled for new ways of telling the truth directly linked to reason and the new practices of government through the use of reason. In the 18th century truth was said through numerical data, verbal propositions and images of reality (as soon as these suppressed the subjectivity of the scientific self) (Danziger, 2008; Daston & Galison, 2010). Since the middle of the 19th century, statistics, as the science of the state, operated as an instrument that, through numbers and equivalences, gave rise to detailed pictures of the nation in which a balance was always optimized through the figures of the normal and the pathological. This pathological took on different figures: the child at risk, the orphaned child,

the immigrants, the poor, the drunk, the crazy, the sick, the criminals, the delinquents among many other possible nuances to be identified under the label of being a hazard to a homogeneous development of the social body. In a certain way, whatever the condition of the 'pathological' or 'risky' person, to that place would correspond a conceptual abstraction capable of providing a 'home' and a therapy. But there were also other ways of linking each individual to the nation and the task of being a citizen. The senses of belonging and of nationalism were fed by particular abstractions that created narratives on the history, conquests and heritages of people.

3. Museums as civilizing machines

The argument of the arts as a moral and civilizing technology was part of a way of reasoning about government, territory and the making up of citizens as part of a new body called 'population'. The museums were thought in close connection with a rationality for the governing of the population, working as an antidote to risky behaviours and even more to the possibilities they could open for an inner transformation of each individual. During the 2nd half of the 19th century the effects of the arts were being discussed in various fronts and for several purposes: for the new industrial society, the arts, particularly drawing, was a kind of technological sublime, providing a grammar to invent, read and work with machines, but the arts were also explored as a field of leisure that, separated from the field of labour, would give the working class the opportunity to make contact to the values of 'culture'. As Tony Bennet argues, in the mind of 19th century politicians and reformers art, "not necessarily of the highest quality, would assist the purposes of reform so long as it started the working man off on a course of aesthetic and, thereby, moral self-cultivation" (Bennet, 2007, p. 94). The connection of the strategies of governing everybody went through a set of practices that had its nucleus in the freedom and the aspirations of each subject. In most European states the rhetorical mobilization of the arts as part of a public improvement provided "a moral rhetoric, a theatrical repertoire, a secular equivalent for religion that linked the experience of the works of art to the promise of liberty" (Taylor, 1999, p. xiv). The romantic view of the arts as a terrain for self-expression and the psychological conception of the subject, from the normal to the pathological traces, made the arts a powerful therapeutic and reformatory instrument by way of which a certain balance was believed to be achieved.

Memory and collective history, for instance, were two of the ingredients that allowed for the creation of a sense of the self that belongs to a community, and museums worked as archival depositories of these narratives. Again, Popkewitz's notion of the 'homeless mind' is useful to understand this shift to modernity. The 'homeless mind' allows for the possibilities of seeing people as having their own history

and spaces of collective belonging, making the person a citizen of a community. It is a mode of reasoning that enables for the production of collective history or memory as an abstraction of who the citizen is and should be. The rise of the modern states was dependent on the creation of imagined communities (abstractions) which assumed the homogenization of population through the development of particular relationships between the individuals and the state, and the individuals among them. Art museums, for instance, represented the shift from a classical episteme to a modern episteme in which a new order of things appeared along a chronological and developmental line considered to be equivalent with the progress of civilization. In these histories – from the history of a nation to the history of art – many exclusions were in the making and, simultaneously, different kinds of citizens were being fabricated.

In the 18th century, as part of a colonial enterprise, many European nobles started to develop practices of collecting, buying, selling, displaying and viewing art, not only as part of their power as members of the nobility but also as a cultural and symbolic practice that was equivalent with their superior and civilized status (Mörsch, s/d). At a national level, the national galleries and museums were established also as one of the ways of exhibiting the nation and its greatness through the display the top achievements of man. The Louvre Museum, as a product of the French Revolution, marks the beginning of a path that brings to the present the naturalization of the civic rituals of museums as secular institutions. Carol Duncan argues that museums, whether we are talking about the aesthetical or the educational museum, are ritual structures "designated as reserved for a special quality of attention" (1995, p. 4). The birth of the museums operated through a certain distribution of the sensible and the making of different positions between the possibilities of contemplation or learning. Within the museum a certain kind of behaviour was, and still is, expected. Museums were there to affirm the nation as a modern civilization and to civilize the working class, producing a civic way of seeing and civic rituals. Simultaneously, a memory was being produced for the nation and its citizens.

Museums, not only because of their architectural order but also because of the collections they held, required ways of being, seeing, thinking, and acting equivalent to what a modern, cosmopolitan and civic-minded nation meant at the time. The exhibitionary complex of art museums displayed chronologically and geographically the highest examples of high civilisation that should serve as the representation of what it meant to be part of the modern cosmopolitan world. The universalizing narratives assumed a unity from which difference was inscribed. Whether an art museum or an international exhibition on education, what was in question was a way of showing and telling certain narratives that always drew its other as the non-civilized or underdeveloped. In terms of shaping particular ways of being, through the affirmation of particular histories, as Bennett puts it, "is not merely a matter of looking and learn-

ing; it is also – and precisely because museums are as much places for being seen as for seeing – an exercise in civics” (1995, p. 102).

The arts were meant to be equivalent with a civilized status through a rhetoric on beauty and perfection that represented the highest level of human creation and, thus, as an envisaged instrument to act in problematic social zones. Poverty, drunkenness, criminality, sex, gambling were just some of the threats to an efficient government of the state. This government did not depend on the use of coercion or force but rather on a detailed knowledge of each of these fields the social sciences were rationalizing as ‘social questions’. The English social reformer and philosopher Jeremy Bentham, the author of the panopticon, stated that

“All the arts and sciences, without exception, inasmuch as they constitute innocent employments, at least of time, possess a species of moral utility, neither the less real or important, because it is frequently unobserved. They compete with, and occupy the place of those mischievous and dangerous passions and employments, to which want of occupation and ennui give of birth. They are excellent substitutes for drunkenness, slander, and the love of gaming” (Bentham, 1825, p. 207)

The view of the arts as a powerful technology of self-regulation was soon perceived by politicians, reformers and educators. It was the opening of an avenue for a will to change, both as a gun against the vicious and an alternative way of spending free time, but also by the relation that a romanticized view of the arts effected within each individual (as a spectator or a producer). The question of taste, as argued by Romans (2005), connects the idea of beauty with morality.

As secular and simultaneously ritual institutions, the museums were ‘powerful transformers’ in converting “what were once displays of material wealth and social status into displays of spiritual wealth” (Duncan, 1991, p. 95). For the aristocracy and bourgeoisie as for the working class, the arts, framed in the museological device, oiled techniques of self-regulation. The techniques developed were just one of the modalities of what Michel Foucault (1988) called the technologies of the self and which, in their general terms, have been configured as a technically determined modality of the supervision of individual freedom.

Even if in its claims the art museum was born from the principle of talking to and being open to all citizens, it acted as a machinery of distinctions in the making of different kinds of people: those that by their education or social status shared a cultural code that situated the arts as an exceptional world only for a few, thus making something that had a social cause as something justified by a natural law; and those that did not possess that code and were being continuously reminded of their status of lack relating to that world and, at the same time, learning the correct and natural order of beauty through the prescription of a national taste built on reference to the old masters. The galleries of genius on display worked as a technology of government in the making of

people and creating a continuum of advanced and less advanced civilizations (Martins, 2015; Ó, Martins & Paz, 2013).

Tony Bennett argues that museums served as instruments for differentiating populations. This means that the more romanticized view of museums as places in which greatness and beauty is displayed has to be problematized in terms of the political rationalities that made museums possible as reasonable places for exhibiting greatness and beauty. At the same time one can forget that the term ‘arts’ as a synonym for the ‘fine arts’ is an institutional social construction that simultaneously separates the world of art from the world of crafts, and the artist from the artisan. The new category of ‘fine arts’ was conceptualized, in the 18th century, as “a matter of inspiration and genius and meant to be enjoyed for themselves in moments of refined pleasure” (Shiner, 2001, p. 5). Museums were one of the devices for exhibiting and ‘teaching’ that message.

Museums as well as schools, hospitals or the prisons emerged as, and through, new forms of social government in which new techniques of regulation and self-regulation were being enhanced and improved. It was, thus, under the moral and civilizing argument that the arts appeared as a terrain for a bio-political strategy, and also as an instrument for the enactment of the technologies of the self in the making of a civilized being. The device of being ‘civilized’ inscribed the differentiation of those who possess ‘reason’ from those who do not. The civilizing process corresponded to a line of development in which culture and the state of being civilized were the opposite of savageness and barbarism. This process had different nuances in different Western countries, but it corresponded to a colonial project in which hegemony was calculated through the governing of differences. Museums and schools will here be considered as two of the governing devices in the fabrication of this citizen as a certain kind of person. Later in the chapter I will argue that it is through an ideal and romanticized view of the arts and the artist that the purposes for the arts in education are shaped, although in schools the arts exist only as a label. My argument is that the arts as a school subject, be it visual arts, music or dance, are not about the arts but about the governing of the child as a certain type of subject. However, this governing is only possible through a redemptive view of the arts as being exceptional that was perpetuated by museums, concert halls, theatres and their ritualized secular practices.

4. Schools as civilizing machines

In the previous section my aim was to stress the link between government and the arts, making visible, through the museum as a modern disciplinary device, the construction of art as an instrument for acting on the social whose mechanism depended on its ability to effect an inner moral transformation that would give rise to particular ways of behaviour. In this section I will jump to the school device.

Modern schooling was for making up the modern citizen as a well behaved citizen able to occupy its place in society. Education carried a salvation narrative of progress and upbringing while representing the possibility to differentiate and govern the child, the family and its relation to the community. What once was only a practice of a minority group became, through public education, a governmental moral concern of the modern nation states. Ian Hunter's study on Culture and Government shows that literary education in England was dependent on the historical emergence of a new kind of educational apparatus: "one capable of combining a concern for individual 'self-expression' with new techniques of supervision and discipline operative at the level of population" (Hunter, 1988, p. 4). Modern schooling was part of a new scientific apparatus on childhood. It was not only a new way of placing children within a new institution called school but rather a new conception of what a child was and should be. The educational sciences, organized as a new field of studying, produced cultural theses about how to rear the child according to its natural development and attributes (Martins, 2017). As Popkewitz (2009) demonstrates, the narratives of the family and the child were essential for the making of the nation and its exceptionalism as an equivalent to progress and civilization. Educational and pedagogical sciences embodied forms of expertise that worked as the shepherds of what was (im)possible to know, think and act relating to the child and its education. From here there resulted the normal and the pathological child that was in need of rescue and salvation.

The arts, as well as physical education, were part of most European curricula since the 2nd half of the 19th century (Kamens & Cha, 1992). These were subjects associated with the pursuit of modernization and the creation of progress by their distinctiveness and superiority in the affirmation of a narrative of civilization. Seen as sources of spiritual growth and a way of improving the civilization of nations, these were subjects that linked the child to the nation and community. Europe was at the heart of this debate through the pedagogical treatises of Rousseau, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, and later through the writing of modern progressive educators. The idea spread all over Europe and the United States and, as Kamens and Cha (1992) argue, diffused more slowly than other school subjects outside the West. In Portugal, for instance, influenced by the English movements in South Kensington, drawing was conceived as the technological sublime that simultaneously embodied the reason and wisdom of Enlightenment through which the nation could achieve its place as a modern nation (Martins, 2011). The argument was repeated by some Portuguese pedagogues during the second half of the nineteenth century and throughout the twentieth century, positioning art education and the child at the heart of the hopes for the future.

The arts came to be introduced into the school arena due to their disciplinary and moral effects. It was not a power through corporeal punishment but, rather, arts were seen as being capable of moulding the child from the inside. The deployment of drawing practices in school through copying the great masters, printings, or engravings was

similar to the practice of scripture in monastic life. Art practice in school, from drawing to music, has been viewed as promoting disciplined and self-governing citizens. It emerged in relation to the issue of the deviant child, the immigrant or the children of the poor. These kinds of people became a recurrent issue to justify that certain children, believed to be born with evil tendencies within families where vices proliferated, could be saved through intensive work on their souls. Police technologies were not only about the maintenance of order through an exhaustive knowledge of the populations to be controlled and governed but also about the productive making of each individual as a moral and civilized piece of that population. What was important was not art in itself but the ways in which artistic practices worked at the level of providing strategies to supplant immoral thoughts and acts.

Looking at the 19th century social purposes for arts education gives us the historical layers of these narratives of the arts as providing opportunities for the child at risk, marginalized communities or immigrants. Arts education was to secure the future through the governing of individual conduct. Philanthropists did not only collect art, they also invested in charity. Hospitals, boarding schools, orphanages were places where the arts were found on the walls, displaying large-scale portraits of the supporters, but also as a technology of government in the child's education. Drawing and music were two of the most invested areas in the education of the deaf, blind, and orphaned child. A utilitarian view of art was being mobilized in the context of which morality, right thinking and useful skills were learned. The arts were seen as being naturally good, as they were supposed to mirror the universal values of beauty and truth.

The arts in education were developed as salvation narratives of the soul (Martins, 2014). Like museum practices were believed to develop, also the practice of the arts in school was granted with a potential to transform, from the inside, those that were to be educated. When talking about salvation, I must clarify that this is not meant in religious terms but rather as a secularization of pastoral practices whose origins are religious. In schools the educated self that was the "good" citizen. His/her salvation implied making an imagined child by way of a crossover of psychological and pedagogical statements.

The salvation themes of the arts in school were taken to govern, from within, the students. And that hope of creating particular kinds of people also provided narratives of redemption among those populations feared as dangers and dangerous to the desired future (Popkewitz, 2008). Art education was (and is) given as a means to social equity through attending poor or problematic families and contexts, the ones considered 'at risk' by their dissident behaviour or those that are also classified by several medical labels, as a therapeutic means or as an instrument for well-being. One field where the link between government and the arts is very evident is youth at risk. Art projects and experiences are given as reflexive projects of self-salvation. An attentive analysis of what is at stake shows us, however, interesting relations between moral panic, risk and youth

arts. We should ask how the notion of risk, fear, deviance is mobilized by making a certain kind of subject and how his/her conduct is conducted under the flag of hope, progress or development. Considering this connectedness, we can see how, by locating in particular youths in discourses of risk and redemption through the arts, we simultaneously reproduce them as occupying particular spaces of exclusion. The legacy of the ways in which Enlightenment brought art and the government of populations into contact is still a part of the matrix of the rhetorics of today.

5. Are the arts in school about the arts?: the alchemies of the arts travelling into education

It seems that there is no question about the arts when we talk about the arts in education. However, what I will be arguing now is that even if art as a subject in school benefits from the aura of its name (and the notion of genius), it is not the artist's practice what we are talking about when talking about the arts in education. When transposed into school subjects, the knowledge that is supposed to represent a specific academic discipline is transformed. What is maintained is the name. However, this name is only a label. Beneath the label, however, there are ways of reasoning about the child's development, learning processes and problem solving organised into layers that aim to change and transform the child into a certain kind of person. Thomas Popkewitz called this the alchemy of school subjects. "School subjects", he argues, "have little to do with the network and relations that form and give order to the norms of participation, truth, and recognition in the various academic fields associated with school subjects" (Popkewitz, 2007, p. 78). Alchemies have a governing effect.

When I am talking about the alchemies of arts education, I refer to a way of thinking about the subjects in school as being more than disciplinary knowledge. One of the arguments being explored is that most of the times arts education is not about the arts but is a translation of psychological principles of the child into schooling. It assumes several shapes in the curriculum (think, for instance, how the curriculum is constructed in maths, physics, sciences, but also in the arts, through developmental theories of children growing. What does this mean? What kind of child is imagined and represented here, but also, what kind of child is considered here to not fit into this? Think about the paradigm "from the simple to the complex", about the different stages of children drawing, for instance, and how these ways of reasoning are ways of governing who the child is, but also who it not is). With the alchemy of drawing, for example, there also come the rules of how children are supposed to learn, which stages of development they are supposed to go through, how knowledge should be divided and provided, and how drawing mirrors the child's inner life.

The different stages of child development through drawing were an instrument that allowed for the outlining of the normal and the abnormal child. It is of particular importance here to stress that drawing was not considered an artistic issue but was translated into particular images that governed how the child should develop. This development was accompanied by an increase in graphic complexity and realism. The ability to draw, for instance, is read according to a catalogue of possibilities that are very much the same as those that were the canons of Western representation. By the end of the 19th century the grids that would define the different stages of development contributed to a government of childhood. The fundamental belief in the sciences of individualization was linked to a normalized view of childhood, and within this field of government the notion of development was one that had a more powerful effect (Martins, *in press*). The naturalized notion of child development, also through and within drawing, is a powerful device for governing the child that is still present today. The erasure of difference is inscribed within the pedagogical practices (ways of seeing, saying and acting). Given the knowledge of these different stages, the teaching of drawing would be organized to be adapted not by reference to drawing as a form of artistic knowledge but rather to the fabrication of a given idea of children or adolescents. In the words of a modern Portuguese educator, drawing was conceived as "a powerful tool" that allowed observers "to appreciate the development of children and adolescents in drawing and their dispositions, their aptitudes and disabilities," these scales made drawing a device of measurement and government (Vasconcelos, 2010 [1934], p. 224). The alchemy of school subjects is to normalize and govern the student's conduct (Popkewitz, 2004). When examined historically, the translations into curriculum were little interested in understanding art, science, mathematics or music as fields that produce knowledge. The gap between the arts as artists practice them and the arts as they are talked and acted in school is not something to be solved, as schools are places invented to transform the child into a citizen. That is the reason why in schools knowledge is presented as being 'useful' for the development of the child. The central organizing principles embody cultural theses about modes of living. The cultural theses were in the past, and still are today, about the dispositions, sensitivities and awareness that linked individuality to collective belonging and morality.

So, how do the alchemies we have been talking about entail narratives of salvation that inscribe the hopes and fears connected to the making of the reasonable citizen of the future?

UNESCO's Road Map for Arts education provides a good example of how the alchemies occur not only within the school curriculum. In this document it is argued that "Without an emotional involvement, any action, idea or decision would be based purely on rational terms. Sound moral behavior, which constitutes the solid grounding of the citizen, requires emotional participation" (UNESCO, 2006, p. 5). We can identify the field of psychology as lenses that normalize arts education discourses as

calculating the personal and inner capabilities of the students. The emphasis is always on the soul of the child as a moral being. This soul is not a religious notion, but rather it corresponds with the secularization of Christian principles of confession and pastorality into strategies that in school will appear as self-development, self-expression and progress.

It is easy to develop a historical amnesia, as the languages of arts education are about learning and human self-betterment that obscure schooling as a social and cultural practice. Even by its own field arts education is seen as providing positive effects in the child. The OECD PISA 2012 Report states that art students are "highly motivated students" that are "taught to envision what they cannot observe directly with their eyes, to observe carefully, to reflect on their own work process and product, to engage and persist in their efforts, and to stretch and explore creative possibilities" (OECD, 2014, p. 122). If we think about each of the effects the magic of arts education is said to produce, we see that none of them is typical for the arts and, at the same time, exactly the same arguments are used for science, mathematics or reading. The classifications used have psychological roots and are about the making of a certain moral kind of person, that is the creative problem solver and life-long learner of the so called knowledge society.

UNESCO identifies these fears and the child that is out of the normative spaces:

"For example, due to societal changes which affect family structures, children are often deprived of parental attention. In addition, due to lack of communication and relationship-building in their family life, children often experience a variety of emotional and social problems. Moreover, transmission of cultural traditions and artistic practices within family environments is becoming more difficult, especially in urban areas" (UNESCO, 2006, p. 5).

The formation of art education was concerned with what Popkewitz called the trilogy: the focus on the child was intricately tied to the 'nature' of the family and community of the child. Community was the social and moral order around which the family was associated. In the social and educational sciences at the turn of the century community was a term that connected particular religious notions about memory and salvation to questions about moral disorder and urban populations of the poor and the working class. The social question and the problem of governing belong to this context. The social, the family, the emotions are put together as the causes that produce the socially problematic child to be governed and administered by arts education. The identified problems within the social tissue have been part of the language of science and government since the 19th century. The domestic sciences at the turn of the 20th century, for instance, embodied theories that regulated the relationships between parents and children, how to rear the child, how to provide healthier environments at home, from spatial organization to diet plans.

The notion of development and the chronological line each child goes through in terms of his/her performance in drawing or music, for instance, was a practice that emerged within psychology and allowed for the establishment of a normal childhood and its government. It is through this alchemy of development inscribed into school subjects, for instance, that certain kinds of subjects are being made up in schools. The presence of the arts in education embodies narratives of salvation about the hopes of the future and its rhetorics of a more progressive and human society. The salvation narratives are given and self-legitimizing, as empowering children and youth.

6. Can we think otherwise?

Art educators and researchers are seldom concerned with the historical layers that make it possible to think and perform their practices. Histories of arts education are commonly written from historicist, linear, chronological and geographical perspectives of progress and development. What I have been trying to do throughout this text was avoiding a presentist view of history. Michel Foucault (1980 [1971]) talked about an ontology of the present as the gesture that considers the subject in the present and the power/knowledge relations that make a certain relation to truth reasonable.

My question would be: can we think otherwise about the presence of the arts in education?

This is simultaneously a theoretical and methodological movement that seeks to understand the contemporary limits of what we can see, think and do. Analysing these limits means putting into question "what is given to us as universal, necessary, obligatory" (Foucault, 1984, p. 45). For those engaged with arts education and for believers in the power of arts for human fulfilment this gesture may seem problematic. Maybe I can say that it is not so much a gesture of rejection but rather a practical critique that opens avenues for possible transformations of ourselves.

As Gaztambide Fernandez (2013) puts it, we have to enhance other "understanding of the arts in education through a more robust language that does not require that all worthy experiences involving symbolic creativity be defined a priori as both good and predictable." Constructing other arguments that can exceed the rhetoric of effects signalled by Gaztambide because that rhetoric discursively construes the arts as things in themselves, "as elixirs that can be injected to transform educational situations and guarantee particular outcomes". Another way of seeing it is through an eventualizing of arts education:

"A simple analogy is possibly useful here. We can think of arts education like a recipe and the outcome. When we go to the bakery, we 'see' and think about the cake in the display case. It is an object that has an identity all on its own that triggers our imagination of

taste and culinary joys. The cake becomes a determinate object – a metonym – something that is representable and has an identity whose effects we project (what would it taste like if we had a piece), and also calculable (we buy it and taste it to decide if it “works”). But the cake is produced from a number of ingredients that have different qualities, capabilities, and characteristics. When assembled and connected, those elements are no longer seen. The cake becomes an object with its own identity and productive of desire. Art education is like the cake, only not an intentional object given its determinacy but one that is historically produced through different events. To “eventualize” the recipe of art education is to make visible the different practices that make it possible to think about schooling, art, teachers, children and difference in people in the governing of the present.” (Martins & Popkewitz, 2015, p. 8)

The rhetoric of effects is always caught in a positivist logic that enforces the prevailing normative and technocratic view of education, reinstating the same social hierarchies reproduced through traditional schooling. The rhetorics of the benefits of the arts for ‘all’ inscribe forces that differentiate and divide. My aim as a researcher in arts education is to disrupt what is taken for granted in arts education. It includes exploring the different ingredients and layers that produce the principles governing what the child or the teacher are, who they should be, and those that do not fit into these spaces. It means looking at the present with critical, inquiring eyes and at how it embodies practices that, by aiming at inclusion, create differentiations, distinctions and divisions. This means rehabilitating a principle of criticism that has to do with the ways in which we do not want to be governed. It is a difficult task and requires, each of us, to let go of the more solidified beliefs about the benefits of the arts. In a way, for me, it seems that for a democratic space for the arts, in which we are not separating those that can produce, the genius, and those that are merely capable of being spectators, for another distribution of the sensible in political terms, in terms of taking part in politics, in terms of changing the visibilities installed, my answer is that we need to acknowledge and question the powers that are playing within each of us when classifying something as good or bad, when desiring something for others, when trying to change society without taking the challenge of transforming ourselves and our unquestioned certainties.

“if we cannot weave new clothes for our naked emperor, we ought to think about writing a new story” (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013, p. 231)

References

- Becker, C. L. (2003 [1932]). *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Bennet, T. (2007). *Critical Trajectories: Culture, Society, Intellectuals*. USA, UK and Australia: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bennett, T. (1995). *The Birth of the Museum. History, Theory, Politics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bentham, J. (1825). *The Rationale of Reward*. London: John and H. L. Hunt.
- Danziger, K. (2008). *Marking the Mind. A History of Memory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daston, L., & Galison, P. (2010). *Objectivity*. New York: Zone Books.
- Duncan, C. (1991). Art Museums and the Ritual of Citizenship. In I. Karp & S. D. Lavine (Eds.), *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Duncan, C. (1995). *Civilizing Rituals Inside Public Art Museums*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1980 [1971]). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault* (pp. 139–164). New York: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp. 208–226).
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the Self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies Of The Self: A Seminar With Michel Foucault* (pp. 16–49). Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect. Studies In Governmentality With Two Lectures By And An Interview With Michel Foucault* (pp. 87–104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Why the arts don’t do anything: toward a new vision for cultural production in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 83(1), 211–236.
- Heath, S. (2008). Foreword. In A. O’Brien & K. Donelan (Eds.), *The Arts and Youth at Risk: Global and Local Challenges* (pp. ix–xvi). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hunter, I. (1988). *Culture and Government. The Emergence of Literary education*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press.
- Kamens, D. H., & Cha, Y.-K. (1992). The Formation of New Subjects in Mass Schooling: Nineteenth Century Origins and Twentieth Century Diffusion of Art and Physical Education. In J. W. Meyer, D. H. Kamens, & A. Benavot (Eds.), *School Knowledge for the Masses. World Models and National Primary Curricular Categories in the Twentieth Century* (pp. 152–164). London: The Falmer Press.
- Martins, C. S. (2014). The Arts in Education as Police Technologies. Governing the Child’s Soul. *European Education*, 45(3), 67–84.

- Martins, C. S. (2015). Genius as a Historical Event: Its Making as a Statistical Object and Instrument for Governing Schooling. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *The 'Reason' of Schooling. Historicizing Curriculum Studies, Pedagogy, and Teacher Education* (pp. 99–114). New York and London: Routledge.
- Martins, C. S. (2017). From Scribbles to Details: The Invention of Stages of Development in Drawing and the Government of the Child. In Thomas S. Popkewitz, Jennifer Diaz & Christopher Kirchgassler (Eds.), *A Political Sociology of Educational Knowledge. Studies of Exclusions and Difference* (pp. 105–118). New York and London: Routledge.
- Martins, C. S. (in press). Time, Drawing, Testing: The making up of the developmental child and the measuring of the nation's development. In S. Lindblad, D. Pettersson, & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education by the Numbers and the Making of Society. The Expertise of International Assessments*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Martins, C. S., & Popkewitz, T. S. (2015). The 'Eventualizing' of Arts Education. *Sisyphus – Journal of Education*, 3(1), 7–17.
- Mörsch, C. (s/d). The Formation of the Art – Education – Dispositive in England. Retrieved from http://www.w-k.sbg.ac.at/fileadmin/Media/contemporary_arts_and_cultural_ueroduction/2_Forschung/Symposienreihe_Participate/Texte/Art_Education_Dispositiv.pdf
- Ó, J. R. d., Martins, C. S., & Paz, A. L. (2013). Genealogy as history: From Pupil to Artist as the Dynamics of Genius, Status, and Inventiveness in Art Education in Portugal. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Rethinking The History Of Education. Transnational Perspectives on Its Questions, Methods, and Knowledge* (pp. 157–178). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- OECD. (2014). *PISA in Focus 38*. OECD Publishing.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2004). The Alchemy of the Mathematics Curriculum: Inscriptions and the Fabrication of the Child. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(1), 3–34.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2007). Alchemies and Governing: Or, questions about the questions we ask. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 39, 64–83.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform. Science, Education, and Making Society by Making the Child*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2009). The Social, Psychological, and Education Sciences: From Educationalization to Pedagogicalization of the Family and the Child. In P. Smeyers & M. Depaepe (Eds.), *Educational Research: the Educationalization of Social Problems* (pp. 171–190). New York: Springer.
- Romans, M. (2005). A Question of 'Taste': Re-examining the Rationale for the Introduction of Public Art and Design Education to Britain in the Early Nineteenth Century. In M. Romans (Ed.), *Histories of Art and Design Education. Collected Essays* (pp. 41–54). Bristol and Portland: Intellect.
- Shiner, L. (2001). *The Invention of Art. A Cultural History*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Taylor, B. (1999). *Art for the Nation. Exhibitions and the London Public 1747–2001*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- UNESCO. (2006). *Road Map for Arts Education. Building Creative Capacities for the 21st Century. Working Document*. Lisbon: UNESCO.
- Vasconcelos, F. d. (2010 [1934]). Problemas Escolares *Obras Completas de Faria de Vasconcelos V, 1933–1935* (pp. 1–271). Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Winner, E., Goldstein, T., & Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2013). *Art for Art's Sake? The Impact of Arts Education*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264180789-en>